

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

UN LIBRARY

**1877**<sup>th</sup> MEETING: 21 JANUARY 1976

JUN 19 1986

UN/SA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1877) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
The Middle East problem including the Palestinian question .....	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.

## 1877th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 21 January 1976, at 3 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Salim A. SALIM  
(United Republic of Tanzania).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Benin, China, France, Guyana, Italy, Japan, Libyan Arab Republic, Pakistan, Panama, Romania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania and United States of America.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1877)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The Middle East problem including the Palestinian question

*The meeting was called to order at 3.55 p.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The Middle East problem including the Palestinian question

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken by the Council [1870th-1876th meetings], I invite the representatives of Cuba, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Guinea, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Sudan, the United Arab Emirates, the Yemen Arab Republic and Yugoslavia, in conformity with the usual practice and with the relevant provisions of the Charter and the provisional rules of procedure, to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. In accordance with the decision taken by the Council [1870th meeting], I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the discussion.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Sharaf (Jordan), Mr. Allaf (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Khaddoumi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took places at the Security Council table; Mr. Alarcón (Cuba), Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic), Mrs. Jeanne Martin Cissé (Guinea), Mr. Jaipal (India), Mr. Al-Shaikhly (Iraq), Mr. Bishara (Kuwait), Mr. El Hassen (Mauritania), Mr. Zaimi (Morocco), Mr. Jamal (Qatar), Mr. Baroody (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Medani (Sudan), Mr. Ghobash*

*(United Arab Emirates), Mr. Sallam (Yemen Arab Republic) and Mr. Petrić (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

2. The PRESIDENT: I have also received letters from the representatives of Algeria, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Hungary, Poland and Tunisia, in which they ask to be invited, in accordance with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure, to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. I propose, if there is no objection, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, in conformity with the usual practice and with the relevant provisions of the Charter and the provisional rules of procedure. There being no objection, I shall invite those representatives to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the usual understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when they wish to address the Council.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Rahal (Algeria), Mr. Grozev (Bulgaria), Mr. Snid (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Hollai (Hungary), Mr. Jaroszek (Poland) and Mr. Driss (Tunisia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

3. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): It is significant that the Security Council cites the "Palestinian question" in its resolution 381 (1975) and has decided to invite the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to participate in the debate on an equal footing and with the same rights as those conferred on a Member State under rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Council. That decision correlates with the decisions, resolutions and practices adopted by the General Assembly and other international bodies in the past two or three years.

4. General Assembly resolutions 3236 (XXIX) and 3237 (XXIX), in recognizing the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people and in inviting the PLO to participate in the sessions and the work of all international conferences convened under the auspices of the General Assembly in the capacity of observer, demonstrate clearly that correlation.

5. The Council's decision reflects the profound changes and developments in the attitude of the United Nations and of international public opinion, as well as

the universally favourable response concerning the restoration of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. This decision by the Security Council articulates its position that the Palestine question in fact forms the essence and the core of the problem under discussion.

6. Owing to the invitation of the representatives of the Palestinian people to occupy their rightful place and participate in the debate, the Zionist representatives have deliberately chosen to remain absent from this crucial discussion. This absence aims at sabotaging the Council's work and paralysing its action. The Zionist representatives wage a dramatic propaganda campaign against the Security Council and the United Nations as a whole, employing the pro-Zionist and pro-imperialist American mass media.

7. However, we hope for a just and courageous action to be taken by the Council to rectify the historical injustice committed against the Palestinian people. The United Nations, including the Security Council, must find a just solution to the Palestinian tragedy, that may be traced back to the partition of Palestine. Members of the Security Council, by objectively studying the Palestine question from its beginning to the present, will perform a great service to the cause of peace and justice.

8. Recorded history tells us that Jews have enjoyed tolerance in the Arab-Moslem States of the Middle East and North Africa where they found a safe refuge from persecutions in Europe. However, Zionism, inspired by racial superiority, religious exclusivity and territorial expansionism, caused a rupture in the amicable relations between the Arabs and Jews in the area.

9. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, the Zionist movement was created. Reacting to adverse social, economic and political conditions under which Jews were living in eastern and central Europe, and influenced by nineteenth-century European colonialism, Zionist leaders set as an objective for themselves the establishment of a Zionist State in Palestine where all Jews of the world would be gathered.

10. Whereas Palestine has been inhabited by hard-working Arabs, lovers of the soil, who built towns and villages on their lands and who converted the desert into green farms, the Zionist leaders have deceived the Western public into thinking that that country was an empty wasteland and that no indigenous people had been living there for thousands of years. For many centuries Palestine has been an Arab land like any other part of the Arab homeland.

11. The Zionist movement undertook many efforts to take advantage of any opportunity to win the support of Western Powers in its endeavour to convert Arab-inhabited Palestine into an exclusively Jewish State. Britain, the most powerful super-Power at that time,

issued the Balfour Declaration of 2 November 1917,<sup>1</sup> pledging British support for the Zionist goal. The Balfour Declaration, pledging British support for the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine, is an illegal document defying international law and basic human rights. It can only be termed a blatant conspiracy against the Palestinian people.

12. The decision in 1920 by the San Remo Conference—which was dominated by the big colonialist Powers—to assign the Mandate for Palestine to Britain, provided an additional proof of the Zionist-British conspiracy. Sir Eric Drummond, Secretary-General of the League of Nations, in his description of the Mandate, wrote: "It was not made by the League, it was rather made by the British Government in collusion with the Jews." By its incorporation of the Balfour Declaration, the Mandate became a tool for implementing the Zionist goal of establishing a Jewish State in that part of the Arab homeland which was inhabited by an overwhelming majority of Arabs.

13. The British administration of Palestine—mainly in the hands of Zionists—was geared to the implementation of the British Zionist policy of transforming Arab Palestine into a Zionist State. Throughout the period of the British Mandate, the Arabs of Palestine opposed the British occupation, which threatened their very existence, and actively struggled to bring about a termination of the Mandate and to establish their independent, democratic State.

14. One of the methods employed and supported by the British administration to strengthen the economic status of the Zionist establishment in Palestine and to undermine the Palestinians' economic and social status involved the transfer of Arab lands to the Jews. This transfer created a large class of unemployed agricultural workers, because those lands, once transferred to the Zionist land agencies, became the inalienable property of the Jewish immigrants. Under the law of those Jewish national agencies, no non-Jew was allowed to be employed on Jewish-owned lands.

15. British policy was designed to destroy the basis of the Arab people's economy. Exaction of very high taxes, imposition of very high interest rates, forcing the prices of agricultural products down, creation of such economic conditions in Palestine where Arab industry could not compete with the Jewish industry, imposition of high levels of customs on imported products to protect Jewish industry and other economic devices placed the Arab people under severe economic strains.

16. The British administration of Palestine rejected the Arab complaints and harshly quelled Arab protests, strikes, demonstrations and armed uprisings against the Zionist designs in Palestine and against the British pro-Zionist policy. The Palestinians presented many moderate and reasonable proposals for Jewish-Arab

peaceful coexistence and for the establishment of a democratic representative Government in which Moslems, Christians and Jews would enjoy equal rights and bear equal responsibilities as equal citizens. Those proposals were rejected because the Zionists viewed them as threats to their single-minded goal of establishing an exclusive Jewish State.

17. Throughout the period of the Mandate, Britain created such military, social, political, economic and demographic conditions in Palestine as ensured Zionist success in the future Arab-Zionist showdowns. When the Mandatory Power viewed the prevailing conditions as ripe for a Zionist take-over of the country, it declared its intent to terminate the Mandate and to request the General Assembly of the newly established United Nations to decide the future of the Arab people *in absentia*.

18. The unjust partition resolution—resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947—was adopted against the wishes of the people of Palestine. The special session of the General Assembly of 51 Member States demonstrated a strategic manoeuvre, led by the imperialist Powers, to legalize the creation of the racist Zionist régime. This session occurred when the majority of the third-world countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America were still fighting to liberate themselves from the colonial yoke. Representatives voted for partition under formidable pressures and humiliating threats from the imperialist Powers. Without those pressures, the outcome of the session would have been very different.

19. The General Assembly had no legal authority to approve partition; it violated international law and contradicted the Charter, which recognizes the right of peoples to self-determination. This decision inflicted a paramount injustice upon the Arab people of Palestine.

20. Instead of taking 56 per cent of Palestinian territory, as specified in the General Assembly resolution, the Zionists forcibly seized 81 per cent of Palestine's land, causing the dispossession and expulsion of hundreds of thousands of Christian and Moslem Arabs from their homes and lands.

21. The imperialist Powers sought a *de jure* recognition of Israel by ensuring the admission of the Zionist régime to membership in the United Nations. However, it should be recalled that General Assembly resolution 273 (III) of 11 May 1949 stipulated that the membership of the Zionist régime within the United Nations was conditional upon its acceptance of and compliance with the preceding resolutions of the General Assembly, particularly those concerning the partition of Palestine and the resettlement of the Palestinian refugees in their homeland. It is clear, on the basis of the aforementioned resolution, that as long as the Zionist régime has not complied with the General Assembly resolutions, the legality of its admis-

sion to membership in the United Nations remains questionable.

22. The Zionist policy of expansionism has not been restricted to Palestine. It revealed its true expansionist nature by waging the 1956 and 1967 wars, occupying the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, the Egyptian Sinai and the Syrian Golan Heights. This Zionist aggression and occupation resulted in the displacement of hundreds of thousands of inhabitants of these lands, forcing them to start a new refugee life far away from their homes and lands.

23. In view of the racist policies of oppression, expulsion, imprisonment and murder of Palestinian Arabs pursued by the Zionist régime, the Arab people of Palestine have ever since been determined, through political and armed struggle, to liberate their land from Zionist occupation and to realize their inalienable rights, beginning with their right to return, their right to self-determination and their right to sovereignty on their national soil.

24. Peace in our part of the world can never be achieved so long as the Palestinian problem continues to exist. This problem can be solved only when the Zionist régime withdraws from all the occupied Arab lands and the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people are recognized and restored. The restoration of those rights is central to any solution of the Middle East problem. Restoration of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians calls for the establishment of a democratic secular State in Palestine including all the Palestinians—be they Moslems, Christians or Jews—with equal rights and responsibilities.

25. The scandalous Zionist record of defiance of the United Nations is well known. In spite of the fact that the Zionist entity was admitted conditionally to the United Nations, and that it bases its existence on a United Nations resolution, the Zionist entity has shown nothing but contempt for the Organization and international public opinion. This defiant attitude is reflected in the declaration by Levi Eshkol, following the war of June 1967, in which he stated that Israel would never execute the General Assembly's decisions even "if the United Nations votes by 121 votes to 1".

26. In July 1967 Golda Meir stated: "If a resolution is passed not to our liking, so what? After all, it is not a tank firing at you."

27. An Under-Secretary in the Israeli Foreign Ministry was reported as having declared, in February 1968: "What does a United Nations resolution amount to? Ninety votes, ninety speeches. What else?"

28. Recently, Mr. Herzog attacked the United Nations and reaffirmed the Israeli attitude to all United Nations resolutions when he declared: "Any Council resolution regarded as inimical to Israel's

interests will join hundreds of other United Nations resolutions in the waste-paper basket."

29. Since 1947, for a period of almost 30 years, the Zionists have refused to comply with United Nations resolutions, decisions and appeals. The United Nations has repeatedly condemned Zionist actions in Palestine and in the occupied Arab territories. However, Israel continues its arrogant disregard of the wishes and decisions of the international community.

30. What should be the international community's answer to the stubborn Zionist defiance? We must find the appropriate answer. Platonic resolutions have been consistently and contemptuously ignored by Israel and its protectors. In fact, the Zionists plot to gain time while creating facts in the area. Bertrand Russell pointed out that every Israeli aggression is also an experiment to discover how much more the world will tolerate. Every time Israel defies the United Nations without receiving any punishment, the authority of the Organization is further eroded. The international community must take effective measures by imposing appropriate sanctions against the racist and aggressive Zionist entity, which was illegally granted home and membership in the United Nations and which persists in disregarding the overwhelming will of the United Nations. This membership must be questioned.

31. The General Assembly, in its resolution 1904 (XVIII) of 20 November 1963, proclaimed the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. This Declaration affirmed that "any doctrine of racial differentiation or superiority is scientifically false, morally condemnable, socially unjust and dangerous". The Assembly also warned against "the manifestations of racial discrimination still in evidence in some areas of the world, some of which are imposed by certain Governments by means of legislative, administrative or other measures".

32. In application of these principles the General Assembly, in its resolution 3151 G (XXVIII) of 14 December 1973, condemned, *inter alia*, the unholy alliance between South African racism and zionism. The World Conference of the International Women's Year held in Mexico in 1975, called for the elimination of "zionism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in all its forms".<sup>2</sup>

33. Furthermore, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Kampala in 1975, declared that

"The racist régime in occupied Palestine and the racist régimes in Zimbabwe and South Africa have a common imperialist origin, forming a whole and having the same racist structure and being organically linked in their policy aimed at repression of the dignity and integrity of the human being."<sup>3</sup>

34. The Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries held at Lima in 1975 also condemned zionism as a threat to world peace and security, and called upon all countries to oppose that racist and imperialist ideology. Finally, General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX) of 10 November 1975 formally condemned zionism as "a form of racism and racial discrimination". That formal condemnation by the General Assembly, in equating zionism with racism, significantly points to the racist character of zionism. It is high time that the international community, inside and outside the United Nations, denounced and exposed this racist and reactionary ideology.

35. From its inception zionism envisaged a Jewish State which was to be exclusively Jewish. Palestine was populated by Arabs, but that fact was deliberately ignored. Zionists spoke in terms of "people without a land to a land without people". That attitude has continued to exist to the present time. A Jewish writer, Aubrey Hodes, in his book *Dialogue with Ishmael*, writes: "Ben-Gurion... despised the Arab way of life and warned publicly against the danger that Israel would become another Levantine country".<sup>4</sup>

36. Michael Bar-Zohar, in his book *Ben-Gurion: The Armed Prophet*, provides the following eloquent picture:

"While this might be called racialism, the whole Zionist movement actually was based on the principle of a purely Jewish community in Palestine. When various Zionist institutions appealed to the Arabs not to leave the Jewish State but to become an integral part of it, they were being hypocritical".<sup>5</sup>

37. According to the Zionist ideology, the establishment of the Jewish State was from the outset based on displacement of the Arabs. The idea that Arabs do not really count as people remains prevalent today. A Zionist song describes East Jerusalem in these terms: "The market-place is empty. None goes down to the Dead Sea by way of Jericho". The reference is to the market-place which is empty of Jews and to the fact that no Jew travels down to the Dead Sea by way of Jericho. In their view, Arabs do not exist.

38. Thousands of examples, practices and quotations can be used to illustrate the racism underlying the Zionist movement and the Israeli establishment. These examples confirm the vicious anti-Arab propaganda and the equally vicious glorification of militarism that cultivates hatred and racial aggression. R. J. Maxwell-Hyslop, a Member of Parliament, referring to a visit to the region after the 1967 war, declared in the House of Commons on 18 October 1973:

"After lunch, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Knesset spoke with great intemperance and at great length to us about the Arabs.

When he drew breath I was constrained to say, 'Doctor Hacohen, I am profoundly shocked that you should speak of other human beings in terms similar to those in which Julius Streicher spoke of the Jews. Have you learned nothing?' I shall remember his reply to my dying day. He smote the table with both hands and said, 'But they are not human beings, they are not people, they are Arabs' "6

39. In the opinion of *Mahanaim*, the official magazine of the Israeli Army Rabbinate, it is impossible for the Jews to live together with the Arabs. The following quotation, from an article published in April 1969, articulates that point of view:

"It is impossible to live together with the Arabs over prolonged periods, for their consciousness, prayers, desires and vision are oriented towards Mecca, whereas the Israeli's are toward Jerusalem. Only those facing Jerusalem represent the true sons of the land, whereas those facing Mecca are true to Arabia. The situation is clear, and its outcome is clear. Either the Arab element ceases to worship Mecca and starts worshipping Jerusalem, or it returns to Arabia and leaves the sons of Zion to fulfil their destiny unhindered. Those who will disturb shall be expelled."

40. A statement from an Israeli Defence Force booklet dramatically points out the racist character of zionism: "One may and, in keeping with Halakha, one must in fact kill them. In no case should one trust an Arab even if he gives the impression of being civilized".

41. In keeping with the racist Zionist dogma incorporated in the Proclamation of the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948,<sup>7</sup> this racist State "will be open for immigration of Jews" and for the regathering of exiles. Thus, any Jew anywhere in the world may claim citizenship and enjoy special ethnic and religious privileges. According to an amendment to that citizenship law adopted in 1971, the exercise of that right does not necessitate immigration to Israel. The racist "Law of Return" gives every Jew, regardless of present citizenship, the right to emigrate to Israel, and all States are prohibited from preventing Jewish emigration. In addition, the "Law of Nationality" grants automatic citizenship. At the same time, Arabs and other non-Jews are denied that privilege. Palestinians whose ancestors lived in Palestine for thousands of years are reduced to second-class citizenship.

42. Many prominent Jewish thinkers and intellectuals oppose zionism, exposing its fallacies while condemning its inherent racism. Recently Rabbi Elmer Berger, President of American Jewish Alternatives to Zionism, cited many examples of racism in Zionist policy in a famous letter to an Arab ambassador. He said:

"Israel is a State, therefore, in which if *apartheid* is not as blatant or as territorially visible as in South Africa, 'Jews' are nevertheless 'more equal than others'. ... If 'racism' is a form of government or a structure of society in which national rights and responsibilities are officially legislated upon the basis of creed, colour or ethnic derivation, then the Zionist character of much 'basic' Israeli law qualifies".

43. Mr. Alfred Lilienthal, a well-known American author, and lecturer and editor of *Middle East Perspective*—a man of the Jewish faith—criticized the racist philosophy of zionism in a White Paper dealing with zionism and racism. He said:

"It is strange indeed how the fallacious obsession of a vanquished foe should have come to dominate the philosophy of the survivors. In imposing nazism on country after country, Hitler proclaimed 'You are not a German, you are a Jew. You are not a Frenchman, you are a Jew. You are not a Czech, you are a Jew.' And zionism similarly speaks to the Jews of the Diaspora as it continuously seeks their involvement in the political problems of the Middle East. How far apart, then, is the Aryan racism and the Zionist racist reality?"

44. Professor Israel Shahak, chairman of the Israel League for Human and Civil Rights, recently published several articles and a book on the racism of Israel. Mr. Shahak's writings describe the oppression of Arabs in Israel, as well as the racist aspects of zionism. Mr. Shahak states in his article of 11 May 1975 in *Pi-Ha'Ato*, weekly student paper at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem:

"It is my considered opinion that the State of Israel is a racist State in the full meaning of this term. In this State, people are discriminated against in the most permanent and illegal way and in the most important areas of life, only because of their origin. This racist discrimination began in zionism and is carried out today mainly in co-operation with the institutions of the Zionist movement. ... In the State of Israel, one who is not a Jew is discriminated against because he is not a Jew. ... The first step consists in admitting the truth. The State of Israel is a racist State, and its racism is a necessary consequence of the racism of the Zionist movement. Facts are facts. After this, we can debate, if we wish to do so, why such a racism is forbidden against the Jews and becomes a good deed when it is carried out by Jews".

45. Finally, I would like to refer to a letter written by two individuals, Marty Blatt and Yarr Avoray, who describe themselves as "Israeli and American Jews". Their letter, published in *The Christian Science Monitor* on 13 January 1976, once again demonstrates the racist character of zionism:

"Zionism is fundamentally a racist political movement because it advocates a Jewish State on a territory the population of which is far from being totally Jewish. A State could contain a Jewish majority without having to be a Jewish State. Israel is a Jewish State not because it has Jews living in it but because the State is controlled by Jews, whereas non-Jews, namely, Palestinian Arabs, are being deprived of both individual and national rights. Such deprivation of Palestinian rights is extremely serious since it is legally based and not a result of day-to-day practice. The Law of Return automatically grants Israeli citizenship to all Jews across the world while denying the same to those Palestinians who either fled or were driven from their homes.

"No wonder that Moshe Dayan admitted: 'It is not true that the Arabs hate the Jews for personal, religious, or social reasons. They consider us—and justly, from their point of view—as Westerners, foreigners, invaders who have seized an Arab country to turn it into a Jewish State.' (*Le Monde*, weekly section, 9-16 July 1967)

"The hysterical attitude of the organized Jewish community in America is obscuring the real issues involved. Some are insidiously trying to cover up the true nature of Zionism as described above.

"We clearly and unambiguously see the need to oppose anti-Semitism and all other forms of racism. At the same time, we suggest that all people who are sincerely concerned about peace and social justice in the Middle East critically re-examine the history and meaning of the Zionist endeavour".

46. Now, what should the United Nations do? What should the Security Council do? What should the world do with a racist movement and with a racist entity? Should they be treated differently from Nazism and *apartheid*? The world is now asking what difference exists between the racist régime in South Africa and the racist régime in Palestine. An honest decision is needed. A courageous action is demanded, and history at last will judge.

47. History repeatedly teaches us that racism inherently involves terrorism. Zionism, which is both a racist and terrorist movement, has committed atrocities against the Palestinian people. During the British Mandate as well as in the succeeding period, Zionist terror organizations massacred thousands of Arab men, women and children, while destroying villages without any military necessity. Subjected continually to repressive measures and inhuman laws and regulations that violate elementary human rights, Arabs today experience illegal imprisonment and torture. In an address to the annual Conference of the American Council for Judaism on 2 November 1967, Anthony Nutting spoke of the forced mass exodus of the Arabs from their homes:

"From the moment when the United Nations passed the partition resolution, in November 1947, until the departure of the British forces from Palestine in May 1948, when the Israeli State was formally established, the Zionists, aided by the Stern gang, went to work to persuade the Arabs to leave the areas which were to form the Israeli State. To reinforce this argument that such Arabs would have no place in Israel, the Stern gang, as some of you will remember, selected a few villages such as Deir Yassin to stage a massacre of the Arab inhabitants to create a general state of panic and hence an exodus of the Arab population. So that by May 1948, when Britain formally and finally abandoned its responsibility for Palestine, more than 300,000 Arabs had been evicted from their homes and farms and had become the first installment of that hapless, hopeless, homeless group of suffering humanity known today as the Palestine refugees."

48. The Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories confirmed the following violations committed by the Zionist authorities: collective and area punishment; deportation and expulsion; ill-treatment of prisoners and civilians; destruction and demolition of houses and buildings; confiscation and expropriation of property; and looting and pillaging.

49. It is important to note that these racist and terrorist actions by the Zionist movement are consistently covered up by an active propaganda campaign. American and western mass media join forces with the Zionists to attempt to cover up the atrocities committed by the Zionist movement against the Palestinians. General Carl von Horn, in his book, *Soldiering for Peace*,<sup>8</sup> points out the distortion of facts by the Zionist movement. He writes:

"We are amazed at the ingenuity of the falsehoods which distorted the true picture. The highly skilled Israeli information service and the entire press combined to manufacture a warped, distorted version which was disseminated with professional expertise through every channel to their own people and their sympathizers and supporters in America and the rest of the world. Never in all my life had I believed the truth could be so cynically, expertly bent".

50. While it may be our fate to face the challenge of Zionist colonialism and to bear its atrocities and aggressions, sometimes we wonder if these people are really the survivors of Bergen-Belsen, Auschwitz or Treblinka.

51. The relations between this racist movement of Zionism and the imperialist Powers reflect another most disturbing facet of Zionism. Zionism, from its very beginnings, has identified itself with colonialist

interests. Since its creation Israel has supported the forces of colonialism and neo-colonialism. Seeking to guarantee the continuation of their policy of aggression and expansionism at the expense of our Arab people, the Zionist leaders joined their fate with the forces of imperialism and in particular with the British Empire in the past and the United States of America in the present. United States imperialism has bolstered the Israeli economy, supplying it with conventional and sophisticated weapons. We, the Arabs, have suffered and continue to suffer from this unholy alliance between the Zionist régime and the formidable American might.

52. The unjust and unlimited United States commitment to the Zionist cause constitutes the main obstacle to the formulation of a just and lasting peace in our region. Relations between the United States establishment and zionism have even become embarrassing to many Americans. The United States authorities are particularly sensitive to any developments that could potentially challenge the Zionist entity. Some of those authorities—and I do not exaggerate—view this defence of Zionist interests as more important than the defence of their American interests. Because of this unlimited support of zionism, the United States has created hostile and bitter relations with all the Arab nations and with the Arab leaders. Because of this commitment, the United States threatens and insults the United Nations. Responsible United States authorities employ strong language and take “tough measures” against the countries of the third world. In reality the United States, together with the Zionist régime, desires a return of the third world to a subservient position of obedience and allegiance. The United States continues to pressure and blackmail many small countries and is reported to be threatening substantial punitive cutbacks in aid to nations opposing United States policy on the Middle East, particularly its position regarding the Palestinian problem.

53. For many years since the revolution of 1 September 1969 in Libya, and especially since 1972, my own country, the Libyan Arab Republic, has experienced those external pressures. Those pressures are aimed at us in order to make us change our political stand concerning the Palestine question and to prevent us from both opposing and exposing United States involvement in the Middle East area. We have been consistently subjected to political and diplomatic pressures, propaganda wars, direct and indirect threats and, finally, refusal by the United States authorities to supply Libya with spare parts and materials. In spite of the fact that contracts were signed for those needed materials, including transport aircraft, and prices paid in cash, the United States authorities reneged on the fulfilment of those contracts. We are most grateful that we are not economically dependent on the United States. Economic pressures cannot alter our beliefs.

54. As I stated earlier, we deplore this cynical approach dictated by the unholy alliance between the

Zionist racist entity and United States imperialism. However, we are truly confident that small countries will stand together in solidarity and resist any kind of pressure. We shall never abdicate or capitulate and we shall never remain silent in the face of this aggressive policy of intimidation. We shall never betray our cause or disappoint our Palestinian and Arab brothers. On this occasion I should like to return to an issue that I mentioned earlier in the General Assembly. Our problem is with the United States Government and establishment rather than with the American people and nation. We hope that one day in the near future the American people will stop to consider the sufferings inflicted upon the Arab nation by the United States governing establishment. We are fully convinced that the people of the United States will know the truth one day and will understand the very nature of zionism and discover the true dimensions of the catastrophic United States involvement in the Middle East.

55. Before concluding, I should like to reiterate my delegation's position concerning resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). Because these resolutions have been bypassed by events and developments both inside and outside the United Nations, they are irrelevant as a framework for any just and lasting solution to the Middle East question. General Assembly resolutions 3236 (XXIX) and 3237 (XXIX), reaffirming the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, along with resolution 3379 (XXX), condemning zionism as a racist movement, and resolution 3376 (XXX), proposing means designed to enable the Palestinian people to achieve their national rights, reflect profound changes and developments in the attitude of the United Nations and of international public opinion and call for a review of the entire question and the method of dealing with it.

56. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Sudan. In accordance with the established practice, I request the representative of Egypt to withdraw temporarily from his place at the Council table in order that it may be taken by the representative of the Sudan. I now invite that representative to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

57. Mr. MEDANI (Sudan): Before expressing the views of my delegation on the item on the agenda, I should like to associate myself and my delegation with those who have expressed their condolences on the death of Chou En-lai, Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China. The great loss, sorrow and grief of the people of China on Premier Chou En-lai's death are deeply shared by the Government and people of my country. Mr. Chou En-lai's historic visit to the Sudan and 14 other States in Africa in 1964 contributed tremendously to the growing friendly and excellent relations existing between our two countries and

between China and many countries in the continent of Africa. It is an excellent example of co-operation among the nations of the third world. The people of the Sudan, I am sure, have lost a great friend.

58. Mr. President, it is a happy coincidence that you personally are presiding over the Security Council debate on the Middle East and the Palestinian question. Your personal association with the decolonization process at home and at the United Nations, your diplomatic skills and your dynamic leadership are widely acclaimed and recognized. Your country is the home and host of the Liberation Committee of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and many liberation movements. The United Republic of Tanzania, under the able and lustrous leadership of Mwalimu Julius Nyerere, has carried faithfully and silently its noble mission against colonialism, imperialism and racism. For these reasons, we are delighted to see you in the chair when the Security Council is discussing the question of Palestine and the Middle East.

59. Security Council resolution 381 (1975), which calls for a debate on the Palestinian question and the Middle East, is a historic resolution. The decision of the Council on 12 January 1976 to invite the representative of the PLO to participate in the debate under rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council is a reflection of the growing international support and recognition of the legal and inalienable rights of the Palestinians, and of the fact that the PLO is the only authentic representative of the people of Palestine, a fact which has been reaffirmed in various summit meetings of the League of Arab States, OAU, the non-aligned movement, the Islamic Conference, the General Assembly, and many international organizations. My delegation is deeply gratified to see the representative of the people of Palestine taking his rightful place in the Security Council on an equal footing with all other Member States, and would like here to extend to him our warm welcome and congratulations.

60. Furthermore, Council resolution 381 (1975) and the invitation to the PLO representative to participate in the debate have put the questions of the Middle East and Palestine in the right perspective for the first time. It is a recognition that the problem of Palestine is the core of the conflict in the Middle East, and that lasting peace and settlement cannot be achieved without the recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinians and the establishment of the independent Palestinian authority.

61. The aforesaid actions and resolutions of the Security Council were achieved very late. However, they provide the Council with a good opportunity to reach a constructive and objective resolution, confirming the new realities in international relations, and in the Middle East in particular. By so doing, they give the Council an opportunity to exercise its primary function and responsibility for the maintenance

of international peace and security which is entrusted to the Council by the Charter of the United Nations. It is indeed gratifying to see the overwhelming and almost unanimous support of the members of the Council of the inalienable rights of the Palestinians—a prerequisite to a lasting peace and settlement in the Middle East.

62. However, the negative attitude of Israel to all constructive efforts of the international community and the Security Council is well known to all of us—the ruthless and barbaric air raids on refugee camps in Lebanon, the establishment of five new settlements on the Golan Heights, and now the boycott of the Security Council's debate and a number of attempts to block all constructive efforts of the Council.

63. Michael Adams reported on 28 July 1975 in *The Washington Post* that:

“With more than 50 settlements already established and with the process of colonization accelerating throughout the occupied territories, many Israelis are easily unaware of the inconsistency between what their Government is saying and what it is doing about reaching a political settlement with the Arabs. Lord Caradon, who visited Israel last month to explore the possibilities of such an agreement, has called these 50 settlements ‘50 signposts to destruction’ ”.

Mr. Adams went on to say:

“They are also 50 classic examples of the way the State of Israel has been constructed; but if the objective is to ensure the survival of the State itself, the Israelis will sooner or later have to abandon these outposts beyond their borders—even if it means reversing the course of Zionist history.”

64. It is the same conclusion reached by David Ben-Gurion himself after many years of damage, suffering and injustice that he had inflicted on the Palestinians and neighbouring Arab States. He said at last in his later years:

“As for security, military defensible borders, while desirable, they cannot by themselves guarantee [Israel's] future. Real peace with our neighbours—mutual trust and friendship—that is the only true security.”

65. The friends of Israel and its sponsors should at least follow the advice of Ben-Gurion and make it understand that its security is not in occupation and the establishment of new settlements. Unlimited support to Israel will certainly lead Israel to further aggression and war that may endanger the international peace and security of the whole world. This cannot be better explained than by the statement of former Senator J. W. Fulbright, when he said—and I quote from *The Washington Post* of 7 July 1975: “We are

providing the material means for an Israeli policy that is beyond our control—a policy that, by all indications, is carrying both Israel and the United States towards a major new crisis.”

66. My delegation shares the view expressed in this debate that resolution 242 (1967) is vague, defective and inadequate to achieve a lasting peace and settlement in the Middle East. The 1973 war of liberation is a product of that inadequate resolution. Indeed, Security Council resolutions 338 (1973) and 381 (1975), and the invitation to the PLO to participate in this debate, indicate that additional measures are needed to achieve a lasting peaceful settlement.

67. General Assembly resolutions 3236 (XXIX), 3237 (XXIX) and 3375 (XXX) have laid down the basic conditions for peace in the Middle East. They suggest that the framework established nine years ago is insufficient to meet the necessary conditions of peace in the Middle East. That is only natural, because everything is subject to change—individuals, nations and organizations are subject to change and progress. However, the Zionist entity does not like to see any change in the framework decided nine years ago, which Israel itself has consistently refused to comply with.

68. It is most regrettable to my delegation that such an intransigent attitude should find support in the words of certain representatives. The representative of the United States said: “Changes imposed on the parties and unacceptable to any one of them, however great the good will, will not work” [1876th meeting, para. 6]. How could such a statement be valid while Israel is persisting in boycotting the Security Council debate in spite of the many appeals made to it?

69. The main theme which has been established in the current debate of the Council, confirming the General Assembly resolutions, reflects that resolution 242 (1967) is inadequate. It is silent on the rights of the Palestinians, it denies the Palestinians their right of self-determination and their right to a homeland in Palestine, while one cannot argue for a *status quo* that is as dead as Caesar.

70. The Sudan Foreign Minister, in his statement during the thirtieth session of the General Assembly, said that President Woodrow Wilson, “outraged by the Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916 and the Balfour Declaration of 1917,... tried to put justice and high principles into a map of treachery and double-dealing.” The Sudan Foreign Minister added: “That is a part of the American tradition which has been abandoned completely. The opposite is now the case.”

71. Yet the Palestinian question has to be considered within the context of those lofty American traditions, if a genuine and lasting peace is to be established in the Middle East. On this subject, it is encouraging to read in *The New York Times Magazine* of 14 Decem-

ber 1975 that President Ford said to Joseph Alsop: “Most Americans are willing to take great risks to preserve the State of Israel, but they are not willing to take great risks to preserve Israel’s conquests.”

72. The General Assembly has already adapted itself to the changing circumstances and realities in the Middle East. It reaffirmed at its twenty-ninth session the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people in Palestine, including the right to self-determination and to national independence and sovereignty, and the inalienable right of the Palestinians to return to their homes and property from which they had been displaced and uprooted; the Assembly emphasized also that full respect for and realization of those inalienable rights were indispensable for the solution of the question of the Middle East as a whole.<sup>10</sup>

73. It is the firm opinion of my delegation that if Israel does not respect this and withdraw from all occupied Arab territories, then peace will continue to be threatened in the area and consequently in the world as a whole. Yet, Israel does not take advice. It remains for the members of the Council to shoulder their great and historic responsibility and take the necessary measures to implement General Assembly resolutions 3236 (XXIX) and 3376 (XXX).

74. I wish to recall the words of Mr. John Scali, United States representative to the United Nations two years ago, when he referred to efforts in the Security Council to solve the Middle East question. He then said that those efforts were “a testimony of mankind’s continuing hope that this great international Organization can move towards its most important goal as the guarantor of peace.” Let us sincerely hope so.

75. Mr. President, I thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak. Your presidency for this month is not an easy task, but our confidence in you is limitless and I wish you all success.

76. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Sudan for the tribute he paid to my country and my President and for the very kind words he addressed to me personally. The next speaker is the representative of Bulgaria. In accordance with the established practice, I request the representative of Jordan to withdraw temporarily from the Council table in order that his place may be taken by the representative of Bulgaria. I invite that representative to take that place at the Council table and to make his statement.

77. Mr. GROZEV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from Russian*): On behalf of the delegation of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria, I should like to thank you, Mr. President, and the members of the Security Council for the opportunity you have given me to participate in the present debate on the Middle East problem including the Palestinian question. I should also like most sincerely to congratulate you, the representative

of the friendly United Republic of Tanzania, as the President of the most responsible body of the United Nations, the Security Council. The fact that you occupy this post at a time when the whole of the Middle East question is being discussed is promising. In you we see a consistent and dynamic defender of the rights of peoples to self-determination. Moreover, as Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples for over four years, you have earned a reputation as a consistent and relentless fighter for the unreserved and unconditional implementation of the sacred right of peoples.

78. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria has expressed the desire to participate in this debate on the basis of the principled position and the profound conviction of our Government that the time has come to consider a political settlement of the Middle East crisis that would eliminate once and for all this protracted and constant source of tension and conflict. The interest of our country in establishing a just and durable peace in that area of the world is more than clearly understandable. This is in keeping with the sacred vocation of the Bulgarian people to build their future in conditions of peace and security.

79. The Middle East, as members know, is directly adjacent to the Balkans and to our country. The solution of the Middle East problem is consequently closely connected with the security of the region where we live. Therefore, in the joint Greek-Bulgarian communiqué of 14 January, issued on the occasion of the visit to Greece of the Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Petar Mladenov, the following was stated:

“Both parties have expressed their concern about the Middle East crisis and have stressed the need to establish a just and durable peace. On the basis of the principle of self-determination of peoples, as well as on the basis of the stipulation that the seizure of territory by force is unacceptable in international relations, both parties have stressed the need to liberate all Arab territories occupied in 1967 and the need for a solution taking into account the legitimate rights of all peoples in the region, guaranteeing the national identity and the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine.”

80. The Bulgarian delegation welcomes the initiative of the Security Council in holding a wide-ranging debate on the Middle East crisis. The present debate proves again the imperative need to take a decisive step forward to establish a just and durable peace in the Middle East. To achieve this, it is essential that three basic problems, which are the crux of the conflict and which are organically interlinked, be solved: the withdrawal of Israel from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967; the exercise of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including the right

to the creation of their own State, and the guarantee of the security and the right to independent existence and development of all States in the region.

81. We are certain that if all the members of the Security Council take into account those essential conditions for the establishment of a durable peace and if they manifest the necessary responsibility, realism and goodwill, the present session of the Council will, as a direct result, lead to the creation of favourable conditions for the resumption of the work of the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East and to the guaranteeing of its success.

82. It has already been stressed during the debate that there are now real possibilities for a comprehensive political solution to the Middle East problem. A lengthy debate during the thirtieth session of the General Assembly pinpointed the crucial fact that an overwhelming majority of Member States already have a clearer understanding of the substance of the Middle East conflict as well as of the ways and means for its radical solution.

83. First and foremost—and this, in our view, is of crucial importance—the fact is almost universally recognized that the Palestinian question is one of the key problems in the Middle East crisis and that, without the exercise of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, it will be impossible to find a just and durable solution to the conflict. There was a time when some thought it heresy merely to mention the rights and interests of the Palestinian people. They were satisfied merely with seeking a solution to the problem through Pharisaic charity and handouts to the Palestinian refugees. Now the same people merely refer to the interests of the Palestinian people. Unfortunately, they do not yet want to recognize that the Palestine problem is first and foremost a political problem and that it is precisely the legitimate interests of the Arab people of Palestine that require the unconditional recognition of its national rights, including its right to independent statehood.

84. These rights have already been recognized and reaffirmed by the overwhelming majority of States in the world as well as by the two most recent sessions of the General Assembly. What is more, the need was reaffirmed for the participation of the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, the PLO, in the consideration of all aspects of the question at all stages and in all international forums for a political settlement of the Middle East crisis.

85. In this connexion an important—and, I would say, decisive—step forward has already been taken. The legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, namely, the PLO, is participating in the work not only of the General Assembly but also of the Security Council. A logical consequence thereof should be the participation of the PLO in the work of the existing international negotiating machinery on the

Middle East problem, the Geneva Peace Conference, from the very beginning and on an equal footing. Those who do not understand or who pretend not to understand the historic significance of this fact manifest either an unpardonable political shortsightedness or a reluctance to promote, in the final analysis, the establishment of a durable peace in the Middle East.

86. I should like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the Bulgarian delegation, most cordially to welcome the representatives of the PLO and to pledge to them the full and unreserved co-operation and support of the Government and the people of Bulgaria for the just cause of the heroic Arab people of Palestine, a cause which cannot fail to achieve victory.

87. The experience of virtually the last three decades shows that a durable peace in the Middle East cannot be based on a mere truce among individual countries or groups of countries in the region. This approach led and will continue to lead, if it continues to be applied, to an illusory calm and ultimately to renewed armed confrontations. The establishment of a just and durable peace in the Middle East undoubtedly requires the implementation of the well-known resolutions of the Security Council and those adopted at the twenty-ninth and thirtieth sessions of the General Assembly on the Middle East and the Palestine question. However, it is essential to apply these resolutions in all of their parts and to all the parties to the conflict. Moreover, we cannot take into account and insist on the implementation of the well-known Security Council resolutions alone, as is done by some bearing a large share of responsibility for the non-implementation of these resolutions to date, and completely forget and disregard the relevant General Assembly resolutions which express the view and the will of the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations.

88. The essence of the Middle East conflict requires a total solution to the problem. Therefore, any partial settlement disregarding the key problems could not lead to durable results. Consequently, the *sine qua non* for the achievement of progress towards a peaceful settlement of the crisis remains the unconditional and total withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967. Any attempt by Israel or its patrons to impose a distorted interpretation of the Security Council and General Assembly resolutions on this specific and crucial question should be categorically rejected.

89. The Israeli aggressor should no longer count on rewards for its stubbornness and its flouting of United Nations resolutions. Both the General Assembly and the Security Council have reaffirmed the need strictly to observe one of the basic principles of the Charter, namely, that of the inadmissibility of the occupation of foreign territory by force. Concessions through partial agreements and separate negotiations are in

essence a violation of this principle. The ruling circles of Israel and their patrons hope to undermine the unity of the Arab peoples and to thwart their sincere wish to achieve a political settlement of the Middle East conflict on the basis of the principles of the Charter and the relevant decisions of the Security Council and General Assembly of the United Nations.

90. The real interests of all the Arab peoples without exception require the frustration of the hopes and wishes of the Israeli occupiers and their patrons. The Arab countries and peoples have once more reaffirmed their goodwill, their desire for peace and their constructive approach to a settlement to this protracted crisis. This position has found broad support and was praised by the United Nations in both the General Assembly and the Security Council. It is high time for Israel to desist from its obstructionist and unreasonable policy, to show the necessary realism and to prove by its actions that it in fact wishes peace and good-neighbourly relations with the Arab peoples.

91. The absence of Israel from the present debate, as well as a number of recent events in that region which are a direct result of the Israeli policy of aggression and provocation, does not attest to either realism or goodwill. The support which this course that was charted by Israel receives from certain States is not in keeping with the requirement for a change in Israeli policy in order to eliminate obstacles to peace in the Middle East.

92. The attempts to limit the scope of the present debate in the Security Council and to limit the framework of negotiations at the Geneva Conference, as well as attempts to sidestep some of the key problems of the Middle East crisis, can only lead to negative results and to the maintenance and strengthening of the positions of imperialism and zionism in the Middle East.

93. As has been thoroughly stressed during the current debate, there is a chance to achieve a just and durable settlement of the conflict between Israel and the Arab peoples. It would be both dangerous and unreasonable to miss this chance again. This, in our view, is the significance of the present Security Council debate on the Middle East problem as a whole. This debate should pave the way for a resumption as soon as possible of the Geneva Peace Conference.

94. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Tunisia. In accordance with the established practice, I request the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to withdraw temporarily from the Council table in order that his place may be taken by the representative of Tunisia. I now invite that representative to take that place at the Council table and to make his statement.

95. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): First, I should like to offer my sincere con-

gratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council; you have assumed that task with the skill, vigour and competence that we have always admired in you.

96. I should like also to extend my sincere congratulations to the new members of the Security Council. They are all friends and brothers of ours, and my country enjoys the closest relations with them.

97. I would also express once again to the representative of the People's Republic of China our sincere condolences on the death of its distinguished Premier, Chou En-lai.

98. Finally, I should like to thank you, Mr. President, and the members of the Security Council for giving me this opportunity to take part in the Council's deliberations on a problem which, with the passing of the years, has become not only a source of deep concern to everyone but also a clear threat to world peace.

99. President Habib Bourguiba, in the penetrating and realistic analysis of the problem he has been working on for many years, particularly at the time of this trip to the Middle East in 1965, stated that the tragic situation that had existed in the Middle East for 30 years stemmed solely from the Palestinian problem, and that a settlement of the conflict in that region was indissolubly linked with a solution of that problem.

100. It took 11 years from the time that analysis was made and submitted to the conscience of the world, it took two devastating and deadly wars for the conscience of the world to rid itself of the heavy veil that a powerful propaganda campaign based on lies had desperately been maintaining over the background and origins of the conflict—that is, the tragedy that has beset the Palestinian people for 30 years.

101. And, finally, the General Assembly followed world public opinion. At its twenty-ninth session, it vigorously affirmed the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and recognized that the problem of Palestine was at the heart of the Middle East conflict; at its thirtieth session, it confirmed that the Palestinian people needed and had, moreover, the right to participate, through their legitimate representative, the PLO, in all efforts, deliberations and conferences on peace in the Middle East.

102. Today the representatives of the Palestinian people are here. They are participating in the work of the Security Council on an equal footing with the other member States. I congratulate them and extend to them a fraternal welcome, a welcome that is all the warmer because it had always been my personal wish to see them present here. For, more than two years ago, even before the October war—more precisely, on 17 April 1973—I had the opportunity to address

the Council and to request it to invite the representatives of the PLO to speak here.<sup>11</sup>

103. The statement made by Mr. Khaddoumi [see 1870th meeting], the head of the delegation of the PLO, was enlightening and encouraging. Those of us who believe in the step-by-step approach regard the participation of the PLO in the Council's deliberation as an important step towards the fulfilment of the rights and national objectives of the Palestinian people and, hence, towards the setting in motion of the process that will lead to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East and at least in the immediate future to a *modus vivendi* capable of directing us on to the path of peace.

104. As for the Israeli delegation, its absence has already emerged as a serious diplomatic error resulting naturally from an erroneous and stubborn political judgement. The world has seen that in this debate, which constitutes a historic stage in the quest for a solution to the tragic situation in the Middle East, the Arab countries—all the countries, including the legitimate representatives of the Palestinian people—are present, whereas Israel once again is shirking its responsibility and pretends, as in the past, to ignore the existence and aspirations of the Palestinian people.

105. Having followed attentively the statements made by various members of the Council, I am pleased to note that the position of the members of the Council conforms to and confirms the evaluation of the situation made by the General Assembly. Everyone now recognizes that the Palestinian problem is at the origin of the conflict and that, as a matter of pure logic, any settlement of that conflict must be preceded by a solution of the Palestinian problem. Thus the natural conclusion is that it is necessary and legitimate that the Palestinian people should, like all peoples, have an independent and sovereign State.

106. Can that conclusion—simple because it is logical and natural, concrete because it is required by day-to-day events—be adopted by the Council and become a decision of the Council? Is the Security Council not even capable of taking a simple and natural decision—knowing, what is more, that in doing so it would be inventing nothing, since General Assembly resolution 181 (II), adopted 28 years ago, provided for the creation of an independent Palestinian Arab State?

107. For many reasons, even after 28 years of conflict, that Arab State in Palestine has not yet seen the light of day. Nor will it soon see the light of day if its creation is subordinated to the will of Israel alone, which rejects it, and if the Security Council, and particularly the great Powers, do not agree on the creation of that State, with the guarantees necessary to ensure its establishment and development.

108. Should the Security Council bow to the view that it should refrain from the slightest initiative not to the

liking of the Tel Aviv Government? Knowing, as we do, the policy, ambitions and ulterior motives of that Government, can we suppose that one day it will bestow its blessing on the creation of an independent Palestinian State? Any postponement of such a decision, in addition to being a flagrant miscarriage of justice, would entail the danger of creating new conditions favourable to another outbreak of violence, would encourage the intransigence of Israel and discourage the clearly expressed good will that has been shown by the other parties to the conflict.

109. To wait and see, to drag one's feet, would be harmful to the quest for the means to bring about peace, particularly since an analysis of the various positions set forth by the parties to the conflict and by the Powers concerned makes it perfectly clear that it is not the principle of the creation of the Palestinian State which is at issue, but that the prime difficulty lies in the ways and means of implementing that objective.

110. Today, one customarily hears informed diplomats and experienced statesmen rejecting any imposed settlement and affirming the need for an agreement between the parties. And yet, for 28 years, have not attempts been made to impose on the Arabs, by a policy of unconditional moral and material support for Israel, first, in 1947, the existence of that State, for which the neighbouring peoples were not psychologically prepared, and then the recognition of that State as a pre-condition to any evacuation of the occupied territories and any recognition of the legitimate aspirations and rights of the Palestinian people? Resolution 242 (1967) was born out of that pressure on the Arabs. Adopted following the six-day war, on 22 November 1967, it was to be the basis of a settlement of the Middle East problem. It was based on two requirements: recognition of the State of Israel, and evacuation of the occupied territories. It disregarded the problem of the Palestinian people, to whom it referred solely in terms of refugees. Following the partition resolution imposed on the Arabs in 1947, that resolution became an additional trial for them. Arab countries accepted it in the hope that it would constitute a basis for the evacuation of Arab territories, and that it might lead to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

111. Unfortunately, not only did Israel not take the resolution seriously, and refuse to abide by it, but also it thwarted the efforts of Mr. Jarring, of Secretary of State Rogers, and of African leaders, and rejected the attempts of all its friends who tried to convince it that its stubbornness and continued aggression might engulf that region—indeed the entire world—in a catastrophe.

112. After the October war of 1973, after the recognition of the PLO by the Arab States, and after the adoption by the General Assembly of resolutions recognizing the inalienable rights of the Palestinian

people, resolution 242 (1967), whose inadequacies have been recognized by all the participants, is outdated. Does the resolution have to be amended, cancelled or replaced? It has, in a sense, already been superseded by resolutions 338 (1973) and 381 (1975), and particularly by the evolution in attitudes. The attitude of the Security Council on the problem of the Middle East and on the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people cannot be confined to a legal attitude, but must be an attitude that goes beyond the rigid and incomplete texts. The Council must adopt a decision that is in keeping with the realities of the situation and based on a global vision of the problem, takes into consideration the rights involved and ensures international peace, which the Council has an obligation to maintain under the Charter.

113. In 1947 and subsequent years, the United Nations did not use the necessary means, although they are provided in the Charter, to implement its resolutions. Thus, Israel, after its creation, ignored all United Nations resolutions, and extended its control over territories that did not belong to it. It exceeded the boundaries established for it by the partition resolution, and refused to evacuate the territories of Arab States, notwithstanding the decision contained in resolution 242 (1967) itself. Israel accepted the disengagement agreements and partial changes in the Sinai only in exchange for substantial political and material advantages, and continued to deny the Palestinians their rights under the Charter and under the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

114. It is now clear that the events of recent years have had an effect on the international public, which finally understands that stability in the Middle East cannot be brought about without the recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people. That view is accepted by many Israelis, who believe that negotiations with the Palestinians is the only proper course of action. But Israel's policy, because of the internal political and economic situation in particular, remains unchanged. Israel believes that there are no rights or legitimate aspirations for the Palestinian people. There would be no Palestinian State or negotiations with the PLO.

115. That negative attitude on the part of Israel is part of a policy based both on a feeling of fear and on an expansionist desire. The maintenance of tension in the Middle East is a fundamental element in the strategy of Israel, which intends to preserve its position by deriving support from the diaspora and countries that support it unconditionally and by maintaining control as long as possible over occupied Arab territories in the hope that it will be able to offer more to an increasingly scanty and disappointing international immigration.

116. Is that a policy acceptable to the international community? Is that a policy likely to bring about peace? Is that a guarantee against further conflicts in the

Middle East, or is it merely incitement to instability and insecurity, as has, regrettably, been shown by the tragic events that have occurred recently in Lebanon?

117. After the experience of 28 years, after four destructive wars, bearing in mind the evolution of opinion in Europe and elsewhere, as well as in the Arab countries, it would be unpardonable not to try to fulfil the minimum objectives set by the Arab summit conference at Rabat in 1974 with realism and clarity, namely, the evacuation of the occupied territories and the creation of a Palestine State in the liberated territories. Those objectives are objectives accepted by the international community as a whole.

118. Just as it is agreed that one can no longer ignore the fact that the Palestinian problem is the corner-stone of the Middle East conflict, the creation of an independent Palestinian State is, in our opinion, the political decision which the Security Council must take immediately with all that that decision entails in terms of means of implementation, including the necessary guarantees referred to by more than one speaker in the course of the present debate.

119. Is the Security Council capable of reaching that decision, on must we await the convening of the Geneva Conference, whose role should not be denied, must we await the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People established by the General Assembly at its thirtieth session, which will constitute a positive contribution to the settlement of the Palestinian problem, or must there be a fifth war, the spectre of which hovers over our debate, before we accept the inevitability of the creation of an independent Palestinian State?

120. While it is true that the recent history of the Middle East is a record of missed opportunities, that must not become the rule. On the contrary, all efforts must be directed towards the unavoidable decision that will initiate the process of the normalization of the situation in the Middle East. The Security Council can and must break the vicious circle in which that area of the world finds itself entangled. Later on, when peace has won over men's hearts and minds, those who have faith in a better future, who are moved by sincerity and a desire for peace, will have to pave the way, in a joint effort, towards the building of a thriving Palestine.

121. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Hungary. In accordance with the established practice, I request the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to withdraw temporarily so that his place at the Council table may be taken by the representative of Hungary. I now invite that representative to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

122. Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary): Mr. President, first of all I would like to extend our sincere appreciation to

you and to all the members of the Security Council for giving me the opportunity to express our views on the issue on the agenda, that is, the Middle East problem including the Palestinian question. It is a special pleasure for us to see you, a prominent son of a friendly African country, presiding over our deliberations on this highly important issue.

123. In the opinion of the Hungarian People's Republic, the present session of the Security Council is an extremely important one. It is the first time that the Council has dealt with the real heart of this long-standing conflict, namely, the national rights of the Palestinian people, and it is the first time that the only legitimate representatives of the Palestinian Arab people, the representatives of the PLO, have participated in the discussions. We are convinced that this is a very promising sign for the future, since the participation of the delegation of the PLO in our deliberations is an active and real contribution to the global solution of the Middle East question. I wish to convey our warm greetings and best wishes to the delegation of the PLO and to the head of its delegation, Mr. Khaddoumi.

124. The support of the people and Government of the Hungarian People's Republic for the Palestinian cause is based upon our socialist principles. Since the liberation of Hungary, we have always supported all the genuine national liberation movements in the world, and we shall do so in the future as well. Nobody can deny that the Palestinian Arab people has the inalienable right to national identity, to self-determination, to a homeland, and nobody can deny that the Palestinian Arab people has its genuine liberation movement, recognized by the League of Arab States, by the non-aligned countries, by the socialist world and by many capitalist countries as well. The PLO, under the chairmanship of Yasser Arafat, was recognized by an overwhelming majority in the General Assembly during the twenty-ninth session. Hungary was among the Member States which took the initiative in placing the question of Palestine on the agenda and in inviting representatives of the PLO to the General Assembly. We are glad that, by the adoption of the relevant resolutions, at its twenty-ninth and thirtieth sessions the General Assembly has taken the first steps towards putting an end to the striking injustices which have afflicted the Palestinian Arab people for over a quarter of a century. We are ready to take an active part in the work of the newly established Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, established by General Assembly resolution 3376 (XXX). There is no doubt in our minds that the Security Council, having the supreme responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security in the world, should follow the way and the example of the General Assembly.

125. The people of the Middle East have already paid an extremely high toll in untold sufferings for the imperialist-Zionist policy of expansion during the last

three decades. It is high time to turn this hotbed of unending wars into a home of lasting peace and justice for all peoples of the region, without exception. On 3 December 1975 in the General Assembly's debate on the Middle East, on behalf of the Hungarian delegation, I stated the following:

"The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic is firmly convinced that a just and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict can be conceived on the basis of three inseparable principles: first, complete liquidation of the consequences of aggression and immediate and unconditional return of all occupied Arab lands to the countries of whose territories they formed a legitimate part; secondly, full recognition for the Palestinian Arab people of their national right to self-determination; and thirdly, the assurance for all States and peoples of the region of an independent life of their own, free from fear".<sup>12</sup>

126. The most appropriate forum for a global solution of the Middle East conflict is and remains the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East. We strongly support the early convening of the Conference, with the equal participation of the representatives of the PLO. There must be no pre-conditions set to their participation. We urge the Geneva Conference to speed up its work and to reach agreements as soon as possible in order to avoid again giving a change to the evil forces of a new expansionist war.

127. The socialist countries—among them Hungary—have no selfish interests in the Middle East. Our sole interest is to promote peace, security, justice and peaceful co-operation among all nations. Until this better world arrives, we shall continue to support all anti-imperialist struggles, including the struggle of the Arab people for the final liquidation of the consequences of aggression, for the attainment of a just peace in the region and for the benefit of the whole world.

128. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Algeria. In accordance with the established practice, I would request the representative of Egypt to withdraw temporarily so that his place at the Council table may be taken by the representative of Algeria. I now invite that representative to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

129. Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, like those that spoke before us, my delegation is pleased to see you presiding over the work of the Council at a time when, once again, it is considering the Middle East question and the Palestinian problem. Your untiring work in the area of decolonization, the unquestioned experience you have acquired in the discharge of your responsibilities in the Organization and the human qualities that we all acknowledge in you naturally equip you to preside over this debate. We are convinced that

whatever conclusions are reached in the present debate your efforts and those of the other members of the Council will contribute, at least, to shedding light on a situation which inextricably links human factors and political considerations, the demands of the law and the constraints of reality, the misfortunes of the past and the hopes for the future.

130. But I should not want to go any further in my statement without first conveying to the Chinese delegation the sincere condolences of my delegation and of my country at the loss of Premier Chou En-lai, one of their greatest leaders and one of the most outstanding statesmen of our time. As President Boumediène said in his message to Chairman Mao Tse-Tung:

"Chou En-lai never ceased for an instant, despite his long illness, to discharge his difficult responsibilities with the courage, the faith and the constancy that have always been characteristic of him. It was with the same resolve and the same generosity that he placed his genius at the service of the revolutionary causes of the peoples of the third world, to whose profound aspirations to independence, justice and progress he was able to give concrete form. Because he devoted his entire life to the struggle for the advent of a new humanity, this great man will continue to live in the memory of his people and in that of the peoples of the world, and will be for future generations the example of revolutionary devotion and commitment."

131. The situation in the world is fraught with numerous and dangerous threats to international peace. This is the case in Africa; it is the case in the Middle East; perhaps it is also the case elsewhere. However, the aim of this meeting of the Security Council, unlike most of the others, is not to deal with an immediate crisis and to take urgent measures to put out or limit an already raging fire. In placing on its agenda "The Middle East problem including the Palestinian question", the Council has expressed its determination to proceed to an exhaustive consideration of these questions, not so much with the intention of arriving at partial and temporary solutions as of defining a long-term view of the matter, in which a general and lasting settlement would find its place. I do not think it is necessary to dwell at length on the merits of such a procedure, but I should simply like to refer to it for the benefit of the Syrian delegation, since it was the initiator of this procedure.

132. This series of meetings of the Security Council is also characterized by the participation of the representatives of the PLO, whose presence here I should like to welcome warmly. The PLO plays an increasingly active part in international institutions and in all discussions concerning the Palestine problem. It was only after a long struggle that the Palestinian people managed to assume the responsibility for its own destiny and thus to become an essential party to

any settlement of the Middle East question. In our view an eminently positive factor is the development of international opinion, which is now convinced of the need to take into account the rights and aspirations of the Palestinian people and endorses the participation of its representatives in any deliberation on the Middle East. The resolutions adopted on this subject by the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth and thirtieth sessions clearly reflect this evolution which, while doing justice to a people whose claims have long been ignored, make possible at the same time more viable initiatives aimed at finding a satisfactory solution to a problem which has not always been understood in all its aspects.

133. We are well aware that there still remains some reluctance to granting the PLO the full privileges pertaining to its status as authentic representative of the Palestinian people. This reluctance was expressed here at the beginning of this series of meetings. It was based on procedural and legalistic considerations, of whose importance we are of course aware, but which it would be dangerous to obey to the letter in order to frustrate their spirit. For it is clear in our minds that those delegations which have raised objections or have been somewhat hesitant in allowing the representatives of the PLO to participate in this debate nevertheless recognize the predominant place that should be accorded to the concerns of the Palestinian people in this debate, as in any debate of a similar nature devoted to the Middle East crisis. If, moreover, we agree that the Palestinians alone are qualified to put forward their claims and defend their rights, it becomes difficult to understand the logic of those who would oppose their participation in a debate which bears on precisely those rights and claims.

134. I do not, however, wish to dwell any further on that aspect of the question since, in any case, the Council has finally welcomed the representatives of the PLO. That decision was a very wise one, in our opinion, not only because it satisfies a just claim advanced by that organization, but also because it gives this debate of the Council a scope which so far it has lacked.

135. That is perhaps, if we look closely at the situation, the only tangible progress that has been made in the search for a settlement of the Middle East problem. Neither the resolutions of the Security Council nor the efforts made pursuant to its decisions by the representative of the Secretary-General, nor initiatives outside the United Nations have been able to clear the way to a solution or even a distant prospect of a solution.

136. The partial accords which are the result of a so-called step-by-step diplomacy are not negligible, though they only scrape the surface of the problem and their impact will remain illusory as long as they do not fall within a broader set of measures dealing with the real elements of the crisis. In saying this,

I do not want to minimize the efforts of the Security Council and the United Nations forces, whose presence contributes at least to discouraging or postponing a rapid deterioration of the situation. I do not wish to disregard the merits of American diplomacy. But it will be agreed that, at best, those initiatives can have only a limited and temporary effect; it would not be reasonable to expect more from them, because none of them is aimed at the crux of the problem, nor does it pretend to be.

137. The first conclusion that should be drawn from this long list of disappointments and failures is that it is impossible to make progress towards a satisfactory and lasting settlement of the Middle East crisis unless we take account of the Palestinian factor and unless within the whole range of emergencies and important matters, we give it the priority and the weight it deserves as a central element of the problem.

138. The fulfilment of this requirement has been made simpler since the Palestinian people has begun to express itself through the PLO, whose representative nature is recognized by all the Arab countries and by an increasing number of States and whose authenticity, like that of any liberation movement, is proved by the very broad support and the total adherence to it of the vast majority of Palestinians. The PLO has indeed, in practice and on the broadest possible scale, acquired the character of a valid spokesman, speaking and acting on behalf of the Palestinian people. The Security Council should take note of this, because since this prerogative is accorded by the will of the Palestinian people alone, it cannot be the subject of either questioning or bargaining.

139. The second conclusion that should be drawn from this debate is that the Palestinian people cannot exist as a people without enjoying the rights common to all other peoples. It seems to us difficult to recognize the existence of the Palestinian people and at the same time to deny them those rights or, which is also the case, to recognize only their legitimate interests. If others consider, as we do, that legitimate interests should necessarily be based on recognized rights, it seems much simpler and much more explicit to have recourse to the elementary rules of logic to decide exactly how the rights of peoples are exemplified in the case of the Palestinian people.

140. The Palestinians are human beings and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights therefore applies to them: international law and the resolutions of the Security Council allow those of them who were forced to flee their homes and abandon their belongings to return to their homes and to recover their property or to receive adequate compensation whenever it is not possible for them to recover their possessions. This right of the Palestinians has always been explicitly stated and periodically confirmed in all United Nations resolutions dealing with the Palestinian refugees, and it is perhaps useful to recall that respect

for this right was one of the formal conditions for the admission of Israel to membership in the United Nations.

141. The Palestinians are a people and as such have the right to have a country, to live in their country, to organize their State, to administer their own affairs and to choose their political, economic and administrative system; in other words, as recognized by the Charter of the United Nations, they have the right to self-determination, which, although it is not a new element in international law, is still one of the most precious achievements of the international community.

142. Thus the right of the Palestinian refugees to return to their homes and to recover their properties and the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people are inextricably linked to the very existence of the Palestinian people; any questioning or limiting of these rights can be interpreted only as another calling into question of the existence of the Palestinians as a people. Those are elements which cannot of course be subject to any bargaining and which should therefore be clearly confirmed by the Security Council.

143. The recommendations which we are in all humility putting forward here are justified by the fact that the Security Council can of course contemplate only peaceful means for the settlement of disputes, by creating the best possible framework to enable the parties concerned to settle their differences. However, it is obvious that, in the very interest of the success of such an undertaking, it is essential to define what is really negotiable or, if one prefers, what is not negotiable. Leaving it to the parties concerned to specify what for them is not negotiable could rapidly lead to a break-down of the discussion, each party being of course tempted to expand to the limit what it is not prepared to negotiate. That is why we believe that it is up to the Council itself to draw a distinction between what is negotiable and what is not and, in the case of our present concern, we have already proposed that the Council should consider as non-negotiable the following three principles: first, that the Palestinian people is essentially an interested party in any settlement of the Middle East problem; secondly, that the PLO is the genuine representative of the Palestinian people for the statement of its claims and the defence of its rights; and, thirdly, that as refugees the Palestinians have the right to return to their homes and to recover their properties and that as a people they enjoy the right to self-determination as far as the definition of their national future is concerned.

144. It is on the basis of these considerations, in our opinion, that we can judge the validity of the tools provided by the Security Council to encourage and channel the search for a peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem. Repeated references have been made during this debate to resolution 242 (1967), which some consider as the sole and irreplaceable framework for the conduct of future negotiations. We

should however be well aware of the fact that the virtues of this resolution have not yet been revealed, since periodic attempts at implementing it have been discouraging. Of course, this persistent failure does not necessarily mean that resolution 242 (1967) is worthless; this failure indicates, however, that its implementation has met with resistance or difficulties that have outweighed its benefits. The problem, then, is to find the reasons why this resolution has not been implemented and, on this basis, to make the necessary improvements therein which would facilitate its implementation.

145. It should not be forgotten that resolution 242 (1967) was adopted after the Israeli aggression of 1967 and that its main aim was to redress the consequences of that aggression. Thus this resolution was first and foremost concerned with the immediate problems resulting from the Israeli occupation of territories belonging to Arab States Members of the United Nations rather than with long-term measures aimed at the definitive settlement of the Middle East crisis. Resolution 338 (1973), which after the October 1973 war was adopted to complement resolution 242 (1967), made even more obvious the partial nature of resolution 242 (1967), which is the reason why we feel that that resolution in its present form provides an inadequate framework for the conduct of serious negotiations.

146. It is therefore obvious that to consider resolution 242 (1967) as an immutable framework for any future settlement of the Middle East crisis is tantamount to paralysing any possible progress towards a solution acceptable to all the parties concerned. We hope that the Security Council will refuse to be confined within limits which render its efforts sterile and that, drawing from past failures a better understanding of the present situation and of the chances for future development, it will not hesitate to adjust its attitude and the decisions devolving upon it.

147. The PRESIDENT: The last speaker today is the representative of Poland. In accordance with the established practice, I request the representative of Jordan to withdraw temporarily from the Council table in order that his place may be taken by the representative of Poland. I now invite that representative to take that place at the Council table and to make his statement.

148. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland): Mr. President, permit me in the first place to discharge the pleasant duty of thanking you personally and other members of the Council for making it possible for my delegation to present Poland's position on the very important issue before us. In speaking today, I am extremely happy to see the presidency of the Security Council in your experienced hands, to see the Council under the wise guidance of an eminent son of Africa, of the friendly United Republic of Tanzania. I feel equal satisfaction over the participation in the debate of

the delegation of the PLO. Both the presence of that delegation in our midst and the high level of its composition testify to the growing international recognition and status of that organization as the legitimate, indeed the sole, representative of the Arab people of Palestine.

149. The position of the Government of Poland on the Middle East conflict, part and parcel of which is the question of Palestine, is well known. It has been presented on a number of occasions—I need mention only the thirtieth session of the General Assembly. Yet, in view of the outstanding significance of this debate, we cannot fail to restate briefly the position of principle consistently adhered to by the Government of the Polish People's Republic. Indeed that position of ours continues to be guided by three political considerations: first, the withdrawal by Israel from all occupied Arab territories; secondly, the safeguarding for the Palestinian people of all its inalienable and legitimate rights, including the right to establish its own, independent State; and thirdly, the securing for all the countries of the region, without exception, of a peaceful and independent development—within their recognized borders.

150. We are pleased to note the growing awareness of the world—and the current debate in the Council has proved this beyond any doubt—that the only point of departure for achieving lasting peace in the Middle East is the liquidation of the effects of Israeli aggression against the Arab lands. But as long as the aggressor pays no heed to United Nations resolutions, including those of the Security Council, we shall need more international efforts and pressure to reach the long-sought and overdue comprehensive—and I stress the word “comprehensive”—solution. For, as I already had an opportunity to point out last month in the General Assembly,<sup>12</sup> the road to an effective solution to the problem leads precisely through a comprehensive political settlement.

151. On numerous occasions the Security Council has discussed different aspects of the Middle East problem and adopted relevant resolutions, including its well-known resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). The General Assembly too has adopted a number of resolutions pertaining both to the Middle East problem and to the question of Palestine. I am referring in particular to the resolutions adopted under those items at the twenty-ninth and thirtieth sessions. Those decisions and resolutions represent the basis for a sound and prompt solution. They should therefore be fully taken account of in seeking further progress in the war-torn region.

152. However, if it is true that the permanent members of the Security Council bear particular responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations, it is equally true that all should realize and share those responsibilities and none should obstruct or delay the search for a peaceful settlement, wherever there is a

threat to or breach of peace and security, including the Middle East.

153. The Polish people, which for more than 120 years was deprived of its own statehood, can well understand—indeed, perhaps even better than anyone else—what is the real plight of the Arab people of Palestine. That same historical awareness lies behind our unreserved support for the just aspirations of the Palestinians. By the same token, we follow with friendly attention the efforts made towards the achievement of their political rights, including the establishment of their own State. History has already proved on many occasions that such national cravings and aspirations can hardly be thwarted by anyone. Less than 30 years ago the Palestinians were expelled from their native land. Only yesterday they still seemed to be far away, reduced by some to the status of mere refugees. Today they have observer status in the United Nations; their organization has become a full member of the non-aligned movement; they are here with us. Tomorrow, I have no doubt, they will be a full-fledged and totally recognized member of the international community. Those who still deny them the right to exist will have to start talking with them. Indeed, the sooner that happens, the better it will be for all concerned, without exception.

154. It is precisely for these reasons that we have long believed that any negotiating forum on the Middle East would be but a grossly incomplete undertaking if it were deprived of the participation on an equal footing and from the very beginning of all the interested parties, including the PLO. It has been a matter of gratification to my delegation that a very similar view on the matter has been widely reflected in this debate, especially in the context of the prompt resumption of the Geneva Conference. The timely proposal of the Soviet Union as its Co-Chairman to resume the Conference, combined with the prevailing trends of the current debate, offer ample evidence in favour of prompt action in this regard. This debate has also shown the intensifying isolation of those who are against such constructive action.

155. It is regrettable, though not surprising, that Israel, instead of joining the discussion, has chosen to obstruct yet another effort by the Organization. There is, in fact, hardly any effort by the international community vis-à-vis a Middle East solution that would not have been obstructed by Israel. It is even true of the noble United Nations peace-keeping venture in the Middle East, where Israel discriminates against a substantial part of the United Nations peace-keeping forces, including the Polish contingent, by denying freedom of movement, thus violating the international agreements it signed and the provisions of relevant Security Council resolutions.

156. The delegation of Poland trusts that the present debate will greatly contribute to speeding up the peace-making process in the Middle East. We believe that it

will give a new impulse to all the efforts of negotiation with a view to finding an effective and comprehensive settlement in the region, including the realization of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, for the good of world peace and stability.

*The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.*

*Notes*

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Supplement No. 11*, vol. II, annex 19.

<sup>2</sup> *Report of the World Conference of the International Women's Year* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.76.IV.1), chap. I, para. 24.

<sup>3</sup> See A/10297, annex II.

<sup>4</sup> Aubrey Hodes, *Dialogue with Ishmael* (New York, Funk and Wagnalls, 1968), p. 67.

<sup>5</sup> Michael Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion: The Armed Prophet* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968), p. 103.

<sup>6</sup> *Parliamentary Debates (Hansard), House of Commons Official Report, Session 1972-73 comprising period from 16th-25th October 1973* (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1973), p. 502.

<sup>7</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, Supplement for May 1948*, document S/747.

<sup>8</sup> See Major-General Carl von Horn, *Soldiering for Peace* (London, Cassell and Company Ltd., 1966).

<sup>9</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2368th meeting.

<sup>10</sup> See General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX).

<sup>11</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-eighth Year*, 1708th meeting, paras. 81-102.

<sup>12</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2425th meeting.





---

### 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.

#### CÓMO 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.

---