

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

1897th MEETING: 24 MARCH 1976

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1897)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Request by the Libyan Arab Republic and Pakistan for consideration of the serious situation arising from recent developments in the occupied Arab territories: Letter dated 19 March 1976 from the Permanent Representatives of the Libyan Arab Republic and Pakistan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12017)	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.

1897th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 24 March 1976, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Thomas S. BOYA (Benin).

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, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1897)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Request by the Libyan Arab Republic and Pakistan for consideration of the serious situation arising from recent developments in the occupied Arab territories:
Letter dated 19 March 1976 from the Permanent Representatives of the Libyan Arab Republic and Pakistan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12017)

The meeting was called to order at 4.25 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Request by the Libyan Arab Republic and Pakistan for consideration of the serious situation arising from recent developments in the occupied Arab territories:
Letter dated 19 March 1976 from the Permanent Representatives of the Libyan Arab Republic and Pakistan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12017)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with decisions taken at preceding meetings [1893rd, 1894th and 1896th meetings], I shall now invite the representatives of Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization to take their places at the Council table and the representatives of Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yugoslavia to take places at the side of the Council chamber on the understanding that, as is customary, they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when it is their turn to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Herzog (Israel) and Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took places at the Council table and Mr. Abdel Meguid

(Egypt), Mr. Zahawie (Iraq), Mr. Sharaf (Jordan), Mr. Baroodi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Allaf (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Petrić (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should also like to inform the Council that I have just received letters from the representatives of Bangladesh, India and Tunisia in which they request to be invited, in accordance with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure, to participate without the right to vote in the Council's discussion.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kaiser (Bangladesh), Mr. Jaipal (India) and Mr. Driss (Tunisia) took places at the side of the Council chamber.

3. Mr. VINCI (Italy): My delegation has listened to all the statements made up to now on the tension and unrest that has recently arisen in the occupied West Bank, and in the Holy City in particular, with the attention and the concern that the situation deserves and requires from all the members of the Council.

4. My delegation had, of course, previously studied very carefully the contents of the letter contained in document S/12017, which our colleagues, the representatives of Libya and of Pakistan addressed to you, Mr. President, to request a meeting of the Council to consider this situation.

5. The facts and the arguments put forward by the main parties concerned have certainly helped us to have a clearer understanding of the issue which the Council is deliberating. However, instead of entering into a detailed examination of the more recent events, and in spite of all the sympathy and concern which they arouse in each of us, we feel that we should not lose sight of the deep-rooted causes of what is occurring in Jerusalem and in the West Bank.

6. In this connexion, we cannot fail to note that if turmoil and disturbances are taking place there it is because of the perpetuation of the occupation by Israeli authorities of Arab territories. My Government deeply regrets that, after some promising moves, the negotiating process is apparently again at a standstill and with few prospects in view, if any at all, for the implementation of pertinent resolutions of the Council, in particular resolution 242 (1967), which provides the basis for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East,

including, as we understand it, the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the occupied Arab territories. It goes without saying that if the Israeli occupation of Arab lands had ceased, incidents of the kind we are witnessing and which have caused concern in the Council would not have taken place.

7. According to a great master of diplomacy, when there is a general, unspoken understanding on an international issue, it is even better to state it. Therefore, we feel it to be both relevant and consistent with the item on the agenda to express at this stage once again our belief that the basic framework of the negotiating process as outlined in resolution 242 (1967) remains valid and should be revived. In the implementation of all parts of that resolution by all the main parties concerned, the Israeli Government should, *inter alia*, relinquish occupation of all Arab territories and, in particular, withdraw its forces from occupied Jerusalem and the West Bank.

8. In this connexion, may I recall that my Government is fully committed at the same time to the recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people, and I should like to refer to what I said on the subject on previous occasions, namely at the 1876th and 1879th meetings of the Council as well as at the 2393rd meeting of the General Assembly,¹ when I spoke on behalf of the nine countries of the European Community.

9. Having said that, and, I believe, having clearly acknowledged that in our mind the frustration and protest expressed by the Arab inhabitants of Jerusalem and the West Bank are not beyond anybody's understanding, for the reasons I have just mentioned, I would, however, like to indicate in some way at this stage some grounds for hope.

10. First of all, I feel that there is an increasing awareness that the situation in the area can, under the influence of old and new conflicting forces and views, get out of control, and consequently the prospect of another war is not at all to be discounted, in spite of the efforts and endeavours towards peace being made by many. This awareness has produced some positive effects.

11. In other words, given the precarious circumstances I have mentioned before and given the continuous danger of further escalation of violence, a notable amount of restraint and tact has been shown by the opposing parties so that incidents occurring in Jerusalem and the West Bank have not got out of hand and have even been managed with considerable caution.

12. This was shown on one side, as we understand from the clarifications given by the representative of Israel, by the executive as well as by the judiciary power of his country, and on the other side, by the restraint exercised by the Arab population in the territories concerned in making their position known to

public opinion. The outbreak of excessive violence by demonstrators has been prevented, thanks first of all to the balance and sense of responsibility shown in general by the Arab population. We cannot but feel encouraged by this general sentiment that bloodshed will not help. Unjustified acts of violence, especially on the part of official authorities, never help. They only make things more difficult for everybody.

13. One more ground for some comfort is provided by the wise decision taken by the Israeli Government to participate actively in this debate in the Security Council. It is a decision I have advocated—as I recalled in our first meeting—since 12 January. In our opinion, this is consistent with statesmanship and political wisdom and comes to terms with requirements of the present hour. I believe that we can all welcome this positive move, since, in spite of the heated arguments used by both sides, nobody can deny that they are sitting at the same table and talking to each other. This offers an opportunity to the Council which should not be lost, in order, first, to encourage this sign from Israel of a lessening of intransigence and of some willingness, apparently, to adjust to the new realities as advocated by the Arabs, and secondly, in order to bring about a constructive outcome of the present deliberations, which, if I understood correctly, also accords with the wish expressed by the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) at our meeting yesterday. I believe that we should not refrain from using our imagination in order to find out how we can contribute to the resumption of the negotiating process.

14. I would like now to recall the special sensitivity and the unceasing concern of Italy with regard to the fate of the Holy City of Jerusalem. I certainly do not need, with you, Mr. President and all my colleagues around the table, to go through 20 centuries of history to explain what has generated that sensitivity and aroused that concern. The representative of Italy. I can assure the Council, will refrain from doing so and will strongly resist what would seem to be an irresistible temptation. Let me only mention that the ancient path linking Jerusalem to Rome, along which a glorious civilization following the steps of St. Paul once found its way, is still an open path for multitudes.

15. The green hills and golden walls of Jerusalem are dear, indeed, to the Roman in me and to the European in me. The shrines of us Christians are there, as well as those of the Moslems and the Jews. It could not be more unfortunate that the Holy City of Jerusalem, the sacred home of the three great monotheistic religions, has become a centre of dispute. As my present Prime Minister, Aldo Moro, stated in the General Assembly on 21 June 1967, "Jerusalem should be not a cause of division but a centre of high spiritual value that can promote reconciliation".²

16. We deeply regret the present course of events. We feel that Jerusalem should be given the high status

to which it is entitled by reason of its universal spiritual character. My Government has committed itself on several occasions to the freedom of the Holy Places of Jerusalem and to the opening of its gates to everybody from everywhere.

17. Speaking in the Council in the course of the debate which led to the adoption of resolution 298 (1971), I personally had the opportunity to state [1582nd meeting] that in the opinion of the Italian Government the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civil Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,³ is fully applicable to the occupied Arab territories, and of course to the occupied sections of the city of Jerusalem. It is therefore the responsibility of the Israeli Government to refrain from all unilateral actions and measures inconsistent with the provisions of international law governing rights and obligations of an occupying Power.

18. In the past we have made our voice heard when violations have occurred, and we shall do the same thing every time it is necessary.

19. As I indicated in my statement of nearly five years ago to which I have just referred, in the opinion of my Government any violation of the aforementioned Geneva Convention is, apart from the juridical aspect, politically harmful and a source of additional tension in the area. That would be all the more regrettable at a time when frustration caused by lack of significant developments prevails in the area. It is therefore incumbent on all, in our view, to continue to exercise the greatest possible restraint. Everything that I have said on this point applies, of course, also to the settlements planted in the occupied Arab territories.

20. In conclusion, there is no doubt in our minds that if Arab crowds are resorting now to street demonstrations and rallies it is because they bitterly resent the continuation of the Israeli occupation and the lack of a concrete, positive outlook, and therefore the prolongation *sine die* of their position as a subjected people. Many of us who had to endure a similar experience for a shorter time can understand what they feel. We have no doubt that those Arab students who are marching and parading in the occupied territories are doing so for a good, honourable cause, since year after year what has been equally prominent in their minds has been freedom, and for too long, instead of having freedom, they have been undergoing the ordeal of occupation by a foreign army.

21. In the circumstances prevailing in the area, we hope and trust that with the help of the responsible leaders of all sides concerned, events will not escalate further at a time when endeavours are being undertaken—by the Secretary-General himself—for the resumption once again of efforts leading to a just and durable peace. In our view, the first duty of the Council at this stage, as I have stated before, is to lend a

hand to these endeavours. And here I should like to subscribe entirely to the words used by our colleague from Pakistan at the end of his statement on 22 March:

"In the view of my delegation it is the primary task of the Security Council to encourage the prospects of peace, which notwithstanding the bitter and emotional things we have heard today, are not non-existent." [1894th meeting, para. 153.]

It is on that hopeful note that I too wish to conclude my statement.

22. Mr. BOYD (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): First I should like on behalf of the delegation of Panama to extend a cordial welcome to Ambassador William Scranton, the new Permanent Representative of the United States. We offer him our best wishes for success in the important mission entrusted to him by his Government.

23. We voted in favour of inviting the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in this debate because we feel that when international problems affecting the Palestinians are being discussed it is highly appropriate for their authorized representatives to be present and to have their voice heard. We feel that it is very helpful for this debate to have present here both the representative of Israel and the representative of the PLO.

24. I turn now to the arguments put forward by the delegations of Pakistan and Libya, which requested this series of Council meetings to consider the events that had recently taken place in Jerusalem and other parts of the West Bank of the Jordan. We sincerely believe that these situations marked by violence in recent days in the Middle East have their roots in the error committed by several of the parties concerned in the problems of that part of the world, parties that have welcomed and found their interests served by the prolongation of the *status quo* in that area with regard to the Arab territories occupied since the 1967 war.

25. We believe that most aspects of the problems of the Middle East and their possible solutions are covered in a way acceptable to all the parties in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), although certain new elements must now be added in order to provide for the recognition of the lawful political rights of the Palestinian people. Those who try to maintain situations marked by the use of force inevitably encourage new acts of violence.

26. Everyone is well aware of the strong religious feelings of most of the world's faithful when reference is made to the Holy Places in Jerusalem, the cradle of the religions practised by Christians, Moslems and Jews.

27. The decision made on 28 January by a judge in Jerusalem that it did not constitute a case of public

disorder for Jews to pray in the immediate vicinity of the Al-Aqsa Mosque led to a series of disturbances in the main population centres in the occupied Arab territories. Fortunately, as the representative of Israel said in his statement, an appeal was submitted on 9 February and

"The Minister of Police, Shlomo Hillel, announced on 29 February that the police will abide by the Supreme Court decision and will arrest any Jew attempting to pray on the Temple Mount. The Minister for Religious Affairs, Yitzhak Raphael, stated on Israel Radio but three days ago that Jews will not be allowed to pray on the Temple Mount." [Ibid., para. 80.]

28. As members of the Council are aware, 94% of Latin Americans are Christian, and more than 92% are Catholic. Consequently, the people in our part of the world take a keen interest in the events in the Holy Land; and as spokesman of the Revolutionary Government of Panama, I believe I have an obligation to express the desire of the Holy See that Jerusalem be given a special status, with international guarantees, so that Catholic worshippers and, in general, members of the three major religions of the world can find the peace needed to realize their aspirations concerning the Holy Places.

29. The truth is that nothing has been done since the adoption of the General Assembly resolution in 1947 whereby the status of a *corpus separatum* was requested for Jerusalem and its environs, to be administered under the authority of the Trusteeship Council [resolution 181 (II)].

30. The Israeli authorities maintain unreservedly that Jerusalem should be Jewish. The Arabs, for their part, are equally intransigent in demanding sovereignty over Jerusalem. We, as Catholics, humbly believe that only by taking an historically realistic approach, only by seeking fairly an ideal future for the Holy City, can we find a satisfactory settlement and eliminate the serious causes of conflict. To achieve that it is necessary to meet the demands and just claims of the parties concerned.

31. The Holy City must continue to be the heritage of the three major monotheistic religions, a sacred heritage of almost a billion and a half of their adherents throughout the world. Jerusalem is the site of temples and of sacred relics for believers, and conditions there must remain equal for all. As the home of the three religious communities that live there, Jerusalem is the goal of thousands of pilgrims who visit it constantly and it must therefore be protected by all possible guarantees and have the greatest possible security.

32. In view of the presence and tenure in Jerusalem of different groups, the logical and intelligent thing to do would be to find a peaceful, equitable solution

to the problem. We must adopt an elevated approach for that purpose and must accept a religious pluralism confirmed by history with sufficient guarantees for the full enjoyment of the respective rights of the three religions.

33. This approach is not unrealistic; it is a goal that we can all achieve if we demonstrate good faith. Our conclusion is that Jerusalem requires a special status, internationally guaranteed. The basic elements of that status would include the following guarantees, in our opinion. First, freedom of residence, freedom of worship and respect for the preservation of and free access to the Holy Places, as well as facilities to maintain institutions, temples, homes and places for those who are in charge of the administration of those institutions. The authorities in charge should give due protection to historical rights and to the rights of the various communities involved to the property they have acquired. The authorities of the city must help preserve and safeguard the historical sites of the Holy City. Secondly, the authorities should ensure equal rights for the three religious communities and should guarantee to foster their spiritual, cultural and social lives. Suitable opportunities must be provided for economic progress so that there may be more employment and better education for those participating in these development plans.

34. If we plan to make a serious effort to develop that idea, we must agree that the special status of Jerusalem must be clearly defined, in particular the legal formula concerning the territory to be affected, which must, in the opinion of us Catholics, include at the very least the Old City, Mount Moriah and the Mount of Olives. Finally, it must be specific with regard to supervisory functions and guarantees to be provided by the international community.

35. We hope, with the faith of the Catholic belief, that many of these ideas, which reflect the thinking of millions of Latin Americans, will be taken duly into account when the time comes to negotiate the international status which must one day be given to Jerusalem on a permanent basis.

36. The delegation of Panama, in its many statements on the Middle East, has always made a constructive effort to promote peace negotiations in that sorely tried region of the world. We are sure that only on the basis of a balanced solution to the problem can we find that peace which today appears elusive and which we all want to see established permanently in that part of the world.

37. Panama repeats its belief that no stable international order can be based on the threat or the use of force and declares once again that we must not recognize the validity of the occupation or acquisition of territory by force. The withdrawal of Israeli forces from territory occupied in the 1967 war and respect for the integrity and security of the territory of all the

countries in the area, including Israel, must be linked with respect for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. Only then may we have a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

38. We share the preoccupation of the Secretary-General that, as a result of so much bloodshed, pain and suffering, at any moment there could be another crisis in the Middle East involving neighbouring countries and endangering peace in that area and, indeed, in the entire world. We cling to the hope that a way will soon be found to reconvene the Geneva Peace Conference.

39. After considering the problem as a whole, it is our conclusion that an understanding can be negotiated, one that will be practicable only on the basis of a Palestinian State, including the Gaza Strip and the West Bank of the Jordan, and that for their part, the Arabs must respect the right of Israel to live within secure and recognized boundaries.

40. Panama, which as a result of negotiations for a new Canal treaty hopes to eradicate the colonial-type enclave which divides its country in two and which is known throughout the world as the Panama Canal Zone, shares the impatience of the Palestinians who await the hour when they will recover effective sovereignty over their land. For that reason we stand together with them, because we recognize that they have certain inalienable rights which they can never renounce.

41. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before I call on the next speaker, I wish to inform the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of Mauritania containing a request to be invited, in accordance with Article 31 of the Charter, to participate without the right to vote in the Council's discussion. If I hear no objection, I propose to invite him to participate, without the right to vote, in conformity with the Council's usual practice and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. El Hassen (Mauritania) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

42. Mr. KANAZAWA (Japan): I should like to begin by associating myself with the statement by you, Mr. President, extending a warm welcome to the new representative of the United States, Governor William Scranton. My delegation is delighted to have this distinguished representative of the United States working with us, and we look forward to fruitful co-operation with him and his delegation.

43. It is most regrettable to note that the situation in a vital area of the Middle East is deteriorating, and we are called upon to discuss recent developments in the occupied Arab territories and Jerusalem. In the view of my delegation this is all the more cause for

concern, because the Government of Japan has for years been apprehensive about the situation in Jerusalem. In recent weeks the situation has become still more disturbing and has resulted in casualties and suffering, particularly among the Arab citizens.

44. The basic position of the Government of Japan with regard to the occupied Arab territories and Jerusalem is that Israel should withdraw from all the territories occupied since 1967. The Government of Japan therefore firmly opposes any attempt to annex those territories and any change, physical or demographic, or other actions and policies intended to alter their legal status. Further, the Government of Japan requests the Government of Israel to comply fully with the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time or War³ in all the territories occupied since 1967.

45. As regards Jerusalem, the people of Japan, with their own spiritual tradition, naturally have the highest appreciation for the long history of Jerusalem. We feel that the great historical and cultural heritage which it has brought to the world should be protected for the benefit of all mankind, without distinction as to race or religion.

46. Since the question of Jerusalem is indeed unique, my delegation attaches special importance to Israel's compliance with General Assembly and Security Council resolutions which prohibit all unilateral changes that would lead to the annexation by Israel of a city which is venerated by Moslems, Christians and Jews alike. The Holy Places of three great religions are situated in Jerusalem, and there is grave danger that any unilateral alteration—physical, religious or political—may cause conflicts among the parties concerned.

47. The recent unrest caused by the 28 January decision by an Israeli magistrate in Jerusalem that Jews could not be prevented from praying in Al-Haram Al-Sharif was most disquieting. We take note, however, of the policy that the Government of Israel has followed in banning Jewish prayer on the sacred hilltop, as well as of its action in obtaining the decision of the Supreme Court on 21 March which upheld that policy and reserved the earlier decision of the magistrate.

48. My delegation is greatly concerned lest the recent incidents in Jerusalem and in other parts of the West Bank should aggravate the situation and jeopardize the prospects for the settlement that is so urgently needed. We appeal to all the parties to refrain from any action that would further heighten the tension.

49. The series of events of past weeks may be repeated, and my delegation believes that there is no remedy for those happenings except a prompt, just and lasting peace settlement in the Middle East. It is my delegation's earnest hope that this will be achieved so that the situation may not take a further turn for the worse.

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

51. Mr. KAISER (Bangladesh): Mr. President, with respect I join the previous speakers in expressing satisfaction at seeing you, a distinguished son of Africa, presiding over these important meetings of the Security Council. We are confident that under your wise and astute guidance the Council's deliberations will be successful.

52. We take this opportunity to welcome the presence of Ambassador Scranton, the representative of the United States. We are sure that with his knowledge and wisdom Mr. Scranton will bring still more meaning and progress to the deliberations of this body.

53. My delegation asked for an opportunity to participate in the debate of the Council to express its grave concern about the serious situation arising from the recent developments in occupied Arab territories. In calling for an urgent meeting of the Security Council on the subject, the representatives of the Libyan Arab Republic and Pakistan referred to some of these recent grave developments. On 28 January a magistrate of an Israeli court in Jerusalem gave a ruling permitting Jews to pray in the premises of the Al-Aqsa Mosque, revered by Moslems all the world over as one of their holiest shrines. The wide-spread protests and demonstrations against this decision by the Arab population in Jerusalem and in other major cities of the West Bank reflect the gravity of the situation and the determination of the people of the occupied territories to resist any attempt to change the status of Jerusalem and absorb it into Israel.

54. My country views this development with great concern and seriousness. To the Moslems of the world Jerusalem is one of the holiest of the holy cities. Moslems all over the world are therefore bound to resist any attempt to undermine the spiritual values of the city of Jerusalem and our Islamic heritage there. On a number of occasions since the occupation of Jerusalem by Israel in 1967, the Moslem countries have had to protest the desecration of the holy shrines of Islam situated in the city. In our view the decision of the Israeli court regarding praying by Jews in the premises of the Al-Aqsa Mosque therefore cannot be regarded as an isolated incident. The latest expression of this concern on the part of the member States of the Islamic Conference was conveyed to the Secretary-General by the representative of Saudi Arabia on 12 March [S/12012].

55. In addition to the desecration of Islamic shrines in Jerusalem, the Israeli Government seems to have followed a persistent policy of changing the religious, cultural, demographic and political status not only of Jerusalem but of other parts of Arab territories occupied by Israel. It is a policy of creating facts to

substantiate an invalid claim by presenting a fait accompli. I do not wish to take the Council's time by enumerating at length the history of application of this policy by Israel in occupied Arab territories. Instead, I should like only to refer, as an example, to paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 3525 A (XXX) on the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories. The resolution condemned in particular such Israeli policies and practices, and, at the risk of repetition, may I be allowed to restate them:

“(a) The annexation of parts of the occupied territories;

“(b) The establishment of Israeli settlements therein and the transfer of an alien population thereto;

“(c) The destruction and demolition of Arab houses;

“(d) The confiscation and expropriation of Arab property in the occupied territories and all other transactions for the acquisition of land involving the Israeli authorities, institutions or nationals on the one hand, and the inhabitants or institutions of the occupied territories on the other;

“(e) The evacuation, deportation, expulsion, displacement and transfer of Arab inhabitants of the occupied territories, and the denial of their right to return;

“(f) Mass arrests, administrative detention and ill-treatment of the Arab population;

“(g) The pillaging of archaeological and cultural property;

“(h) The interference with religious freedoms and practices, as well as family rights and customs;

“(i) The illegal exploitation of the natural wealth, resources and population of the occupied territories.”

The resolution also declared that these policies and practices of Israel constituted grave violations of the Charter of the United Nations, in particular the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity and the principles and provisions of international law concerning occupation, as well as an impediment to the establishment of a just and lasting peace.

56. The problem therefore is not only religious or social; it is essentially political in nature and arises from the military occupation of Arab territories by Israel. The recent incident in the occupied Arab territories once again reminds us, if any such reminder is necessary, of the danger inherent in the present situa-

tion in the Middle East and the urgent need to find a just and lasting peace in the area. We have always maintained that the return of all occupied territories and the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people are two essential elements for any just settlement.

57. In the past the Security Council and the General Assembly have on a number of occasions considered the actions of the Israeli occupation authority to change the status and character of the occupied city of Jerusalem to give effect to its declared intention of annexing it. In doing so, both the Council and the Assembly not only condemned these acts but also declared them totally invalid and called on the Israeli authorities to desist from such measures to change the status of Jerusalem and to rescind those already taken. The recent action of the Israeli authority constituted another violation of the decisions of both Council and Assembly. The decision of the Israeli Supreme Court overruling the Magistrate's Court could at its very best be in the nature of very temporary relief. But the status and future of Jerusalem and other occupied territories cannot be left to the unilateral decision of the occupation authority. It has therefore become imperative for the Council to take prompt and effective action to ensure implementation of its own decisions and to prevent further deterioration of an already explosive situation.

58. In conclusion, my delegation would urge urgent action by the Council in the hope of peace and justice rather than inaction or stalemate, which could breed another holocaust.

59. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Iraq. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

60. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq): Mr. President, may I first thank you and the other members of the Council for allowing my delegation to participate in the present debate.

61. At long last the Zionist representative has deigned to make an appearance before this body, and this appearance has been hailed in certain quarters as a good omen for the prospects of peace in the Middle East. One wonders what brought about this change of heart. Why the sudden *volte face* from the lofty and unshakable determination not to appear in this chamber while the unspeakable Palestine Liberation Organization was present? What brings the Zionist knights in shining armour here to what they consider to be a disreputable public convenience? What brings them to this den of iniquity?

62. Surely the Council has not changed since it last met in January to discuss the question of Palestine, nor has the PLO been miraculously transformed into something acceptable to Israel. The representative of

Israel has taken the trouble to tell us as much in his statement. No, it must be the realization that not even the staunchest supporter of the Zionist entity can stand up to defend the Zionists' violations, their actions and their policies in Jerusalem and the other Arab territories under military occupation.

63. One should perhaps wonder what was, then, the contribution made by the Israeli representative in this debate. It boils down to this. Whatever Arabs or the rest of the world may say on Israel's policies in the occupied territories, it is simply not true; it is but a collection of damnable lies, malicious falsehoods and repetitions of the tactic of the big lie. Neither Jerusalem nor the world has witnessed such an enlightened, humane, tolerant, just and benevolent administration on earth as the Zionist entity—established indeed by force of arms, terror and bloodshed in the Holy Land. Anyone and everyone who dares to criticize or even question any aspect or action of this divinely inspired political movement is a purveyor of hate and discrimination, an anti-Semite, a racist and worse. They, on the other hand, believe themselves to be, as the self-styled spokesmen and representatives of the chosen people, sacrosanct and infallible.

64. Then, too, they claim that whatever happened in the area is the outcome of Arab policies and aggressions against little, innocent, newly born, defenceless Israel. They have repeated often enough in this chamber and in other forums of the United Nations that from the beginning, from 1948, it was the Arabs who invaded this peace-loving little innocent State. I shall not go into a long, detailed refutation. I shall merely quote a high Israeli official who should have known, namely, David Ben Gurion. In his book *Rebirth and Destiny of Israel*⁴ he says the following:

"Until the British left, no Jewish settlement, however remote, was entered or seized by the Arabs, while the Haganah"—which was then the military force of the Zionists, an underground army—"captured many Arab positions and liberated Tiberias and Haifa, Jaffa and Safad. So on the day of destiny, 15 May 1948, that part of Palestine where the Haganah could operate was almost clear of Arabs."

"Clear of Arabs"—how very reminiscent is this usage of words of the term *Judenrein* which the Nazis employed in their part of the world. It was a fact that before a single Arab soldier had set foot on Palestinian territory there were 300,000 Arab refugees already ejected by the Zionist policies of terror and massacre.

65. The other big claim they make and repeat endlessly—and it has been repeated again during this debate—is that in 1967 again it was the Arabs who had staged an unprovoked aggression against the State of Israel. That was a ploy used by the representative of Israel in the Security Council in 1967, and I should like to remind members of what he said then. This

was Mr. Rafael, who was then the representative of the Zionist régime here. He stated:

"I have so far received only first reports about the developments. From these it is evident that in the early hours of this morning Egyptian armoured columns moved in an offensive thrust against Israel's borders. At the same time Egyptian planes took off from airfields in Sinai and struck out towards Israel. Egyptian artillery in the Gaza Strip shelled the Israel villages of Kissufim, Nahal-Oz and Ein Hasheloshah. Netania and Kefar Yavetz have also been bombed. Israel forces engaged the Egyptians in the air and on land, and fighting is still going on." [1347th meeting, para. 30.]

66. How far that was from the truth. Would that it were the truth, the situation would have been different today. There would have been no occupied territories and no occupied Jerusalem. To this day the Zionist representatives insist on continuing this fallacy, thinking that the world will accept such interpretations as they want to have imposed on the world. But what are the facts, again? We had the generals coming out a year later—not much later—and admitting the truth. On 19 March 1972 *Ha'aretz*, an Israeli newspaper, reported:

"Dr. M. Peled said that the thesis that in June 1967 Israel faced the danger of annihilation and that the State of Israel was fighting for its physical survival is 'a tale which was born and elaborated only after the war'. Dr. Peled, who was in the Army General Staff during the 1967 war, is now a professor of history at the Shilo'ah Institute. He further noted that in May 1967 there was no danger of annihilation to Israel: 'The Egyptians concentrated 80,000 soldiers, while we mobilized against them hundreds of thousands of men'."

The General Rabin himself, who was the Chief of Staff in 1967, said in an interview published in *Le Monde* what must be the final word:

"I do not believe that Nasser wanted war. The two divisions he sent into Sinai on 14 May would not have been enough to unleash an offensive against Israel. He knew it, and we knew it."

67. Other speakers have already dealt amply with the different ramifications of the item on the agenda. I shall limit myself to the examination of the statements made by the representative of this paragon of virtue and veracity, General Herzog, the ex-military governor of occupied Jerusalem.

68. A number of references and claims have been made concerning access to the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem. References to this were in fact made no fewer than four times in the statement made by the representative of Israel; they appear in several places in the verbatim record of the 1894th meeting. I think this deserves

careful examination. The allegation was that the Arab Governments, and Jordan in particular, had refused to safeguard free access to the Holy Places. The truth of the matter is that in response to an appeal made by the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, the Arab Governments of Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria pledged themselves to the following declaration on 15 November 1949:

"The Governments of Egypt, the Hashemite Jordan Kingdom, Lebanon and Syria undertake to guarantee freedom of access to the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites situated in the territory placed under their authority by the final settlement of the Palestine problem, or, pending that settlement, in the territory at present occupied by them under armistice agreements; and, pursuant to this undertaking, will guarantee rights of entry and of transit to ministers of religion, pilgrims and visitors without distinction as to nationality or faith, subject only to considerations of national security, all the above in conformity with the *status quo* prior to 14 May 1948."

Israel, on the other hand, in a response to a similar appeal made by the Conciliation Commission, replied that it was of the opinion that

"it would in the circumstances be in the interest of a constructive and final settlement if the matter of formulation were dealt with after more far-reaching consideration of these problems by the General Assembly."

It is distinctly clear that Israel itself chose not to make any such commitments regarding the Holy Places as those made by the Arabs.

69. There is one remark in the statement made by the representative of Israel that seems to have escaped the attention of the members of the Council. He said that the Jews had refrained from exercising their inherent right to pray on the Temple Mount. Now that is quite remarkable. While the representative of Israel was protesting that there were no Zionist encroachments upon the Moslem sanctuary, he nevertheless took that occasion to stake a claim for a non-existing right to the Islamic Holy Places.

70. Now do the Zionists in fact have a right to stake such a claim? Interestingly enough, the League of Nations had looked into this matter. As long ago as 1930 an international commission was established under the chairmanship of Eliel Löfgren, a former Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs. The Commission heard evidence from Arabs and Jews in Palestine and submitted its report in December 1930. On the issue the Commission reached these two conclusions:

"(1) The Western Wall"—we are not speaking now of Al-Haram Al-Sharif—"was an exclusively Moslem waqf property and part of a Moslem holy

place, Al-Haram Al-Sharif area. The pavement in front of the Wall and between it and the Al-Magharbah quarter was also a Moslem *waqf* property and formed part of a legally constituted religious foundation.

"(2) The Jews have the right of access to the Western Wall for devotions on the pavement, and should be permitted, on specified occasions, to bring specified articles pertaining to acts of Jewish devotion."

That was the Commission's conclusion, and that was the report which was accepted by Britain and the League of Nations. It was made legally binding as an international document by an Order in Council. In 1931 it became law in Palestine. The report was published, as I have mentioned, as the Löfgren Commission report in 1931.

71. Then General Herzog had the nerve to lecture members of the Council here on their inability to comprehend a situation whereby courts of law are independent of the executive. This falls very strangely indeed from the lips of the representative of a régime that resorts to the policy of collective punishment. Apparently the executive in his land is also independent of the judiciary, at least as far as Arabs are concerned. We need merely refer to the reports issuing from the occupied territories of suspects punished even before they are indicted or prosecuted—not only the suspects, but also their innocent relatives. They are chastised by having their houses blown up and by being ejected from their domicile. And yet we hear the representative of Israel sitting in this Council lecturing others when his régime denies the rights of a whole people to nationhood, even to residence in its historical homeland.

72. There have also been exchanges on the question of the reconstruction of the Temple. There were allegations and denials and counter-allegations, and now there are further statements that I should like to quote here. On 23 July 1967 the London newspaper *The Sunday Times* wrote:

"Reports that sentiment exists in Israel to rebuild the Temple, which could entail destruction of the present Moslem sanctuary, have further heightened tension."

"On 16 August 1967 the military Rabbi of Israel, Shlomo Goren, expressed the wish to see the Jewish Temple rebuilt on the site of the Moslem Holy Shrine of Al-Aqsa."

This latter item about 16 August 1967 concerning Rabbi Goren was reported by the *Agence France Presse* and published in *L'Orient* of 17 August 1967. *Time* magazine on 30 June 1967 ran the following report:

"The Temple (of Solomon) must be constructed on its original site. This could only be done by demolishing Islam's Dome of the Rock."

The historian Israel Eldad, a former Irgun terrorist, said:

"We are at the stage where David was when he liberated Jerusalem. From that time until the reconstruction of the Temple by Solomon, only one generation passed. So will it be with us. 'And what about that Moslem shrine?' Answers Eldad: 'Who knows? Perhaps there will be an earthquake.'"

73. A great deal was said in the statement of the Zionist representative to deny that there had been Israelization of educational programmes and curricula and to assert that this was a lie and that the reverse was true.

74. In 1965 the Division of Higher Education Research of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare commissioned at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem a three-year project entitled "Some problems of educating a national minority: a study of Israeli education of Arabs". This was project No. CE-6-21-03. This report made a comparative study of the curricula that were being applied among Jewish schoolchildren and among Arab students, and it juxtaposed the secondary school curricula, clearly betraying the educational structures needed to maintain Israeli domination, on the one hand, and a systematic attempt to undercut the Palestinian Arab's sense of his particular cultural history as an Arab, as well as the history of his own position as a Palestinian Arab, on the other.

75. Mr. Uri Davis, former Vice-Chairman of the Israeli League for Civil and Human Rights, who is at present working in London with War Resisters International, made a study of this, and it was published in the *Journal of Palestine Studies*, No. 9, autumn issue 1973. He came to the following conclusion:

"One can imagine the effect on the Palestinian Arab mind straitjacketed to articulate its own particular identity in terms of 256 hours of Bible and Jewish oral tradition and 30 hours of Koran. (It is to be noted that there are, moreover, no provisions for the study of the New Testament.) This procedure correlates to the Arab inferior political and economic position a position of cultural and historical inferiority. It is predicated upon denying to the Arab, as far as possible, effective tools in terms of which he could critically confront the presentation of the Israeli Jew as the bearer of modern enlightenment and progress in the area; it attempts to present the Israeli Jew as having a long-standing genealogy of historical and cultural superiority stemming right out of the introduction of the first documented, abstract and monotheistic religion."

76. The Israeli representative made yet another interesting and highly revealing statement. He said that it was utterly false that the Arab population of Jerusalem had been compelled to leave their homes. He stated:

"The only Arabs removed in the Old City of Jerusalem were those who had occupied Jewish homes in the Jewish quarter after the fighting in 1948. They were obliged to return the property to their rightful owners and were indeed compensated." [1894th meeting, para. 90.]

I take it he would agree, then, that the Palestinians, when and if they return to their homes, would be entitled to such restitution.

77. But let us look at this claim about the Jewish quarter in the Old City of Jerusalem. In an article in *The Guardian* of 29 April 1972, David Hirst wrote:

"Before 1948 the Jewish Quarter was at the most 20 per cent Jewish-owned. The Israelis are now taking over the lot. They are in the process of expelling 5,000 Arabs who live there."

78. Then, in an attempt to refute the fact that there is suppression of Islamic and Christian heritage and institutions, the Israeli representative said that it was "malicious nonsense" and that there had never been "such an... expansion and development of religious life in the city for all faiths as has occurred over the past few years" [ibid., para. 92].

79. Now, what is the truth concerning that?

80. The Italian Jesuit periodical *Civiltà Cattolica* has accused Israel of forcing Arabs, particularly Christian Arabs, to leave East Jerusalem and the West Bank. Written by Father Giovanni Rulli, the article in that bi-monthly is considered by many to be the most severe criticism of Israeli policies yet voiced by a Roman Catholic. This item was carried by the *Jewish Chronicle*, published in London, on 25 June 1971.

81. Another statement from the Vatican was contained in an article in the 22 March 1971 edition of the Vatican daily, *L'Osservatore Romano*. It had a prominently placed editorial entitled "Jerusalem and peace", which stated that the Christian and Moslem Palestinian communities in Jerusalem today feel that their existence and development is threatened by a policy which seems to aim at slow suffocation. The policy of making Jerusalem more Jewish, said the paper, has been in effect since the occupation of the Arab sector of the city during the June war of 1967. It added:

"This occupation was transformed by the Israeli parliament practically into annexation under the formula of unification. This determination to acquire the Arab sector has manifested itself ever since in

measures of a legislative, fiscal and urban nature which are impressing on Jerusalem an ever more special character at the expense of the non-Jewish population. Moslems and Christians are compelled for reasons of urban expansion to live in ever increasingly restricted spaces and, finally, to look elsewhere for a future they feel they no longer can find in their homeland's environment. Reference to expropriations measures is sufficient to give an idea of the radical manner with which the physiognomy is impressed on the city that greatly differs from its historical and religious character and its universal vocation. In August 1970 another 1,200 hectares, which is 2,640 acres, were expropriated in the Arab sector of Jerusalem and on the outskirts of the town for the carrying out of the Greater Jerusalem Plan. On 21 February 1971 the Hebrew Municipal Council of Jerusalem approved, despite open opposition of technicians and architects, the plans prepared by the Construction Ministry for housing in the suburbs. This means that there will be a real belt of buildings on the hills around the Holy City consisting of 20,000 homes destined to house 75,000 Jews. A very serious state of things is developing against international law through the logic of faits accomplis. Unfortunately, these are not peace projects and cannot leave indifferent those who really work for definitive peace in the Middle East."

82. The representative of Israel then touched on the situation in the Gaza Strip, claiming that the situation was so peaceful there that the disturbances taking place on the West Bank were the making of agitators and agents provocateurs because of forthcoming elections in that area of the West Bank. I would only quote a short part of an article written by a member of the British Parliament, Mr. Carol Johnson, a member of the Labour Middle East Council which had toured the Gaza Strip with a British parliamentary group. He says:

"During our stay we had the opportunity of judging 'the resettlement and construction work' on which the Israelis claim they are engaged. One is always reluctant to make dogmatic statements after a brief visit, but having seen what had been done in some of the camps and discussed the position both with Israeli officials and Arabs I learned nothing firm and definite about 'resettlement' but saw a good deal of evidence about destruction and dispersal."

That is from an article in the *Middle East International* of October 1971.

83. The representative of Israel, in his usual tactic of attacking right and left on matters that are far outside the agenda item, spoke of the attitude of Moslem Arabs to various cultural entities, and he mentioned Iraq specifically. He said, "Look at the fate of the Syrian Christians in Iraq... One has but to

contemplate the sombre and grim fate of the Kurds in Iraq".

84. Again, these are subjects that the Council should not be dealing with, but since they have been raised it is my duty to refer to them, even if briefly.

85. A letter published in *The Christian Science Monitor* of 9 December 1974 from Professor A. Voobus of the Royal Academy of Belgium says, under the heading "Minority in Iraq":

"An event recently occurred in Iraq which would have made headlines in more normal circumstances. The Government in Iraq has granted full cultural freedom to the Syrian Christian minority. Authority has been given to educate the children in their native language in the elementary schools. The cultivation of the heritage of the Syrians via Syriac language and cultural studies in all higher institutions of learning at the expense of the Government has also been approved. Radio and television services have also been put at the disposal of the Syrian Christians. In addition, a scholarly journal has been established and an academy for Syriac language and literature founded, actions heralded by a congress to which scholars from many countries were invited. As one who was in attendance, I can affirm that this occasion was indeed a dignified event."

86. As to the question of the Kurds, we have seen lately reports in the local press here by a gentleman who was close to the Nixon Administration, a correspondent by the name of William Safire, claiming that the Israelis were expecting the faction following the Mullah Mustafa Al-Barzani to stage an attack on the Iraqi Government while Iraq was engaged in the 1973 war against Israel. This bit of information, apparently gathered from some House committee on intelligence, should explain the interest of the Israeli representative in the Kurdish dissident group following Mustafa Al-Barzani.

87. As to the position of the Kurds in general in Iraq, I can only refer him to articles such as the one written by Mr. Arnold Hottinger in the *Swiss Review of World Affairs*, published in July 1975, entitled "Kurdistan after the revolt"; another article by Mr. Edward Mortimer of the editorial staff of *The Times* of London, entitled "Iraq and the Kurds", published in the *Middle East International* in 1975; an article in *The Observer* of 6 April 1975 by Gavin Young under the title, "VIP treatment for Kurds"; and, most important of all, a report by the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs from a team sent by the World Council of Churches to visit Iraq; this is Report No. 5, dated 1975.

88. As to the question of Arab Jews, and Iraqi Jews in particular, my delegation has already, on 19 January at the 1876th meeting, referred to that situation and the circumstances that accompanied the uprooting of

the ancient Jewish community in Iraq. I think that the representative of Israel would be well advised to look into the position of these so-called Oriental Jews, the Sephardic Jews, within Israel, their status as second-class citizens and their deprivations after they had gone to Israel from Arab countries as a highly cultured and highly professional people. Now they are second-class citizens, and their children are considered as delinquents.

89. This is not to mention the third-class position of Arabs who are still in Palestine. That would take separate and full studies. Chapters could be written on it and it could be investigated with great ease.

90. Now again, when the representative of Jordan stated the fact that Arab cemeteries were also desecrated by the Zionists, the representative of Israel could only say that this was a vicious lie, that it was completely untrue, especially the reference to the cemetery of Mamillah. Let me quote from an article in *The Guardian* of London, also by Mr. David Hirst, under the title, "Bulldozing through Arab history", published on 27 April 1972. It says:

"It is a frequent Israeli practice to portray the Arabs as despoilers and desecrators. The Jewish cemetery on the Mount of Olives is visible from the Haram, and guides have been pointing it out with the suitable comment on the vandals who desecrated it during Jordanian times. An Israeli 'White Paper' has expatiated on the official and systematic depredations visited on it. The cemetery did, indeed, suffer from pilferers; one service which tombstones performed was as paving stones for the latrines of a military encampment nearby. But the vast bulk remains intact. With the 'unification' of the city, the Arabs accused of vandalism in their part of it have been able to go and see what the Israelis have been doing in theirs. They could see what happened to Mamillah. It has been swept away, a rubble of earth, tombs and the bones of their occupants, by Israeli municipal bulldozers. For the Arabs of Jerusalem—for those with a sense of history, that is—what the Israelis are doing to their city amounts to a historic act of ingratitude. Few would dispute their claim that of all the conquests of Jerusalem the two Arab ones were the most civilized."

91. Nor was it only the Moslem cemetery of Mamillah; the Christian cemetery on Mount Zion was also desecrated and the Augusta Victoria Hospital in Jerusalem was bombed with napalm by the Israelis.

92. Members of the United Nations have heard time and again statements about the destruction of the Jewish quarter. That is another violation laid at the door of the Arabs. But let me quote from a letter written by Sir John Richmond. Sir John Richmond was a member of the Foreign Office who served in the Middle East with the Palestine Government in 1946 and 1947. At present he is Lecturer in Modern

Near East History at Durham University. He wrote the following on 5 June 1971 to the Roman Catholic weekly *The Tablet*:

"... the destruction of the Jewish quarter of the Old City and the departure of its innocent inhabitants were the direct consequences of attempts by Haganah and Palmach to carry out Operation Schifon. This was part of the Plan Dalet, designed to achieve Jewish occupation of the Old City of Jerusalem, which had not been allocated to the Jews under the partition plan."

That is not the word of an Arab against the word of the Zionist representative; it was written by an authoritative, highly knowledgeable person familiar with the area and its history.

93. Not content with all that, the representative of Israel goes on to accuse the Arabs of setting out to Arabize the Old City of Jerusalem and to erase its Jewish identity. Now, to be able to erase an identity one has to establish that there was in fact such an identity. What are the facts? This time I shall quote a well-known American writer, historian and journalist who visited the Holy Land in 1929. He wrote:

"That was, probably, the first impression I received of walled Jerusalem in the early days: that it was an Arab city. It was as Arab as Cairo or Baghdad, and the Zionist Jews (that is, the modern Jews) were as foreign to it as I was myself. I had expected this, of course. I knew that the Old City had not been changed, that the large Zionist population of Jerusalem (an actual majority) lived in new quarters outside the walls, and that Palestine was still predominantly an Arab country. But a fact on paper has not the same effect as its physical configuration.

"Two days in Jerusalem gave me a clearer perception of the fact than I could have received from a volume of statistics. I had enough political experience to realize that such things as these must determine feeling and action, and from my second or third day in Jerusalem I began to wonder if all was as well between the Arabs and the Jews as I had been led to believe. I knew nothing; but anybody could see, in half an hour, that here were the physical elements of a conflict."

That was written by Mr. Vincent Sheean in his book *Personal History*, published by Doubleday Doran and Company, New York, in 1935.

94. Then the representative of Israel bewailed the fact that the world had kept silent about all these violations and desecrations. He repeated some words of Mr. Abba Eban to that effect. But again let us look at the facts. In an interview published on 3 July 1971 in the *Corriere della Sera* in Italy, Mr. Eban had almost criticized the Holy Father himself for his

silence about the profanations of the holy Jewish city before 1967. According to an item by Agence France Presse published in *The Herald* on 17 October 1971, the Pope did not reply, but much later *L'Osservatore della Domenica*, through the pen of Vatican spokesman Professor Federico Alessandrini, revealed that Christians had also been victims of "profanations" which were not on the "part of the Arabs" and that the statistics which Mr. Eban cited were rigged.

95. Members of the Council were also told that an international committee established ostensibly for the restoration and beautification of the Old City was singing the praises of the Israeli Government for its wisdom in dealing with Jerusalem. Not only that; that committee established supposedly for the restoration and beautification of the Old City saw fit to comment on education in Israel and to give its blessing to what the enlightened Israeli administration was doing.

96. Be that as it may, let us refer to the work of a British architect, Alfred Kutcher, who was a member of that committee on Jerusalem, which in fact in 1970 rejected and condemned Israel's 1968 master plan for the city. He wrote a book called *The New Jerusalem: Planning and Politics*, and, according to *The Christian Science Monitor* of 5 March 1975:

"Mr. Kutcher insists that Jerusalem cannot absorb the rapid growth rate prescribed by Israeli planners, who are moving in as many Jewish immigrants as quickly as possible. Awareness that Jerusalem's spiritual essence is inextricably bound up with her visual, tangible qualities—an awareness evidenced by 4,000 years of building in the city—is now not only simply ignored; it is not even recognized, Mr. Kutcher writes."

And Mr. Kutcher continues:

"Instead, a new way of thinking about Jerusalem has sprung up. The city is a resource to be exploited. Its spiritual and visual qualities are commodities to be bought and sold. The authorities, in order to raise ready cash from property investors, have been selling away the city's visual and symbolic heritage. Architects have eagerly joined in building for Jerusalem as if it were the moon."

97. Now, a number of speakers have emphasized the importance of the Geneva Conventions and their applicability to the areas occupied by Israel. But the unfortunate fact is that while Arab countries have accepted the applicability of these Conventions, such is not the case with Israel.

98. In October 1973, at the start of hostilities, the International Committee of the Red Cross took immediate steps to enhance the protection of civilians in communications to the Governments of Syria, Iraq, Egypt and Israel. It asked them to apply the draft

agreement for the protection of civilians.⁷ The Governments of Syria, Iraq and Egypt agreed to do so. On 19 October the Government of Israel refused. The explanation given by the Israeli representative in the Special Political Committee in his statement of 19 November was that the Government of Israel considered that the fourth Geneva Convention "did not apply for a number of legal reasons" and that Israel "reserved its position on the applicability of the Convention in the administered areas".⁸ Perhaps the representative of Israel would like to enlighten public opinion further. He is always talking of "enlightened public opinion" and of its being very sympathetic to Israel. Would he care, perhaps, to inform it why he and his Government do not consider the Geneva Conventions applicable?

99. In the view of my delegation, the reason is that Israel considers these occupied territories as liberated territories, as belonging to Israel again by right. The Twenty-eighth Zionist Congress, held in Jerusalem in January 1972, unanimously adopted the following two resolutions:

"1. The right of the Jewish people to 'Eretz Yisrael' is inalienable.

"2. During the Six Day War, the aggressors were repelled, the land of our ancestors was liberated, Jerusalem was redeemed and reunited."

Then, on 16 March 1972, the Israeli parliament passed the following resolution:

"The Knesset has resolved that the historic right of the Jewish people to the Land of Israel is beyond challenge."

Those, in our view, are the reasons why Israel now refuses to apply the Geneva Conventions in the occupied territories.

100. Now, the International Committee of the Red Cross does not resort to the practice of giving publicity to its findings. And yet, even that Committee itself found it necessary, at the end of 1970, to release an outspoken report accusing Israel of repeatedly violating the fourth Geneva Convention by blowing up houses and even whole villages, in a deliberate policy of collective reprisals. The report listed 10 villages and camps which had been totally destroyed by the Israelis. A spokesman for the Red Cross justified the International Committee's decision to publish the report by saying:

"After two years of protest we have not been able to obtain from the Israeli Government a satisfactory response on its attitude towards the fourth Convention."

101. Finally, the representative of Israel concluded his statement here with the following words:

"I offer no excuse for our presence in Jerusalem. I owe no apology. We are there as of right—a right

that has been hallowed by our Bible, a right which has been sanctified by our history, by our sacrifice, by our prayers and by our yearnings, a right which has been strengthened and vindicated by virtue of our creating the only liberal administration giving complete freedom of worship to all faiths. [*Ibid.*, para. 122.]

102. Now, that indeed is a far cry from the statement made by Israeli representatives before committees of the United Nations prior to the admission of Israel to the United Nations. Then they were seeking admission to the United Nations and they were undertaking responsibilities which subsequently they failed to fulfil. The representative at the 47th meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, during the third session of the General Assembly, had the following to say:

"The Government of Israel will co-operate with the Assembly in seeking a solution to those problems. ... I do not think that Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter"—which precludes interference by the United Nations in the domestic affairs of Member States—"which relates to domestic jurisdiction, could possibly affect the Jerusalem problem, since the legal status of Jerusalem is different from that of the territory in which Israel is sovereign."⁹

103. Many Members at that time wanted to make sure that Israel would abide by those undertakings and by the special obligations under the Charter, and they were in doubt about this. One of them was a jurist from Latin America, Mr. Castro of El Salvador. He stated in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee on 3 May 1949 that

"The delegation of El Salvador intended to vote in favour of the admission of Israel, provided that Israel's attitude towards the General Assembly resolution of 29 November 1947"—that is, the partition resolution—"on the internationalization of Jerusalem and the resolution of 11 December 1948 on the repatriation of the refugees, was first fully clarified by the representative of Israel."¹⁰

However, when the time came for the admission of Israel into the United Nations, El Salvador abstained. It and a number of other, European, delegations were not satisfied by the assurances given by the representative of Israel in that Committee then or later on.

104. But this is not a new matter. Israel challenged the United Nations as far back as 1949: on 17 December it decided to move its parliament to Jerusalem and declared that city as its capital. On 20 December the Trusteeship Council met and called upon Israel to revoke its action. The Council adopted the following resolution:

"The Trusteeship Council,

"Concerned at the removal to Jerusalem of certain ministries and central departments of the Government of Israel,

"Considering that such action ignores and is incompatible with the provisions of paragraph II of General Assembly resolution 303 (IV) of 9 December 1949,

"1. *Is of the opinion* that the action of the Government of Israel is likely to render more difficult the implementation of the statute of Jerusalem with which the Council is entrusted by the General Assembly resolution of 9 December 1949;

"2. *Requests* the President of the Trusteeship Council:

(a) To invite the Government of Israel to submit a written statement on the matters covered by this resolution, to revoke these measures and to abstain from any action liable to hinder the implementation of the General Assembly resolution of 9 December 1949;" [resolution 114 (S-2)].

Israel's response to that request by the Trusteeship Council had already been declared by Ben Gurion, as recorded on page 362 of his book, *Rebirth and Destiny of Israel*.⁴

"The United Nations saw fit this year to decide that our eternal capital should become a *corpus separatum* under international control. Our rebuttal of this wicked counsel was unequivocal and resolute: the Government and Knesset at once moved their seat to Jerusalem and made it Israel's crown and capital irrevocably and for all men to see."

105. Mr. President, I apologize to you and the members of the Council for having taken such a long time, but I confined myself to the statements and allegations made by the representative of Israel in his statement. I think the members of the Council and the Members of the United Nations are in a position now to draw the conclusions that are necessary from the actions undertaken and the violations committed by Israel over the past quarter of a century. The inaction of the Council has only encouraged the aggressor to persist in its violations. Should it be allowed to continue in this course? That is the question now before the Council.

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

107. Mr. JAIPAL (India): My delegation is grateful to you, Mr. President, and to the other members of the Council for giving us this opportunity to present our views on a question that is of the deepest relevance for the establishment of a just and durable peace in the Middle East.

108. For nearly a century the world community has been made aware of the immortal longings of

persons of the Jewish faith whose position as depressed minorities in European States had alienated them from their immediate environment and caused them such intensity of suffering that it created in them an overpowering urge to go at all costs to the land of their legendary origin and to establish Jewish sovereignty in a Jewish State. But what we have been witnessing in recent years is not the fulfilment of that powerful urge, but rather its extravagant excesses and its moments of exaltation manifested in attempts to expand its sovereignty and to subject its Palestinian Arab neighbours to an administration that has all the aspects of colonial rule.

109. The other day we heard about the "enlightened" and "liberal" policy in the territories administered by the Government of Israel. What is the legal authority under which Israel is administering its so-called territories? Does the fact of military occupation during hostilities give a country the right to administer areas under its occupation even after the termination of hostilities and, if so, for how long? In 1947 when the Jewish community accepted the United Nations decision to partition Palestine into two States, was there in that decision an implied authority for one of the two States to take over and administer the other State indefinitely, for reasons of its own security?

110. The position of Israel in relation to Arab territories has been simply that of an army of military occupation, a role that can only be of a temporary and transient character and not one conferring on Israel authority, control or administrative power to alter the status of either the Arab State of Palestine or the city of Jerusalem, both of which are offshoots of the same decision of the United Nations that created Israel.

111. If one accepts the United Nations basis for the establishment of the State of Israel—as Israel does—then Israel should also accept the fact that the Arabs of Palestine are equally entitled to exercise their inalienable rights and their sovereignty in their own lands. We see no valid reason to delay the exercise of their rights by the Arab people of Palestine, since the military necessity that brought about the occupation of their land by Israel no longer seems to exist.

112. The Arabs of Palestine are entitled to an independent existence, and in this respect they are no different from the people of Syria, Lebanon and Iraq, all of which were placed in the same category of Mandated Territories as Palestine was by the League of Nations. There can be no justification, therefore, for Israeli rule or administration of the Arab territories in Palestine which continue, in our opinion, to remain under the sovereignty of the Arab inhabitants.

113. In brief, the occupied Arab areas may not be annexed by Israel, nor may they be administered as if they were territories of Israel. That position has been made clear in several resolutions of the General

Assembly and of the Security Council, Indeed, the Council on more than one occasion has stipulated that all legislative and administrative measures taken by the Israeli occupying force to change the status of Jerusalem or the occupied areas, to take over Arab lands and properties, to transfer Arab populations and to establish Israeli settlements are null and void. The Council would be justified and would be well advised to recall and reaffirm its position in regard to the actions of Israel in the areas under its illegal occupation. It will be necessary also to reaffirm the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by conquest.

114. The root of the immediate problem continues to be Israel's failure to withdraw from areas occupied by it during the conflict of 1967. Occupation as a result of military necessity has now become prolonged into nine years of virtual colonial rule. It is now 28 years since Palestine was partitioned, a period of time even longer than the entire period of the British Mandate which came into force in 1922. The longer the Israeli occupation continues the more frequent and assertive will be the demonstrations of protest by a self-respecting people against their enforced occupation.

115. May I add that, however enlightened and liberal this occupation might be, the lesson of history is surely that an alien Government, however good, is no substitute for self-government. The restoration of Arab sovereignty in Palestine has now become a matter of the utmost urgency. Nine years is a long time for any military occupation, and 28 years is a very long time indeed to wait for promised independence. The terrible disparity between sacrifice and redress is such that more extreme steps might well be attempted in order to seek greater redress.

116. My delegation believes that Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) constitute an adequate basis for the search for an honourable, just and durable peace settlement. This search must be intensified. But it is surely unrealistic to link the search for secure and recognized boundaries to the exercise of their national rights by the Palestinian Arabs.

117. An attempt should be made to unlink military aspects from the normal exercise of political rights and freedoms of the Arab people of Palestine. Unfortunately, Israel has taken the line that the crux of the problem is the Arab refusal to recognize the right of Israel to exist. May I suggest that it is unrealistic to expect any sort of recognition at the point of a gun? Fresh efforts at a peace settlement need to be made, and we hope that the efforts will be intensified under United Nations auspices and that Israel will find it possible to accept and recognize the political and social reality of an Arab State in Palestine.

118. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Tunisia.

I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

119. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, first I should like to thank you, as well as the other members of the Council, for allowing me to set forth in the Council my delegation's views regarding the disquieting situation which unfortunately obtains in the Arab land of Palestine. But it would be remiss of me to embark upon the subject without first addressing to you, Mr. President, my sincere congratulations on your accession to the presidency of the Council and on the skill and devotion you have displayed in conducting the Council's work.

120. I should also like to extend a warm welcome to Mr. William Scranton, the Permanent Representative of the United States, whose acumen, experience, objectivity and prestige will, I am convinced, effectively contribute to the search for appropriate solutions to the serious problems in the agenda of the Security Council and of various other United Nations bodies.

121. The decision the Council took to involve the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization in this discussion demonstrates the ability of the Council to transcend the sometimes inadequate framework of those documents which govern its functioning and also bears witness to its desire to respect the will of the international community henceforth to have the Palestinian people, represented by the PLO, involved in all efforts, negotiations or conferences bearing upon peace in the Middle East. General Assembly resolution 3375 (XXX) in fact requested that the PLO, the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, be invited to participate in all efforts, deliberations and conferences on the Middle East held under the auspices of the United Nations, on an equal footing with other parties, on the basis of resolution 3236 (XXIX).

122. The Security Council, bearing in mind the spirit of that resolution, has applied its rules of procedure, which are after all provisional, with intelligence and discernment. Its members have seen to it that justice prevailed over narrow texts, thus enhancing the prestige of the Council and simultaneously that of the entire Organization. The presence of Israel, the absence of which we noted last January during the discussion on the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, may well indicate some beginning of an awareness of the blinding truth, the essential aspect of which is universal recognition of the fundamental and legitimate rights for which the Palestinian people has been struggling so valiantly for the last 30 years.

123. The situation which at present obtains in Jerusalem and in the occupied Arab territories is both serious and alarming. The representatives of the PLO, Egypt, Syria, Jordan and others have detailed those Israeli practices which affect both the Holy Places in

Jerusalem and the human rights of the non-Jewish population in the occupied territories. It is too damning a record for the international community to be able to agree to tolerate it any further.

124. What are the components of this record? It is very simple to list them, and the very brevity of this list will clearly bring out the magnitude of the tragedy which has not only befallen the heroic people of Palestine but has also affected the Holy Places which are venerated by more than 2 billion human beings of various faiths. They are: the annexation of certain parts of the occupied territories; the establishment of Israeli settlements in those areas; the destruction and demolition of houses inhabited by Arab nationals; the confiscation and expropriation of Ara's property in the occupied territories and the transfer of this property to Israeli institutions or nationals; the deportation, expulsion, displacement and transfer of Arab nationals; mass arrests, administrative detention and ill-treatment meted out to the Arab population; the brutal repression of any attempt at protest; the pillaging of the archaeological and cultural heritage of the Arabs; constraints placed upon religious freedom and customs; the illegal exploitation of the natural wealth, resources and population of the occupied territories.

125. World public opinion, in its deep concern, has frequently had occasion in various forums and at various levels to express its profound disapproval for the illegal actions that have been systematically undertaken by Israel to change the status of the occupied territories. Thus the General Assembly, since its twenty-fourth session—not to mention any earlier sessions—has expressed the serious disquiet it feels at the persistence of the violations of human rights in the occupied territories and has also condemned such policies and practices as collective and area punishment, the destruction of dwellings and the deportation of the inhabitants of the territories occupied by Israel. I am referring to resolution 2546 (XXIV).

126. Having continued its consideration of this matter at its twenty-sixth, twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth sessions, in the light of the reports of the Special Committee instructed to inquire into Israeli practices, the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session reaffirmed [resolution 3240 (XXIX)] that all steps taken by Israel to modify the physical character, demographic composition and the institutional structure or status of the occupied territories or any part thereof were null and void. It went on to reaffirm that the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949 was fully applicable to the territories occupied by Israel in 1967.

127. At its thirtieth session the General Assembly once again gave its attention to this unhappy state of affairs and adopted four resolutions in this connexion condemning those practices, particularly those

affecting the Al-Ibrahimi Mosque, and once again deplored the persistent refusal of Israel to implement the Geneva Convention on the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War [resolutions 3525 A-D (XXX)].

128. The Security Council has frequently had occasion to consider the fate of Jerusalem and this connexion has adopted resolutions 252 (1968), 267 (1969) and 298 (1971). In his noteworthy statement, to which we listened with great interest, the representative of the United States [896th meeting] reminded us very appositely of the statements made by Ambassador Goldberg in 1968 and by Ambassador Yost in 1969, during consideration of Israeli violations of the status of Jerusalem.

129. The international community has become aware of the abuses and the actions going beyond the pale of international law which have been initiated by Israel. These abuses are repeated daily and confirm the intentions of Israel to pursue and to intensify its policy of colonization and annexation, partial or total, of the occupied Arab territories, whether they be in Gaza, the Golan Heights, the West Bank of the Jordan or Sinai, as was pointed out by the representative of Egypt in his statement on Tuesday in connexion with a site being set aside for the construction of a port on Egyptian territory [895th meeting].

130. International public opinion has been aroused at the scope of these demolition and disfigurement operations and the speed with which they have been undertaken. In this connexion the article by John Cooley in *The Christian Science Monitor* on 5 March 1975 under the heading "A bulldozer battle over Jerusalem" clearly illustrates the distressing realities. The author writes, *inter alia*:

"Building promoters in the east sector of Jerusalem which has been annexed by the Israelis are bringing constant pressure to bear to "expel" and to "resettle" the populations of the old part of the city and to "modernize" the latter. The expelled Arab families have been confronted with the spectacle of new buildings in an angular style designed for the Israelis on the rubble of their own shattered homes."

131. What is happening in Jerusalem is not an isolated incident but rather is part and parcel of a deliberate policy aimed at transforming the character of the occupied territories. Any territorial occupation is followed by the same scenario: the expulsion of the Arab inhabitants, the transformation of the localities and the setting up of Jewish settlements. Of course, with their peculiar logic, the Israeli authorities expect that the Arabs living under their occupation should look on like passive bystanders while their homes are destroyed, while their property is confiscated and while their holy places are desecrated.

132. How has the representative of Israel attempted to justify these inhuman acts? First of all, by launching

a virulent attack against the members of the Council and those participating in its work and then by an assiduous and extremely naïve defence of the benefits of occupation. Through these attacks the representative of Israel obviously hopes to succeed in distracting the attention of the members of the Council and world public opinion. It is his hope perhaps that these tactics will prevent the members of the Council from getting down to the root of the problem.

133. If the international community wants this situation to be stopped, it should set about solving the root of the problem, namely, the total and immediate evacuation of the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, and the complete and full guarantee of the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. These two necessary prerequisites to bringing about a lasting peace in the Middle East have been stated and restated forcefully by the Organization, but the task has been made difficult because of the persistent refusal of Israel to implement its resolutions.

134. The Israeli leaders must realize that the fact that they belong to the Organization imposes upon them obligations which they can no longer continue to shirk. If they continue to ignore the realities of our time, if they refuse to grant the Palestinian people the most elementary human and national rights, Israel will thereby be clinging to a policy inspired by mythical vision of the world which is 2,000 years out of date.

135. In the opinion of my delegation, the Security Council should firmly demand that Israel put an immediate stop to the practices and violations which affect and disfigure the holy places and which modify the historical character of the Arab monuments, towns and villages in the occupied territories, but the Council should also view this matter in the context of the situation of which it is the outcome, namely the crisis of the Middle East. Therefore, as my delegation sees it, it should take a decision which not only deals with that aspect of the matter but at the same time affirms the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine to return to their homes and to recover their properties and their right to exercise their option of self-determination and to have an independent and sovereign homeland.

136. In the opinion of my delegation the resolution that the Council is about to adopt should above all require an immediate cessation of the practices in occupied Arab territories, including the violations of and interference in the holy places; but no decision will really have any point as long as it does not go to the root of the problem. Therefore my delegation considers that the Council should shoulder its responsibilities and should state, either during the present meeting or at a forthcoming one, that any solution of the problem of the Middle East necessarily implies the immediate and total evacuation of the occupied territories and the full and complete guarantee of

the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people as defined in General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX), which, I must emphasize, implies the establishment of a Palestinian State which is both independent and sovereign. Only the adoption and implementation of such a decision can prevent the outbreak of a new conflict which would have incalculable consequences not only for the peoples in that area but also for mankind as a whole.

137. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now invite the representative of Mauritania to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

138. Mr. EL HASSEN (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, first of all I should like to congratulate you on your assumption of the Presidency of the Council, and I should like to say that I am indeed very pleased to be taking the floor under your presidency. You are the representative of a brother country which is known for its courageous stand on the question at present before the Council. I should like also to thank you, and through you the other members of the Council, for giving the delegation of Mauritania this opportunity to participate in this important debate.

139. May I also take this opportunity to bid welcome to Ambassador William Scranton of the United States, whose reputation as a man with a clear and penetrating mind has preceded his appointment here to United Nations Headquarters.

140. Once again the Security Council has before it the question of the Middle East, and it is now considering the serious situation arising from the recent events in the occupied Arab lands. For several days now the entire world has been witnessing the clashes producing bloodshed between the civilian populations of the occupied West Bank and Israeli soldiers who, using their weapons, have caused many victims, the majority being young people and students.

141. The facts are known to us all. They have been presented eloquently by a number of other speakers who preceded me in the Council. We have in fact witnessed those events on American television, which can hardly be accused of any pro-Arab bias, or still less of advocating the cause of the Palestinian people. Those televised reports have shown us the true colours of what has been called "the only democracy in the area".

142. The Israeli police and army, using firearms, clubs and sometimes even police dogs, have charged unarmed and defenceless civilian populations, striking blindly and apparently with some relish. Those scenes on television were grimly reminiscent of the massacre in Sharpeville, South Africa, the anniversary of which was observed a few days ago by the Special Committee against Apartheid. The methods used by the South African régime against civilian populations demon-

strating peacefully for their fundamental rights were absolutely identical to those used by the Israeli army against the Arab populations in the occupied territories.

143. Yet we have been told that Israel is the only democracy in the area because it has a *régime* with separation of powers, as if the form of government were an end in itself, regardless of the fact that that form may have no real meaning. That is a travesty of democracy and an insult to all the countries that claim to be democratic and that indeed try to give democracy real content.

144. We have also been told that Israeli policy in the occupied territories has been beneficial because it has brought economic and social progress to the Arab people. That is a simplistic notion which shrewd propaganda has attempted for a long time to foist on people, but it is a notion which has been exploded even more clearly by daily events. In fact, occupied Arab territories have been physically changed and their demographic composition modified by Jewish settlements; holy places have been defiled; and Arab villages have been destroyed and their populations driven away. Such then is the beneficial influence of Israel in the occupied Arab territories. What there has been in fact—and recent events in the West Bank have borne this out—is pure and simple colonization by force.

145. That colonization is quite different in many ways from the type of colonization that we have been called on to condemn so often in the United Nations. If we take the lowest form of colonization, namely, *apartheid*, we find that Zionist colonization in Palestine has been the only one which has actually driven an entire population from its national territory and has replaced it with a population of immigrants from all parts of the world. That is one of the many features of Israeli colonization which even the *apartheid* régime has hesitated to introduce in its policies and methods of domination.

146. Israel's machiavellian plans with respect to the people of Palestine and other Arab peoples are not of recent vintage. They were summed up by Herzl in his book *The Jewish State*:

“Let us assume, for example, that we wish to drive wild animals out of a country. Naturally we would not use spears and arrows, nor would we go out alone and track down a bear, as people used to do in the sixteenth century in Europe; but we would organize a collective hunt, one which was powerful and well-equipped. Thus we would drive away the wild animals and we would use very powerful bombs for the purpose.”

Those animals, in the view of Israelis, are none other than the Arab inhabitants of Palestine and other Arab citizens.

147. The events which have shaken the occupied West Bank, no matter how regrettable the loss of human life may have been, have at least had the advantage of exposing Israeli methods and have proved once again the determination of the Arab people to fight against the invader until final victory. But the origin of those events is only one aspect of the large-scale military aggression perpetrated by the Zionist against the Arab countries. It is now clear to everyone that the problem of the Middle East will be resolved only when the Palestinian people have their inalienable national rights restored and when all the occupied Arab territories are liberated. The international community is becoming increasingly aware of the need to attain those two objectives if peace is to be restored in the area, an area which, before the existence of Israel, was the symbol of fraternity and tolerance.

148. The new trend in world public opinion, which has, ironically enough, been created by intransigence of Israel and its systematic refusal to look the facts in the face, is best illustrated by the fact that the representatives of the Palestinian people are now being given a place in all world conferences. The decision of the Security Council to invite the Palestinian Liberation Organization to participate in this debate on a question which concerns it first and foremost is part of that trend and accurately reflects the concern of the international community. Israel and Israel alone continues to delude itself by pinning its hopes on the continuance of differences of opinion and even conflicts which might arise here and there among Arab States. It is true that the Arab countries as members of the same family might disagree on given questions, but whenever a foreign element enters and tries to lodge in their body, by force and without their consent, their solidarity reasserts itself immediately and it is spontaneously rejected. The October 1973 war has given proof to the authorities in Tel Aviv that the solidarity of the Arab States is a natural thing when confronting a common enemy who wants to occupy their territory and dominate their populations.

149. Israel should realize that it cannot pin its hopes on internal dissension among Arab States as it tries to perpetuate the occupation of Arab territories and their annexation by force. Peace in the Middle East can be served only by the strict and faithful application of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council calling for the liberation of occupied Arab territories and the restoration to the Palestinian people of their inalienable national rights. Until those two conditions have been met, Israel will not know any peace other than a peace with terror and instability.

150. It is therefore the duty of the Security Council to make Israel understand that truth and to guarantee for all the Arab States in the area the rights which are recognized by international law. We are convinced that, on the basis of the support of all Member

States, the Council will live up to that hope and will commit itself to the way of law and morality.

151. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Israel in exercise of the right of reply.

152. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): I spoke yesterday [1895th meeting] about the spectacle of those who live in glass houses throwing stones. I do not think it could have been better illustrated than by the last five speakers who have regaled us. The representatives will have noted a confirmation of what I stated earlier on in the debate, namely, that this forum is being turned into an instrument of an Arab design to drag out these meetings for political reasons certainly not connected with the issue in question. We have long forgotten the complaint originally made, which was false. This intermediate recitation of anti-Israel diatribe will continue if you allow it, Mr. President. I assure you, Sir, that it has no effect on us.

153. But what a waste of valuable time and how incongruous is this exhibition. Since our meeting yesterday, over 130 people have been killed in the fighting in Lebanon, and a total of approximately 280 since we embarked on this futile debate, and the Council continues to disregard in the most callous manner what is happening in Lebanon as a nation is torn apart and continues to highlight the complete and tragic lack of relevance of this body to events in the Middle East.

154. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization has asked to speak on a point of order. I call on him.

155. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): I am sorry that I had to interrupt again, but the item we are discussing is the situation arising from the Hitlerite atrocities committed by the Zionists against my people in Palestine. We should not divert the discussion to Lebanon or any other place. With your permission, Mr. President, I should like you to draw the attention of the speaker to the need to confine himself to that.

156. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of the United States has asked to speak on a point of order. I call on him.

157. Mr. SCRANTON (United States of America): It has been quite clear, as we have all sat here and listened to all the statements by all the various countries represented, that this has been an extremely wide-ranging commentary on the situation in the Middle East, and I feel strongly that the representative from Israel has the right to comment thereon. This is aside from bringing to your attention the question whether the individual who has intervened has a right to make a point of order.

158. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

159. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, I should like to draw your attention to the fact that the representative of Israel is resorting to completely intolerable methods in his statement. He prefers to talk about what is happening in other countries, and this is not a matter which is being discussed. We are discussing the situation which has arisen in the territories occupied by the Israeli aggressor, and it is only on this subject that the representative of Israel may speak. As far as the Soviet delegation is concerned, although it has, shall we say, its own views about the domestic affairs of Israel, in our statement we did not interfere in the domestic affairs of Israel. I think that it would be only correct if the representative of Israel refrained from interfering in the internal affairs of other countries.

160. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Israel and I would ask him to take into account the various statements that have just been made.

161. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): I can understand the delicacy of the situation and the problems which are raised by the fact that one mentions points which are so inconvenient. However, the mere interventions themselves serve a good purpose. Incidentally, I was very gratified to learn that there is no reference being made whatsoever to the domestic affairs of Israel in this debate, and I should hope that this situation will continue. Mind you, I had not noticed it, but I am willing to take the word of the representative of the Soviet Union.

162. There are gradations in the lack of credentials to intervene in this debate, and I believe that the Iraqi credentials are of the lowest. How dare the representative of a country from which an ancient Jewish community of 160,000 had to depart after thousands of years intervene in this debate? It lies not in his mouth to talk about human values, the representative of a country which is engaged in the public hanging of innocent Jews in the main square in Baghdad for the edification and amusement of the assembled throng. I know what the answer will be; it will be that not only Jews were hanged then, that Christians and Moslems were among the victims there—the Iraqi version of peaceful coexistence on the gallows. I might remark that one of those hanged at that time in Iraq was the cousin of a member of my delegation and that his young pregnant wife was forced to watch the execution.

163. And now we have learned of the execution of Alexander Aaronsen, a male nurse, a Dutch Jew, who devoted his life to helping the sick and the injured in the developing countries of Africa and Asia, including

in the Albert Schweitzer Hospital in Gabon. While on a mission of mercy to the Kurds in northern Iraq, he was seized by Iraqi soldiers on 24 March 1975—a year ago today. It is now apparent that Aaronsen was executed last December, after a secret trial—a customary phenomenon in Iraq. Mr. Jan Beekman, a member of the Dutch Parliament who visited Iraq last January, was told by high Iraqi officials, including the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, that Aaronsen was still alive then. The chargé d'affaires of Iraq at The Hague informed Aaronsen's mother by a simple telephone call the other day that her son was dead. This was the reaction of the Dutch Foreign Ministry:

“We are dismayed, horrified and deeply outraged, especially by the incredible way the Iraqi authorities have acted. They have fooled us systematically for a year. We are simply perplexed.”

I have here the leading articles from all the Dutch newspapers on this barbaric act. I do not want to waste the time of this body on this but merely to say that it lies not in the mouth of the representative of such a régime to talk about human values in this or any other forum.

164. Furthermore, I am not convinced that Bangladesh is in a position to lecture us about civil liberties, internal stability and respect for human rights, including respect for the lives of political opponents.

165. To the representative of India, I would say that I wish the opposition in India the degree of political liberty enjoyed today by the Palestinian Arabs in the West Bank, who enjoy today the greatest degree of freedom of speech and writing in the entire Arab world, despite all the problems—and there are problems. How many Arabs are there outside Israel who are free to speak, write and vote openly against the Government of the country in which they live?

166. I was also very moved by the representative of Mauritania evincing such concern for the Palestinian Arabs. I had not noticed a similar concern for the rights of the inhabitants of Spanish Sahara. This situation would really be comic if it were not so tragic.

167. I awaited the remarks of the representative of Tunisia with great interest. I was convinced that we would be regaled with details of the events of the past few days described in such grim detail by the Tunisian Foreign Ministry and the Tunisian Chief of Police. I refer to the alleged Libyan plot to kidnap or kill the Tunisian Premier, to the revelation—and I quote here from Reuters of today:

“That other Libyan special intelligence groups have been sent to Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Somalia and Italy, and that more than 5,000 Tunisian workers had been expelled from Libya in the last two weeks”.

Really, has the Tunisian representative nothing better to occupy himself with?

168. I do not wish to go on. I merely wish to ask again, as I did yesterday and as I will every day, what is the purpose of this debate? If it is to achieve any form of accommodation in the Middle East, do you really think that this is the way, that this is the manner? Do you expect any self-respecting country to agree to this form of dialogue or diatribe? Is this the way we are going to achieve peace in the Middle East?

169. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Iraq has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table.

170. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq): I must admit that in making my statement I did not speak from a prepared text, but I do not think I used any abusive epithets concerning the Zionists and their representative here. The opposite is true. Yet, General Herzog is obviously stung. Truth must have hurt him, not what I said. As I pointed out, I confined myself in my statement solely to points which he had raised himself, and it was he who dragged Iraq into this debate. He spoke of Iraq in a way that made it necessary for my delegation to participate in this debate.

171. I said in my statement that this was not the time nor the place to raise the question of Iraqi Jews, but I wonder, what is it that the Israeli representative objects to. Iraq is not the first nor will it be the last to execute spies, and I think I can safely assure the representative of Israel that if Israel is thinking of sending any more spies or agents into Iraq they would most likely be executed. He sees no harm in Israel's friend, South Africa, executing not only spies but innocents. According to the *Sunday Times* magazine of 10 October 1971, of all executions judicially performed in the world every year, half occur in just one country—South Africa. Israel is bosom friends with South Africa. The representative of Israel does not raise moral issues there; that does not matter.

172. May I read one example of what has happened to the Jews in Iraq, which should suffice:

“I have been in Israel 22 years. I came from Baghdad, Iraq, when I was six and a half years old. Why did we come to Israel? I ask myself that question. As a child I, of course, had no choice. My parents brought me. My parents were rich people in Iraq. They were merchants. They had a wholesale business in clothing and food-stuffs. I remember our house in Iraq. It was a nice house. We also had a car. Here in Israel we have nothing. The reason my parents gave for coming to Israel was fear. They were afraid of the Arabs. They believed it was the Arabs who bombed our big synagogue in Baghdad. Today it has become clear that it was a Zionist who

threw the bomb so that the Jews there would think that the Arabs had done it. It was only after practically the entire Iraqi Jewish community got to Israel that these things started coming out. Somebody says a word here, and people investigate. Word of mouth brings the true story out. It was also published in the papers, and as far as I know nobody denied it. When we heard that we were going to build our country here and that this was going to be a developed country, well, we were really very excited. We wanted to take part in this, but after a year and a half we realized it was all one big bluff. The bluff was that it was exactly the opposite of what they told us."

This is from a book entitled, *The Kids Who Went to Israel: Autobiographical Sketches of Young Immigrants*, by Harold Flender, a pocketbook published by Simon and Schuster, New York.

173. These are the facts of the case. I had mentioned other sources that were referred to by my delegation when we intervened in the debate on the Middle East last January. I think that should suffice.

174. The truth is that the Israelis never cared for the welfare of these ancient minorities living all over the world, these Jewish communities. All they were interested in was that they should be uprooted and serve the Zionist purposes in the occupied Holy Land.

175. One more quotation from very orthodox Jewish groups, the Neturei Karta of the United States. In *Principles and Definitions: Judaism and Zionism* they say:

"In fact, Zionism is most interested in undermining the position of Jews in other countries so as to make them emigrate to the State of Israel, and this plan has already been systematically carried out in a number of countries. One prime example is the burning of the synagogues in Iraq 16 years ago, not by anti-Jewish enemies but admittedly by Zionist emissaries who actually succeeded thereby in uprooting a Jewish community that had endured literally for thousands of years."

176. And one more testament to the position of these Jews uprooted by the Zionists and the conditions they now find themselves in in Israel. I am not surprised that the representative of Israel speaks with such venom against Iraq. According to a news item, one of the Jews suspected of connexions with a mixed Arab-Jewish espionage ring was of Iraqi origin, the son of a Zionist family which was supposedly persecuted for its Zionism in Iraq. This bit of news was published in *Ma'ariv*, a newspaper in Israel, dated 22 December 1972. And another Iraqi Jew has this to say:

"A community that controlled most of the resources of Iraq, one of the most developed States of the area, was turned into a subject group dis-

criminated against and oppressed in every way"—this is after their arrival in Israel. "A community with its own high ethical values was caught in the spokes of Ashkenazi culture, which is totally foreign to it. A unified and cultured community began to produce delinquents of every kind in Israel. Its fine, well-formed children are now all handicapped."

This is from an article that has been reproduced in *Middle East International*, January 1973, entitled "How the Iraqi Jews came to Israel".

177. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of India has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I therefore invite him to take a seat at the Council table and give him the floor.

178. Mr. JAIPAL (India): It was not quite clear to me whether the representative of Israel was questioning our credentials for speaking. I would assure him that our credentials are quite impeccable. India has been interested in this question since the early days, when the termination of the Mandate came up for discussion in the United Nations.

179. It seems to me that the representative of Israel was not listening to my statement carefully enough. If he had been, he would have known that I discussed only the situation in the Israeli-occupied areas. But in his wisdom he has chosen to talk about the internal affairs of my country. I am rather moved by his concern for certain members of the opposition. I should like to identify them; perhaps there is some bond of sympathy between them and the representative of Israel. Members of the Indian opposition who tried to subvert democracy—that is, certain members of the extreme left and the extreme right—have been detained under our Constitution and in accordance with our laws. The rest of the opposition is very active and kicking in the Indian Parliament, which is currently in session.

180. Quite obviously, the representative of Israel—who is not here at the moment—has been a victim of what has been referred to here as Zionist press propaganda. I would not normally use that term. But I would like to tell him that this reminds me of a famous English cricketer called Len Hutton, who captained the English team once. When one of his decisions was questioned in the press, he was asked whether he had anything to say about it, and he replied that his normal reaction, coming from Lancashire as he did, was to regard today's newspaper as being good only for carrying home tomorrow's fish and chips. I suggest that the Israeli representative accept Len Hutton's advice.

181. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of the Libyan Arab Republic wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I now call on him.

182. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): We have listened to the usual fabrications and allegations of the representative of the Zionist entity; they have become a tradition here. We are very familiar with this language. It is not the language only of the representative of the racist régime in the Middle East; for a long time it was the language also of the racist régime on the other side of Africa, South Africa. Every time we attacked *apartheid*, the representative of South Africa here would start making comparisons with the life and the situation of the Africans in independent Africa, in the independent third world, to prove that his blacks—as he called them—were living better than the independent Africans.

183. The representative of the Zionist entity talked about problems we have in the Arab world, in the Arab nation. We have never denied that such problems exist. We are a living nation. This is a very important, indeed a decisive time in our history. We are fighting for our progress, for our unity and also for our liberation. We have our problems. We have our experience. We have a right to that experience and to make our mistakes, just like all the nations in the history of the world that fought for their liberation and their unity.

184. I asked to speak only because the representative of the Zionist entity mentioned Libya, my country, twice. My colleagues from other Arab countries have replied to the other allegations of the representative of the Zionist entity, but since he referred to Libya I want to tell him this. Libya is a young country. Libya is an Arab country. We are fighting for our liberation, for our progress. We are fighting for our unity. We liberated our country from foreign armies and foreign bases. Our country is one of the freest and most independent countries in the world. We are fighting zionism not because we wish to fight the Jews; we are fighting zionism because zionism is aggression, zionism is racism. This racist entity in the Middle East must be destroyed and it will be destroyed one day.

185. When Mr. Herzog spoke the other day he betrayed his racism with his own words. He referred to "the inherent destructiveness of the Arab purpose". He said, "In addition to destroying each other, [the Arabs] are incapable of tolerating the presence of any other element in their area." [1894th meeting, para. 108.] Mr. Herzog was talking about the Arabs as such. He was not talking about the Arab Governments. He was not talking about the Arab régimes. He was not talking about the Arab leaders. He was talking about the Arabs as such. We are very familiar with such language. Mr. Herzog used some words and expressions that we find elsewhere; all that is needed is to substitute the word "Jew" for the word "Arab". All the anti-Semites use that language. It can be found in *Mein Kampf*.

186. I think that Mr. Herzog is among those who have not learned their lesson.

187. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Saudi Arabia wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

188. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I do not see Mr. Herzog here. He must think that some of us have the flu—some of us, not all of us. In any case, he always disappears when I speak. Perhaps he is trying to mind his glass house somewhere. I myself do not see any glass houses. All these figures of speech, these similes, get us nowhere at all. The whole question resolves itself into a very simple issue, which can be best expressed by an Arabic proverb that says, "He hits me and he begins to cry"—in other words, he is the first to complain.

189. I refer Mr. Herzog to 1919 and to 1922, when the Jewish population of Palestine was only 6 to 7 per cent—many of them our Jews. Ninety-four per cent—forget that they were Arab—were the indigenous people of Palestine, the natives of Palestine. And, allegedly, the First World War was fought "to make the world safe for democracy"; yet he is talking about democracy and voting. That was the late Mr. Woodrow Wilson's phrase: "to make the world safe for democracy". And amongst the Fourteen Points of the League of Nations, which I observed later *ex officio*, was what was called the principle of self-determination. The war was fought to free people.

190. By dint of what logic could the Allies—and by "Allies" I mean the Allies of the First World War, Britain and the others, but especially Britain—promise a land that did not belong to them to the Zionists? And Mr. Herzog speaks of high ideals and votes.

191. As I mentioned, and will mention time and again, the world is in such a sad plight because democracy has been ritualized and reduced to a box and a chit of paper, whereas the politicians and leaders—or "misleaders"—carry on and do what they want with the destiny of people, especially those who cannot defend themselves.

192. To paraphrase a verse from the Holy Koran, "He who initiates evil is the more tyrannical." Mr. Herzog speaks of what the Arabs did here and there, but he forgets that those European Khazar Zionists did not hail from the area. It is an alien ideology tantamount to colonialism. They moved on into the land of Palestine, the land of peace, and have created trouble ever since they set foot there.

193. As I mentioned, had it not been that the Allies received the help of the United States in 1917, they would have been beaten by the Imperial German armies of Wilhelm II. And who brought the Zionists into our midst? The British, because the Zionists promised them that they would bring the United States into the First World War. And they did. And Mr. Herzog talks of justice and of self-determination.

194. Yesterday I refuted the allegation that God parceled out lands to people, and I asked the developed, industrialized countries—those which have electronics and electronic communications—to try and get us some message from the Deity as to whether God gave Palestine to the Jews. And Mr. Herzog has the temerity to throw mud at the Arabs. What a self-righteous, supercilious attitude he takes, as if to say: "Who are those Arabs? This land was given to us by God." He never could answer what proof he has that God gave them Palestine. I still am waiting for the answer.

195. Nor has he yet replied to what I maintain, and repeat again: that many of the people of Palestine had been the ethnic Jews of the land and became Christians and later Moslems. And these Khazars, whose forebears never laid eyes on the Holy Land, can come and claim the land as their own?

196. He talks about atrocities. What about Deir Yassin, where 250 or 260 people were slaughtered at dawn, just because they happened to be Palestinians and non-Jews. What about the hanging of the British soldiers from trees in Palestine? Those who brought the Jews to Palestine were the British. I do not want to blame the British people; it was Balfour who was responsible, yet Balfour did not give them *carte blanche* in Palestine. How dare Mr. Herzog throw mud at the Arabs and engage in rhetorical invective? But I do not blame him. We had an Arab poet who lived in the seventies of the last century who wrote—and here I am speaking in figurative terms—"If a rabid dog is tied to the door of a house, don't blame the dog: it is the one who tied the rabid dog that bites who should be blamed." Some of you Europeans and Americans brought this figurative rabid dog into our midst.

197. He talks about Arabs fighting one another. Why does not he talk about the Christians in two World Wars who fought one another? He picks out of their context the differences which we Arabs sometimes have. It is a healthy sign to have differences. And what if we Arabs have fought one another at times? That is none of his business. I feel sorry for him, but let him beware: he is arousing not only the Arab people of the Arab world, but the people of the Moslem world, and the friends of those who believe that the Arabs have been treated with injustice. But he gets away with it and talks about "glass houses" and "diatribes".

198. Let those who support Israel beware that they cannot maintain their strength and power if they are based on injustice. Where are the empires of yore? Crumbled—and the modern empires too. I do not want to exacerbate matters by naming them.

199. A few words to my good friends from the United States. I was flabbergasted when our good friend Mr. Scranton intervened to chastise this gentleman

sitting at my left because he raised a relevant point to the effect that Mr. Herzog was trying to divert attention from Palestine to what is happening in Lebanon. Had there been no refugees in Lebanon things would have been better. Who drove the Palestinians to Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and other parts of the world, to countries not even contiguous to Palestine? Who drove out the peaceful Palestinians who lived in Palestine but those Khazars, those European colonialists.

200. But, good Lord, colonialists? The other colonialists were a blessing in comparison with the Khazars. Neither the British nor the French for that matter ever expropriated the properties of the people of the land. Of course they had to rationalize their colonialism, and at one time they called it "the white man's burden". But how could the Zionists rationalize their colonialism? "God gave us Palestine. We are the chosen people of God and you, all the peoples of the world, have to go down. You are upstarts because we are the chosen people of God." What fiction, what hoaxes.

201. They have even played on the emotions of the Europeans and swindled them, by saying: "Those Palestinians are trying to benefit from the death of Jews who perished in the Second World War." Before those Jews had a country, so to speak, before Israel was established, they made West Germany pay billions of dollars. And, like others, I was touched when I read a book which Mrs. Roosevelt pointed out to me, saying: "You read that book. It is very touching." It was *The Diary of Anne Frank*, a girl of a Jewish family which lived in the Netherlands. She, her parents and her brother and sister were interned by the Germans. It was not until recently that it dawned on me that 90 per cent of the alleged dialogues were written by a certain Mr. Levine. The father of the young girl who died published that book as the authentic diary of his daughter and made money because the book ran into 40 editions. I was touched when I read that book, but I did not know about it until this year. Mr. Levine, who furnished the dialogues, wanted to be paid and asked for \$50,000. Of course the father did not want to pay. So he went to court and brought an action—spit in my face if I am saying something which is not based on my findings—and the court said, "Well, you had better pay \$50,000." Finally, an out of court settlement of \$50,000 was made. It was all fiction. As human beings we feel sorry that Anne Frank died. It reminds me of the fiction that God gave them Palestine.

202. Then what about Dachau? I am not a German—and the Germans are not my cousins—nor am I British; that is why I talk objectively. There were no gas chambers in Dachau, perhaps there were in other concentration camps. There was a crematorium, and people, Jews and Gentiles, were dying like flies at the end of the war. The Zionist mass media made everybody believe that it was not a crematorium but

a gas chamber. But an English researcher—and I did not want to exacerbate matters or I would have brought his findings—said it would have taken about 230 years to cremate all those who were allegedly gassed in Dachau. People who do not know the truth shed tears, including myself. I feel sorry for anybody who is killed. And this Mr. Herzog comes and throws mud at us and leaves. What is he doing, building a new glass house outside? Let him come and look us in the eye if he has the courage.

203. One word more. I want to assure him and those representatives seated behind the Israel sign that, even with all the injustices that have been perpetrated against the Palestinians—that I know about from the Palestinians—the Palestinians are willing to let the Jews live in peace amongst them, provided that they allow them to go back to their homes. Will the Zionists allow these people to go back to their homes?

204. He talks of Lebanon, Syria and Egypt and of their excesses, but he forgets that the leaders of Zionism are stark colonialist usurpers who will never succeed in remaining in the Holy Land of Palestine if they pursue the same policies.

205. They have cursed Arafat. I spoke with Arafat before he made his statement to the Assembly.¹¹ He told me: "I am going to say something that will please you. We are willing to offer them the olive branch." I did not know that that was in his speech. And what do they call them? "Terrorists. He had a gun. He is inhuman." Of course they want to make him the Devil incarnate, a man who is trying to defend his country.

206. Let these people around this table note: I am researching the troubles in Lebanon and I have found seven foreign sources of help to the tough guys, to the gangsters, and the leaders of the Palestinians are trying to calm the situation; they are not setting Lebanon on fire.

207. Let Mr. Herzog keep his nose out of Lebanon, because there is a hornets' nest there. And let the big Powers stop pulling strings, because, by the law of nature, leave aside divine wisdom, they will pay a price that will mean their dissolution. If not in my lifetime, you, Sir, who are still young, will see them crumble as they have crumbled in Africa, not, perhaps, through our might, but because in nature—if you do not want to believe in the Divinity—there is something very simple that we have been taught; those who sow evil will reap evil, and they will crumble and dissolve.

208. Go back to where you came from if you do not want to live at peace with the Palestinians. The Palestinians are the core of the question. All the trouble around about is peripheral.

209. I have been a Pan-Arab since 1922, when I was laughed at for becoming one. There were only two Arab

States then. We were all living like your country, Sir, under the foreign yoke. And in my lifetime I find there are 20 independent Arab States Members of the United Nations. And we are afraid of these Khazars coming from—where? Eastern and central Europe, originally from the northern tier of Asia. They will melt like a pinch of salt in a boiling kettle when the time comes.

210. In conclusion, I think Yasser Arafat and the leaders of Palestine will still have the Arab olive branch available, if you want to take it. And if not, please clear out so as to save yourselves and your children—not now, but in the long, long run.

211. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I now call upon him.

212. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Mr. President, I sincerely thank you for having made your ruling permitting me to raise a point of order. This is covered by rule 30 of the provisional rules of procedure, and I should like to read the text of the invitation you and 10 other members of the Council extended to us. It says, *inter alia*:

"the invitation to the PLO will confer on it the same rights of participation as are conferred on a Member State when it is invited to participate in a debate under rule 37" [1893rd meeting, para. 4].

I was not surprised that the representative of the Government of the United States opposed your ruling. It is very well known that the United States has developed some sort of psychosis against the rights of the Palestinians, so any time the Palestinians wish to exercise their right it is the United States Government that is opposed to that.

213. On the other hand, concerning the situation in Lebanon, I understand that the Lebanese authorities have asked the Palestine Liberation Organization to co-operate with them tomorrow in maintaining order and discipline when the Lebanese Parliament meets.

214. The representative of the Zionist authorities spoke about the haven of the Palestinians under occupation. Does he want us to believe that paratroopers and border police and shooting and the use of guns against the population are only signs of joy and jubilation? He mentioned something about freedom. We know today that the International Press Association in occupied Palestine has protested because the Zionist authorities arrested a cameraman and struck another newsman. And one wonders why. Simply because they were covering a journalistic story about the funeral of the 11-year-old boy who died as a result of the Zionist-Israeli shooting upon demonstrating youngsters.

The meeting rose at 7.55 p.m.

Notes

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Plenary Meetings*.

² *Ibid.*, *Fifth Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1530th meeting, para. 134.

³ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, p. 287.

⁴ New York, Philosophical Library, 1954.

⁵ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Ad Hoc Political Committee, Annex*, vol. I, document A/1113, sect. C, article 4.

⁶ *Ibid.*, sect. B, para. 4.

⁷ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, p. 402.

⁸ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Special Political Committee*, 890th meeting, para. 23.

⁹ *Ibid.*, *Third Session, Part II, Ad Hoc Political Committee*, p. 286.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 187.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, *Twenty-ninth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2282nd meeting.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم منها 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. Наведите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу : Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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