

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FOURTH YEAR

2126th MEETING: 14 MARCH 1979
NEW YORK

UN LIBRARY

JAN 10 1983

UN/SA COLLECTION

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2126)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the occupied Arab territories:	
Letter dated 23 February 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13115)	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.

2126th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 14 March 1979, at 11 a.m.

President: Mr. Leslie O. HARRIMAN (Nigeria)

Present: The representatives of the following States: Bangladesh, Bolivia, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Gabon, Jamaica, Kuwait, Nigeria, Norway, Portugal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2126)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the occupied Arab territories:
Letter dated 23 February 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13115)

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

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the occupied Arab territories:
Letter dated 23 February 1979 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13115)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings, I invite the representatives of Egypt, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Mauritania, Pakistan, Senegal, Somalia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Yemen and Yugoslavia, as well as the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, to participate in the debate without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan), Mr. Blum (Israel) and Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took places at the Council table and Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Hollai (Hungary), Mr. Jaipal (India), Mr. Suwondo (Indonesia), Mr. Shemirani (Iran), Mr. Bafi (Iraq), Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon), Mr. Kane (Mauritania), Mr. Naik (Pakistan), Mr. Fall (Senegal), Mr. Hussein (Somalia), Mr. Sahloul (Sudan), Mr. El-Choufi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Eralp (Turkey), Mr. Al-Haddad (Yemen) and Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Viet Nam and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in which they asked to be invited to participate in the discussion. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Martynenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. Ha Van Lau (Viet Nam) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. Mr. HULINSKÝ (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): This is not the first time that the Security Council is considering the question of the situation in the Arab territories occupied by Israel, and it is not doing so merely by chance since the situation in those territories continues to worsen. On the one hand, the Israeli authorities are intensifying their policy of discrimination vis-à-vis the Palestinian people and, on the other hand—and this is quite logical—the resistance of the people of Palestine in its struggle to exercise its inalienable rights against the policy of territorial expansion is increasing. The convening of the Council to hold the present emergency meetings is therefore quite natural and timely. A peaceful, just and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East question is unattainable without resolving the key issue, namely, the Palestine problem.

4. The experience of recent years and events which have occurred in that region show that there can be no lasting peace in the Middle East until the consequences of Israeli aggression have been eliminated, until the Israeli occupation of Arab territory is ended and until the Arab people of Palestine secure their legitimate national rights. This general view was borne out during the debates on the Palestine question at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly.

5. The fact that the Palestine question is the key issue in the whole Middle East question is clear also from the separate Israeli-Egyptian talks, notwithstanding all the manoeuvres, the spur-of-the-moment journeys, the speculation and diplomatic stratagems of the participants in those talks.

6. The Conference of heads of Arab States and Governments which took place at Baghdad in November 1978 condemned the results of the Camp David talks as an attempt to legalize the occupation of a large portion of

the Arab territories and as an attempt to trample underfoot the right of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination and the creation of their own State. The heads of Arab States who took part in the Baghdad Conference squarely rejected the attempts by participants in the separate deals to "resolve" the Palestinian question with limited self-government for the Arab inhabitants of Palestine while maintaining the military occupation of the West Bank of Jordan, Gaza and East Jerusalem. They once more unanimously stressed the demand that Israeli forces be withdrawn from all occupied Arab territories, and they emphasized the exercise of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination as a *sine qua non* for lasting peace in the Middle East.

7. The nature of the Israeli expansionist policies is fully reflected in the present situation in the occupied Arab lands. The actions by the occupation authorities in those territories cannot be justified by military or strategic needs, and even less by the anachronistic biblical arguments that have been adduced. What is happening in those territories—as is, again, quite clear from the present Council debate—is an attempt to perpetuate the fruits of annexation. That end is served by the increasingly intensive policy of Israel that would change the demographic and geographical nature of the occupied territories, particularly through the systematic infiltration of Jewish settlers.

8. Official United Nations documents show that since 1967 about 100 settlements have been established in the occupied territories. The present Government of Israel not only does not intend to abandon those practices; on the contrary, it is stepping up its actions in that direction. The plans that have been published and already adopted show that throughout the next three years dozens of new settlements will be created. There is information that since 1967 the Israeli authorities have confiscated thousands of hectares of the best agricultural land and destroyed more than 20,000 Palestinian homes, turning the inhabitants into refugees and expatriots. Following the ploys of the Israeli expansionists, that policy should finally lead to the full colonization of the Arab lands, threatening the very existence of the Palestinian people in their own territory.

9. The United Nations has at its disposal a number of official statements by the representatives of the Israeli Government which fully bear out that conclusion. For example, recently, at the last session of the General Assembly, the Foreign Minister, Mr. Dayan, stated:

"The Israeli settlements in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza district are there as of right. It is inconceivable to us that Jews should be prohibited from settling and living in Judaea and Samaria, which are the heart of our homeland."¹

Surely, in the light of such statements, it is clear to all that we have here a plan that is aimed at confronting world public opinion with a *fait accompli* that would prepare it for an atmosphere in which it would be convinced that it

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Plenary Meetings, 26th meeting, para. 94.*

is "unjust" to demand that the Jewish settlers leave the occupied Arab territories.

10. Israeli philanthropy, which is cynically proffered to world public opinion by the representatives of Israel, in an effort to influence world opinion, is simply propaganda. Information in the possession of the Organization shows that the Israeli actions bear the true stamp of the aggressor, which with the connivance and support of certain Powers, has grown used to occupying and confiscating other peoples' lands and expelling the Arab population from their homes and, finally, blithely using other peoples' property. That is the so-called solution of the Palestine question practised by the Israeli authorities in the last months, since Camp David.

11. The ideas I have expressed concerning the need for a comprehensive approach to the settlement of the Middle East problem also apply fully to the question of Jerusalem, a solution of which my delegation regards as part and parcel of that settlement. Changing the status and character of the city of Jerusalem and proclaiming it the capital of Israel is just as illegal as all other measures that would annex Arab territory. Such measures are indeed mines, as was stated by the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, Mr. Terzi [2123rd meeting]. Yes, indeed, they are mines on the path to a just peace in the Middle East, since they are an attempt openly to expropriate foreign territory by force, and they run counter to well-known resolutions of the Council that are the basis for a political solution to the Middle East conflict.

12. The Czechoslovak delegation supports the just demands of the Palestinians of which we were informed by the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization in the Council. We are ready to support the demands voiced by the representative of Kuwait, Mr. Bishara [2125th meeting], which, as we see it, will form a basis for the draft resolution on this question now being prepared. We consider them to be measures aimed at easing the plight of the Palestinians and to put a brake on the continuing wanton acts of the occupation authorities.

13. We once more associate ourselves with the majority of the Members of the Organization, who see that the only way to a genuine solution to the existing situation in the Middle East, which is dangerous to international peace, is nothing less than the cessation of Israeli occupation of all Arab territories and thus the elimination of this intolerable, unnatural and explosive situation in which 3 million Palestinians are deprived of their inalienable right to self-determination and creation of their own state and have been given the status of an expatriate people.

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

15. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): I wish to thank the members of the Council for allowing me to participate in this debate on the situation in the Palestinian and Arab territories occupied by Israel. I am

very pleased to see you presiding over the Council's work as it discusses a problem so crucial to international peace and security. I am pleased first of all because of the relations that our two countries enjoy, but also because of the friendly and co-operative relations that we have had personally for so long now.

16. We participate today in this discussion as representatives of a country that holds the current presidency of the Islamic Conference, which has observer status in the United Nations and all 42 members of which are States Members of the United Nations.

17. Speaking at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly on item 126 of the agenda on the recent illegal Israeli measures in the occupied Arab territories, the delegation of Senegal² stressed that, at a time when, after 30 years of conflict in the Middle East, there were favourable prospects for peace and when most of the parties concerned were showing a desire to reach a negotiated settlement, one of the parties—and an important one, at that: Israel—was stubbornly pursuing its short-sighted policy of force and faits accomplis. We said that that policy, an example of which was the implantation of Israeli settlements in the occupied Arab territories, was contrary to the establishment of a climate that would promote negotiations and could only disrupt a process of true peace.

18. Since then, Israel, disregarding the unanimous condemnation of the international community, has continued its expansionist and annexationist policy.

19. Since 1967 we have witnessed a vast movement of illegal occupation and expropriation of Arab lands on the West Bank of the Jordan River. Hundreds of hectares of land that had been cultivated by Palestinian families for generations have been grabbed from their lawful owners. Many villages in the same area have been raised and their inhabitants forced to leave. The land thus taken over has been distributed to Israeli settlers. Using as a pretext "security reasons" or "service needs", the Israeli authorities requisition the land they want and, after a certain amount of time, allocate it to groups of civilian settlers.

20. If we consider that, under military laws in force in that area, Israel can seize any plot of land it wishes, then it is perfectly clear that the path is open to total annexation of the West Bank of the Jordan. Ample evidence of this is available from various trustworthy sources. It leaves no doubt whatsoever about Israel's ulterior motives in taking such action. Israel is engaged, in the occupied territories, in a mass displacement of Palestinians and their concentration in isolated areas, areas that can be easily controlled, since they are cut off from each other and are consequently vulnerable.

21. Since 1967, 80 settlements have thus been implanted and, far from slowing down, the movement has been growing—especially since the Likud Party came to power. The documents and maps made available to the Council prove without any possible doubt that Israel

intends to make these settlements permanent. The statements made in the Council by the delegation of Israel make this absolutely clear, too. The former Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Rabin, himself stated, in January 1977, that the implantation of settlements by Israel guaranteed Israel's security and established a firm base for its search for peace within defensible frontiers.

22. Israel's intention is very clear: to make its presence on the West Bank permanent by putting forward arguments about so-called security, arguments which it stubbornly and constantly advances in all the negotiations concerning a just and lasting peace in the region and the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. To that end, three belts of Jewish settlements have been constructed in a north-south direction on the West Bank. They are linked together by a network of lateral roads in such a way that the entire western area of the Jordan River is systematically criss-crossed. At the same time, there is a wide movement towards encircling the Arab villages and towns in the region, thereby reducing them to scattered hamlets without any possibility of direct communication.

23. Moreover, showing contempt for the lawful rights of the people of the region, who are basically farmers, Israel has extended its control and its monopoly over almost all the water resources of the area. Because of their geographical position, the Jewish settlements are competing with the Arab villages for the use of the water resources of the region. Using very large plots of land and, therefore, considerable amounts of water, the Israeli settlers have reached the point where they are depriving the local population of the minimum amount of water needed for farming and even household purposes.

24. The aim of all this is to reach a stage in a very short time when the Palestinians will have no possibility of working their land. Thus, the Palestinians are in effect being turned into a kind of proletariat—reduced, in order to survive, to constituting a supply of labour for Israeli farms and businesses. This situation, where the individual is left with no choice but to work for the oppressor or starve to death, can only be described as a form of slavery in disguise.

25. All those facts reinforce our apprehensions about the genuine desire of the Israelis to give back—in accordance with resolution 242 (1967), unanimously adopted by the Security Council—the Arab territories that have been illegally occupied for more than 12 years now.

26. If these attempts to dismember the Palestinian people are not quickly stopped and if a brake is not put on the colonization movement, all the efforts to solve the Middle East crisis peacefully will inevitably be doomed to failure.

27. Frantic—not to say desperate—attempts have been made recently to find a negotiated settlement in the Middle East. We must, however, face the fact that these efforts do not seem to promise any positive and lasting solution because they do not take enough direct account

² *Ibid.*, Thirty-second Session, Plenary Meetings, 48th meeting.

of the Palestine question, which is the very heart of the problem of the Middle East. The full exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, its legitimate representative, is an absolute pre-condition for any over-all, final and just settlement of the Middle East crisis.

28. While it is true that the question of Jerusalem cannot be dissociated from the Palestine problem as a whole, the fact remains that the Holy City of Jerusalem—because it contains the places holy to three revealed religions, Judaism, Christianity and Islam, whose adherents number more than 1.2 billion—has a privileged place in the heart of hundreds of millions of believers; and it is, to say the least, nonsensical that the Jews, who make up less than 1.5 per cent of these believers, should try to arrogate to themselves the right of exclusive control over that sacred city.

29. In 1948, the Arab Palestinians possessed about two thirds of West Jerusalem—claimed as it were, to be Israeli Jerusalem. Now practically nothing is left for them; Israel, since 1967, has been pursuing its policy of confiscating land even in the eastern part of the city, which up to then had been occupied exclusively by Arab Palestinians. Since then, Israel has been trying to change, to its benefit, the demographic, cultural and religious character of the Holy City. Many historic and religious sites have been desecrated, and in certain cases destroyed. The Al-Aqsa Mosque itself may collapse because of the digging going on nearby. Some mosques have been turned into synagogues—in particular the Al-Haram al-Ibrahimi mosque at Hebron.

30. Specifying further its intention of proceeding with the Judaization of Jerusalem, the Israeli Government has prepared a draft law providing for the transfer of the foreign diplomatic missions from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. This transfer should be taking place in the relatively near future. In this connexion, I must stress the fact that, with regard to the question of the Middle East, the problem of Jerusalem is the one in regard to which Israel is least aided and abetted within the international community. Even its most whole-hearted defenders have not so far dared to question the international legal status of the Holy City. At the present time, many important ministries have been transferred to East Jerusalem, Israel thereby hoping to confront the international community with a fait accompli.

31. What is the outcome of all this? The answer is very simple. Israel has no intention of withdrawing from the illegally occupied areas. Hence, considering the occupied territories of the West Bank of Jordan as liberated Israeli territories, the Tel Aviv Government has hastened to legalize and authorize the creation of settlements, in flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949 and the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. That policy can only confirm that Israel intends to remain permanently on the usurped Arab territories and to make of Jerusalem, as the representative of Israel stated here, the Jewish capital of a

Jewish religious State. The international community cannot accept or condone such a state of affairs. The city of Jerusalem must be open to the three monotheistic religions, where Christians, Moslems and Jews can coexist in peace and mutual respect for their beliefs, under United Nations guarantees.

32. At the present series of meetings, the Security Council must adopt appropriate measures to curb the Israeli policy of colonization in the occupied territories. The General Assembly has adopted a number of recommendations relating to the situation in the occupied territories; unfortunately, they have not been implemented because of systematic obstruction in the Council. The States members of the Council that systematically oppose any proposal aimed at ensuring a just and lasting peace that would take into account the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people are really the ones that are responsible for the present plight of the Palestinian people. If they are really concerned about the rights of the Palestinian people—as they sometimes claim they are—they should pay more attention to the recommendations of the General Assembly, which are at the present time the only valid basis for a just and lasting solution of the problem of the Middle East.

33. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Jordan, on whom I now call.

34. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): Before replying to some of the allegations made by the representative of Israel yesterday [*ibid.*], I should like to address myself to a question of immediate importance to the Council, namely, Jordan's position in regard to the results of the Camp David talks.

35. The Government of Jordan was obliged to take a specific and clear stand on the results of the Camp David talks, first, because Jordan was mentioned in the general framework of the agreement of a comprehensive settlement, and secondly, because Jordan is duty bound in shouldering its national and historical responsibility towards the principal Arab cause, namely, the Palestinian cause.

36. The Government of Jordan has rejected both the procedural and the substantive results of the Camp David talks. From the procedural point of view, Jordan was not a party to the discussions, nor was it a participant in drafting the decisions. Therefore, Jordan regards the Camp David decisions as containing no vital elements leading to the establishment of a just and permanent peace in the area, or meeting the expectations of the Palestinian people regarding the exercise of their right to self-determination on the Palestinian land which, consequently, would lead to their right to sovereignty.

37. That, however, did not prevent the Government of Jordan from studying the contents of the Camp David agreements, in an attempt to open another way, on a new basis, that would be in line with the principles which Jordan has been committed to uphold since 1967. These principles are in keeping with the relevant United Nations

resolutions and they guarantee the achievement of a just peace.

38. In his press conference on 23 September 1978, His Majesty King Hussein asserted in the Government's communiqué that Jordan did not and would not close the door to a comprehensive, peaceful, just and permanent settlement of the crisis. This correct view—and Jordan is in the best position to know it is correct because of the rich experience it has acquired, particularly in its struggle with Israel—provides the guidelines for Jordan's position, which is based on the following principles.

39. First, self-determination and sovereignty; assurance that the Palestinian people will exercise their right to self-determination and, eventually, their sovereignty over their land. What is important is not only the Israeli withdrawal but also the restoration of Arab sovereignty over Arab land and Arab Jerusalem.

40. Secondly, comprehensive settlement. "Comprehensive" does not mean the inclusive quantity of the parties to the conflict, that is, for Egypt, Syria, Jordan and the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the negotiations but, rather, it means the comprehensive solutions of the problems, i.e., no solution to the problem of occupation without the solution of the problem of sovereignty, no solution to the problem of self-determination without the solution of the problem of Palestine. Therefore, for a settlement to be comprehensive, all the problems should be covered and all the parties should participate.

41. Thirdly, a balanced solution. Any solution to any conflict must be balanced, otherwise it will not be termed a permanent solution. This applies to the results of Camp David. The agreement between Egypt and Israel settles various problems between them, but the agreement on the comprehensive solution does not answer the rest of the problems relating to the other Arab parties. The agreement on Sinai and the settlements is clear, while no mention of this was made in the comprehensive settlement, nor is there any mention of sovereignty over the West Bank, Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip. Even when sovereignty is mentioned in the wording of the communiqué, it centres on the sovereignty of States which might allow Israel to back out on the basis that it does not apply to the West Bank, since its status is still hanging in the air.

42. The imbalance in the solution applies to the United States role in the negotiations. It is the role of partner-in-execution and not of partner in the negotiations. This means that the United States will execute what is required of it, that is, execute whatever the parties have agreed upon. Furthermore, the imbalance is clearly shown by the fact that Israel has the choice of war or peace, while we only have the choice of peace. Besides, the imbalance already exists in the fact that Israel is in a better bargaining position because it has the land.

43. The basic difference between the position of the Jordanian Government and that of the United States Government rests on the fact that the United States is

asking us to join the negotiations first on the basis that this will lead to results. But Jordan bases its position on wanting to know the results to which the negotiations will lead in order not to walk into a dark tunnel, knowing not where it will end.

44. Fourthly, fragmentation of the problem. Jordan's wide experience in the Arab-Israeli conflict leaves us unconvinced by the United States position calling for our joining the negotiations on the basis of the results of the Camp David conference, particularly when we remember Israel's part in complicating the conflict and fragmenting the principal problem into small problems, each as important as the greater one.

45. In 1967 the Knesset ruled to annex Jerusalem under Israeli sovereignty, and then created the problem of settlements. When Begin's Government came to power it changed the name of the occupied West Bank to Judaea and Samaria on the basis that the land of British Mandated Palestine was the Land of Israel. This, instead of dealing with the implementation of resolution 242 (1967), which centres on bartering land for peace, the suggested negotiations now deal with the problems of Jerusalem, sovereignty, withdrawal and the right to self-determination.

46. The present Jordanian position on all this is outlined in the following: Jordan did not close the door leading to a comprehensive, peaceful and just settlement; what Camp David offers does not represent the right path leading in that direction. Therefore, the Government will continue the dialogue, hoping to find a new basis other than those offered by Camp David. This will enable Jordan to take an active role in the success of peace efforts leading to a comprehensive and just settlement.

47. Now, this is in reply to the Israeli representative's allegation yesterday that Jordan was not concerned with the achievement of a permanent and lasting comprehensive peace.

48. The wise representative of India described, at yesterday's meeting of the Council [*ibid.*], the statement of the Israeli representative, long as it was, as barren except for its length. I need hardly state that I totally concur with that seasoned assessment, save on one point: here and there the Israeli representative, though deliberately avoiding a factual discussion or rebuttal of the basic and substantive components of our complaint—namely, the ruthless, heedless and ongoing cannibalization of the remnants of the Palestinian people on the remnants of their ancestral homeland, whose heart and soul is Holy Jerusalem, endeavoured to question the authenticity of the facts which I and my colleagues had presented to this Council—facts fully substantiated by maps showing numbers of settlements and alien colonizers. This, I thought, was a net gain, for I take it that, though unwittingly, the Israeli representative has endorsed our request that it is more imperative than ever that the Security Council should send a commission from amongst its members to investigate and ascertain the authenticity—or otherwise—of our facts; for how else can the Security Council exercise the authority vested in it

by the Charter on an issue which affects a whole people that is seeking redemption from the highest executive organ of the United Nations? I am confident that the Council has already discerned the brazen falsehoods and the diversionary and deceptive tactics of the Israeli representative, but it is imperative that the proposed commission should see the situation on the spot and reach its own conclusions.

49. I was not in the least surprised when the Israeli representative castigated the Council for seizing itself "at the whim", as he called it, of Jordan and its allies, of an "artificial issue, a matter that does not constitute any threat to world peace and security".

50. Yes, the alien usurpers and their Government regard the existence and survival of the Palestinian people as artificial—not worth discussing. After all, do not the Israelis take a callous attitude towards the fate of a whole people, the legitimate owners of the land, treating it as irrelevant, unimportant and an impediment to be removed by all possible means and with the utmost expedition? Since, like their Fascist teachers, they regard the Palestinians not as human beings whose inalienable rights, dignity and freedom must be safeguarded under all laws, human and divine, how could the Israelis, who established their State by endless bloodshed and terrorism, understand, let alone appreciate, the norms of decent behaviour and the accumulated precepts of international law?

51. As for the Israeli representative's contention that the cannibalization of the Palestinian people does not pose a threat to world peace and security, I would only remind him that Hitler's arrogant claim that his new order would last for 1,000 years was crushed in a mere few years, even though he boasted of its invincibility.

52. Let me repeat once more to the representative of the illegal Israeli entity—I say "illegal" because it has flouted the very premises and resolutions which would have given it formal legality—that in God's measured time, which the short-sighted are prone to misapprehend and miscalculate, the Palestinian people, supported by all patriotic Arabs throughout the Arab world and by all the truly faithful throughout the Islamic world, and by all peace-loving peoples who put their ideals above fleeting and unethical expediency, will combine in a common struggle to restore justice and legality in all their aspects and to undo the real artificiality of Israeli usurpation.

53. Let the Israelis deflate their egos and not be deceived by the gadgets showered upon them that have brought about their destabilization and caused them to lose their sense of proportion. These are fleeting advantages which are intrinsically of brief duration. Yes, the struggle will go on until real peace, based on justice and legality, is achieved. World peace and security are contingent on these elementary truths, as the Israelis will one day discover.

54. I had not replied earlier to the Israeli allegation that our complaint was designed to undermine the so-called peace effort. Apart from our firm conviction that no peace is worth its name if its price is keeping Jerusalem,

its holy places, its environs, in captivity—and that is already one fifth of the occupied West Bank—and apart from our equally firm conviction that when the price is dumping the Palestinian people and their just cause into the wilderness of nowhere, and apart from our conviction that the so-called peace is an Israeli diktat peace—apart from all this, we had deferred presenting the complaint, as many members of the Council know fully well, from early January to March, in deference to the just causes of our brethren in Namibia and Zimbabwe and to the tragic conflict in South-East Asia.

55. The Israeli representative has reverted to the worn-out allegation that the Arabs have been refusing peace. What peace? When Palestine was partitioned the Palestinians did no more than express their dismay at the dismemberment of their country by a few public gatherings, a few demonstrations and pronouncements. After all, they were totally unarmed. The Israelis, having paid lip service to the acceptance of the partition plan, responded by launching their 80,000-strong military machine against a totally unarmed people under the British Mandate.

56. Their first organized attack was against the quarter where I lived and they managed, after heavy bombardment, to blow up 25 houses in the Sheikh Jarah quarter. None of the civilian inhabitants had a single bullet, let alone a rifle. We were totally unarmed and defenceless. The Israelis pursued their organized military attacks throughout Palestine and managed, by the end of the British Mandate on 14 May 1948, unlawfully to conquer four fifths of Palestine, including two thirds of western Palestinian Arab Jerusalem, an area far greater than was allocated to them under the partition plan of 29 November 1947 [*General Assembly resolution 181 (II)*]. They also managed, by systematic and barbarous terrorism, to uproot a civilian population and reduce it to the status of refugees, and they have remained refugees for almost three decades, up to this day.

57. That is the sordid and despicable background of an Israel seeking respectability and acceptability. It is a background soaked in infamy, terror and illegality. The silly observation about the distance between Bethlehem and Ramallah is the outcome of this outrageous onslaught, because the distance between Jerusalem and Ramallah is, according to my recollection, close to 18 to 20 kilometres, but since the Israelis unlawfully seized our western Jerusalem we—I am talking about the Jordanian Government—were forced to construct a tortuous road between Jerusalem and Bethlehem across winding, hilly terrain which added another 15 to 16 kilometres—I have not calculated it exactly—to the direct road, a mere five to six kilometres, over which I have driven a thousand times. My figure, therefore, of close to 40 kilometres between Bethlehem and Jerusalem is as close to the truth as a layman's calculation could reconstruct. It is not intended to inflate, as the Israeli representative alleges. Besides, the Israelis have built settlements and extended the boundaries of Bethlehem to the pools of Solomon just beyond Bethlehem and also to the refugee camp of Halazon, beyond Ramallah. Plus or minus, it is as close to reality as I could recollect. Besides, who needs to inflate when anybody can verify that Jerusalem's

colonized boundaries encompass the whole area between Bethlehem, Jerusalem and Ramallah, with sizeable bulges to the east and west adding more to the colonized area?

58. Silly as it seems, it is the only argument used by the Israeli entity's expansionist colonization to defend the indefensible crime and to try to refute the fundamental premise of my presentation. I hope that the Security Council's commission will be able to unravel all this when it goes to the area.

59. While talking about peace, the mere idea of which is anathema to some because it runs counter to the Zionist ideology openly declared by the Zionist leaders, let me remind the Israeli representative that in 1950 the representatives of the Arab States involved, including the Palestinians, met at Lausanne under the aegis of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine and initialled the Lausanne Protocol,³ which implemented General Assembly resolution 181 (II) on the territorial question, and resolution 194 (III) on the return of the Palestinian refugees, which could have permanently resolved the conflict almost three decades ago. But when the Protocol was sent to Tel Aviv for ratification it was repudiated. A member of the Israeli delegation told his then Palestinian friend who was with one of the Arab delegations that it was hopeless because every time the subject of a return of Palestinian territory and people was mentioned, "the old man's eyes"—meaning the late Ben Gurion—"turn red". That put an end to any possibility of a real, meaningful settlement.

60. The next Israeli penchant for peace was given concrete expression by Israel's unwarranted invasion of Egypt in 1956. A further concrete expression was its treacherous attack on Egypt in 1967, the real goal of which was not Sinai but Holy Jerusalem and the rest of Palestine. We knew that fact all along. The Israelis and the Americans, as long ago as 1968, offered such a restoration through Mr. Dean Rusk, then the United States Secretary of State, in exchange for non-belligerency. The then Egyptian Government flatly refused such a deal as unethical and a betrayal of their Jordanian, Palestinian and Syrian brethren. The claim by the representative of Israel that his Government had given notice to Jórdan not to join the war has since been proved by researchers to have been a theatrical ploy, as such notice was given after hostilities had already been triggered by Israel.

61. As one Israeli newspaper which I read shortly after the war and the euphoria that accompanied it, conceded: "We had laid a premeditated trap for Jordan and it fell right into it." Indeed, judging from all the available sources, including the highly revealing book *Conspiracy of Silence*, Israel was bent on forcing the war on Jordan whether it liked it or not because the real aim of that dirty war, drenched in infamy and conspiracy, was to seize Holy Jerusalem and the rest of the Palestinian lands. Certain sections of the Central Intelligence Agency and

other key departments were in collusion and were in this dirty deal up to their necks. Indeed, a number of those personnel came to Jordan especially, I remember, and fervently urged the Jordanian politicians to advise King Hussein, during the two weeks which preceded the war, to patch up his quarrel with Egypt, forgetful of the fact that for one and a half decades those very same people were doing all they could to foment estrangement between the two countries. But to ensure Israel's seizure of Jerusalem and the West Bank they turned overnight into ardent pan-Arab nationalists.

62. The representative of Israel has reiterated in theatrical, fervent tones the unique and continuous association of the Jewish people and Israel with Jerusalem. I should remind him that Jerusalem—otherwise known as Uru Salem or the City of God and Peace—was built and inhabited by the Jebusite Semitic Arabs 2,000 years before marauding Israeli nomads infiltrated the city in small groups. All one has to do is to read Catherine Kenyon's archaeological book entitled *The Digging of Jerusalem*.

63. For thousands of years it had been the city of the Jebusites and Canaanites except for a brief interlude of a few hundred years some 3,000 years ago. Even during that period of Israeli control the indigenous Palestinian inhabitants remained the most substantial part of the inhabitants. When the Caliph Omar entered Jerusalem in the seventh century it was a family reunion with his fellow Christian Arabs, who not only welcomed him but also aided him against the then decadent Byzantine rule. It was the Moslem Arabs who permitted Jews to reside in Jerusalem, if they so wished, against the advice of Archbishop Sophronius. The same thing happened when Saladin recovered Jerusalem from the European feudal invaders who had masqueraded in the name of religious zeal. The Moslems never expelled or persecuted the Jews but treated them as believers in God's message. It was the Romans, the Babylonians and the Europeans who expelled the Jews.

64. Jerusalem to the Islamic world is the first Qibla to which people turn their faces in prayer. The spiritual journey of the Prophet Mohammed and his ascension to heaven from the Al-Aqsa Mosque at God's behest to witness his creation, consecrated Islam's eternal attachment to the Holy City, but without the slightest prejudice to the other two great faiths with which Islam associates itself. The claim to Jewish exclusivity in Jerusalem does a great disservice to original Judaism, inspired like the other monotheistic faiths by the message of Abraham, the forefather of the Semitic Arabs and the Semitic Jews—I repeat, the Semitic Jews and certainly not the Khazars. Islam and Christianity are universalist and are addressed unto all mankind, regardless of race, colour or creed. All one has to do is to profess one's belief in God, the creator of all the universe, his prophets and observe a few rituals such as prayer. Modern Judaism is addressed to the Jews and to the Jews alone—and not only that, to the Jews who were born of a Jewish mother. Many cases have been brought before Israeli courts protesting against that narrow exclusiveness.

³ *Ibid.*, Fourth Session, Ad Hoc Political Committee, Annex, vol. II, document A/927, annexes A and B.

65. It is not my intention here to get the Council involved in theological interpretations and disputations or in matters of comparative religion. We respect every faith as its adherents see it, whether it be Christianity, Islam, Judaism, Buddhism, Hinduism, communism, socialism, laissez-faire, Shintoism, and any and all religions and ideologies. They have all made great contributions to the advancement of mankind. But religious or ideological expressions, no matter how lofty, cannot and should not impinge upon the rights of others in a multifarious and variegated world. We did not introduce the religious element, as the Israeli representative stated yesterday. What we are saying is that while we are averse to discriminating against others, of whatever faith, we shall never tolerate being discriminated against. The 800 million adherents of the Islamic faith and the scores of millions of Christian Arabs who regard Jerusalem as an integral and focal point of their religious faith, their history and legacy, have been deprived of access to the holy places as a consequence of Israeli occupation, holy places which they passionately revere. That has now gone on for 11 years and it is a situation which is totally insufferable for all the faithful. Any Jew is given the "red carpet" treatment if he goes to Jerusalem, no matter which country he may have heralded from, simply because he happens to be a Jew, while a Palestinian—Christian or Moslem—whose heritage goes back millennia, is brutally denied his right to return to his city. If that is not exclusive racism, then what is?

66. I wish here to refute categorically—and probably for the tenth time—the statement that during the time when the East Bank and the West Bank of the Jordan were united the Jews were not permitted to visit the Wailing Wall. The truth is that the Israelis denied themselves that right by opting for the material over the spiritual. In the aftermath of the Armistice Agreement in 1949 and 1950, a special committee was established—an offshoot of the Armistice Commission—to resolve that problem. Jordan's position was that Israelis could go to the Wailing Wall and also restore the Hebrew University and the Hadassah Hospital on Mount Scopus in exchange for allowing the Palestinian Jerusalemites to return to their homes, which they had built with their own sweat, effort and savings, in two thirds of Western Jerusalem, which was wholly Palestinian. Jordan also requested the restoration of Jerusalem's natural water supply in Ras el-Ein in the plains of Palestine, which the Israelis had cut off, as well as the electric power and the reopening of the short Jerusalem-Bethlehem road. The Israelis decided that plundering the homes, furniture and other family belongings was apparently a far more lucrative deal than saying their prayers. Cutting off Jerusalem's water supply, electricity and the Bethlehem road, which is only a few kilometres long, would bring serious discomfort of what remained of Arab Jerusalem. The talks naturally ended in failure. That applies not only to Jordan, but also to all other Arab countries. I refer to a statement that was made by those Arab Governments on 15 November 1949, which reads as follows:

"The Governments of Egypt, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Lebanon and Syria undertake to

guarantee freedom of access to the holy places, to 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."

67. Another blatant distortion which we have refuted on many occasions, but which regrettably I have to refute again, is the Israeli allegation that the Jordan army had shelled the holy places. Everybody knows that it was the Israeli military machine which, one hour after the British High Commissioner departed from Jerusalem, unleashed its relentless attacks against the Mascovia compound and all the other Arab quarters which had not been seized earlier. Having accomplished most of that aggressive mission, it assembled its most formidable units, including the Palmach, in an attempt to storm the ancient walled city. They shelled it ruthlessly. They employed tanks, which I think were German, damaging the Al-Aqsa Mosque, churches and other holy places, in addition to inflicting numerous casualties upon the civilian population. There was no Jordanian army in the city then, since it had withdrawn totally from Palestine in deference to United Nations resolutions.

68. On 14 May 1948 the Palestinian civilians took to the walls and beat back all the Israeli onslaughts day and night for three days, until the dawn of 17 May, when they had absolutely no ammunition left. The Jerusalem National Committee decided to send a delegation to Amman to ask for help. At the dawn of 18 May a contingent of no more than 600 Jordanian troops came to the rescue, engaged in street-to-street fighting and overwhelmed the close to 1,000 Israeli Haganah and Irgun planted in the Jewish quarter, in the Old City, against the urgent pleadings of the civilian Jewish community of that quarter. The Israeli soldiers were taken prisoner, treated according to international convention and law and later repatriated through the Red Cross. They included the daughter of Moshe Sharrett, the then Foreign Minister.

69. It was only natural that in ferocious house-to-house fighting serious damage would be inflicted on premises in the area. This included the two synagogues, the big one and the small one. These were the two known synagogues. If my credulity rating in estimating ever-changing distances as a result of changing roads is 9 per cent, as the Israeli representative alleges, then his credulity rating on the number of synagogues in the Jewish quarter is close to nil, unless he regards every house in the Jewish quarter as a synagogue. How did he come up with 59 synagogues? I have been intrigued by this question, because it has been raised before, but not at the same rate of inflation as that to which the representative of Israel has resorted. I was told by the inhabitants of the quarter, more than 50 per cent of which is Arab property, that they would amount to a mere handful. The previous

Israeli representative here mentioned, I think, 48 synagogues.

70. When the representative of Israel talked about what he called the desecration of the Jewish cemetery, he made himself vulnerable on two scores: first, a minimal relocation of stones was carried out in the same way as some graves in Bab al-Sahina, Herod's Gate, were relocated to widen the road somewhat, and that included the tomb of my grandfather in that cemetery, which shows there was no discrimination in this relocation; secondly, he has opened the floodgates to the hundreds of desecrations carried out by Israel since 1948 throughout Palestine, the most infamous being the Mamillah historic 1,000-year-old cemetery, where all the people of distinction have been laid to rest—men of learning, leaders, heroes, theologians, philosophers and others. The Israelis bulldozed that historic Islamic cemetery and turned it into a public park for people and animals to trample upon. The United States Consulate in West Jerusalem overlooks that historic site and will no doubt endorse my statement.

71. The Jordanian army was not an army of invasion because it had already been present at all the most strategic spots in Palestine until the end of the Mandate. In Jerusalem they were in El-Alamein Camp; they were in Qatamon; they were in Haifa; they were all over the place, including Sarafand. They re-entered to save 80,000 Jerusalemites who were huddled in the Old City of Jerusalem for fear of Israeli massacres that would have dwarfed the massacre of Deir Yassin.

72. I regret that the representative of Israel should have seen fit to try and defame the name of one of our great Arab leaders, the Sherif of Mecca. Apparently he does not know his integrity and the esteem in which we hold him. The Sherif of Mecca decided to forgo his sovereignty over a large Arab domain in the Arab East rather than alienate one inch of Palestinian territory, and in 1925, in the days of colonialism, he was put on a ship and exiled to Cyprus, where he died a lonely and brokenhearted man. The people of Palestine acknowledged his integrity and his fidelity to their cause and insisted that he be buried in the Al-Haram al-Sherif area, where today his soul rests in peace.

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

74. Mr. SAHLOUL (Sudan): Mr. President, permit me at the outset to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of March. I am confident that, with your ability and experience, which are known to us all, you will perform the duties expected of your august office in the best possible manner. I wish also to extend our appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Abdalla Bishara of Kuwait, for his performance as President for the month of February, when the Council was faced with some of the most intractable issues, issues which Ambassador Bishara tackled with the utmost tact and skill.

75. Allow me to express my gratitude to you and to the other members of the Council for allowing me to make a statement on the situation in Jerusalem and the occupied Arab territories.

76. The fact that the Council has decided to take up this issue at this juncture is a measure of the concern felt by the international community at the persistent policy of Israel to continue and intensify its repressive measures against the Palestinian people in the occupied territories, with the purpose of securing permanent domination over those territories. We share the concern of the international community in this regard on two grounds: first, as members of the Islamic Conference, deeply concerned over the fate of Jerusalem and the shrine of Al-Aqsa Mosque, which is the third holiest shrine in Islam; and, secondly, as members of the Arab family of countries, who feel disturbed over the uncertainty that characterizes the future of the Palestinian people and their right to return to their own country and establish their own State on their territory.

77. We are witnessing now the unfolding of a serious situation in the occupied Arab territories. The Israeli authorities are systematically and relentlessly pursuing a policy of establishing new settlements in these territories. The number of settlements already established has reached a total of 80. This policy is, in effect, eroding the status of Jerusalem and the rest of the Arab territories by changing their legal status, geographical nature and demographic composition. The situation in the occupied territories has changed drastically since 1967, owing to the policies of the respective Israeli Governments, which have been pursued relentlessly and without interruption, with the objective of the ultimate assimilation of these territories. The settlements and the colonies are being positioned in such a manner as to form ultimately barriers between the remaining population of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and the rest of the Arab world, both east and west. Arab Jerusalem has already been surrounded by high-rise residential colonies, which have been constructed to form an effective barrier between the 105,000 Palestinians still inhabiting that sector of the city and the rest of the territories of the West Bank. Thus, in effect, Arab Jerusalem has been turned into a ghetto and its links with the West Bank and Jordan have been severed.

78. As for the rest of the West Bank, a string of agricultural colonies has been set up in the Jordan Rift which forms the north-south length of the eastern border of the West Bank. Another belt of industrial and agricultural colonies has been established in the highlands to link the belt of settlements on the West Bank's northern border with Israel. These settlements have already achieved two Israeli objectives: first, the control of most of the cultivable land of the Jordan valley, and secondly, the effective control of the water resources of the territory, which in future could link the West Bank to the territory of Israel inextricably and render any plans for the autonomy of the West Bank ineffectual. Meanwhile the Israeli authorities carry on with their policy of confiscating the land and thickening Israeli settlements in the occupied territories. Large sums

of money have been approved for this purpose and the necessary legislation has been adopted by the respective Israeli authorities.

79. All these actions have been taken by Israel, in spite of all the resolutions adopted by both the General Assembly and the Security Council and in spite of calls by the international community on the Israeli authorities to desist from taking such steps, as they frustrate all efforts to achieve a comprehensive, lasting and just peace in the Middle East.

80. The international community has reached a consensus that a peaceful settlement of the conflict in the Middle East can be achieved with lasting effect only if such a settlement is comprehensive and just. The Palestinian problem continues to be the core of the conflict in the region; no just and lasting peace can be achieved unless the Palestinian problem is solved effectively and the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people are restored, including the right to self-determination and the establishment of their own State on their own territories. The continued erosion of the demographic composition of what remained of Palestine will make it impossible for the Palestinian people, in any settlement of the Middle East problem, to have their own homeland. There are 2.5 million Palestinian Arabs residing in refugee camps or in other countries outside the territory of Palestine proper. Surely no settlement of the Palestine question can be envisaged without giving due and utmost consideration to the importance of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to return to a land they can call their own.

81. The picture we are seeing in the West Bank and Gaza Strip demonstrates an entirely different situation. In effect, what is happening is the creation of conditions in these occupied lands which are designed to encourage the remaining 800,000 Arabs to emigrate or to be gradually squeezed out of their homes, by depriving them of any meaningful means of livelihood, the opportunity to develop a reasonably viable economy to maintain even the present population of the territories at subsistence level.

82. The continued establishment and thickening of settlements adds ominously to an increasingly complex situation, thus increasing the chances of a conflagration in the Middle East which will seriously affect the stability of the region and pose a serious threat to international peace and security.

83. If we reflect seriously and realistically on the recent developments in the occupied territories and adjoining regions, we can foresee the development of an ominous situation, one to which we feel it is our duty to draw the attention of the international community before matters get out of hand. New forces are rising in the region, new equations of power are developing, and new expectations are being formulated. The fate of Arab Jerusalem is becoming as important as the fate of the whole of the occupied territories, and the problem is no longer directly confined to the Arab countries. If the United Nations is to heed the new developments, it has to impress on the

Israeli authorities that they cannot continue their policy of eroding the character of the occupied territories, including Arab Jerusalem, with impunity, as they seem to have done so far, and expect at the same time to live in peace with their neighbours and reap the benefits of a peaceful coexistence.

84. The United Nations should also impress on the Israeli authorities that they cannot continue to bully the hapless population which has found itself under the heel of military occupation since the war of 1967, or feel ambitious enough to cast themselves in the role of a stabilizing Power in the region. The Israeli authorities should acquire a more realistic sense of proportion, which includes among its elements the ability to come to terms with the realities of the situation and should contribute to the establishment of an edifice of a comprehensive settlement, based on justice and human right and with the capacity to cast off any ambition of hegemony over the region of the Middle East. The Israeli authorities should bear in mind that time is not on their side and that new forces and alliances are rising in the region which will eventually overshadow the present military preponderance that they seem to have acquired by claiming that their own survival is in jeopardy and drawing on the sympathy which this claim seems to have generated. Their military might may not prove to be of a lasting nature in the light of changing circumstances which characterize the course of events in the Middle East at an accelerating pace.

85. However, it is our conviction that the Israeli authorities are incapable of assessing the situation realistically and will persist in going along their present dangerous path. Consequently, the situation of the Palestinian Arabs in the occupied West Bank and the Gaza Strip will continue to worsen, thus giving rise to explosive pressures in the region which may eventually engulf us all. We are therefore convinced that the time has come for the international community to become more assertive in dealing with the Israeli authorities.

86. The Security Council is therefore requested to discuss the problem and make its decisions in the light of the abundant information at its disposal from many reliable sources—information exposing the Israeli practices against the Palestinian population—and in a manner designed to arrest the deteriorating situation in the occupied territories. In this respect we fully support the proposal of the representative of Jordan to dispatch a commission of the Council to the Holy Land.

87. The Arab people have confirmed, time and time again, that they want to live in peace, but it can only be peace with dignity and justice. The Security Council should uphold the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, and once more call upon the Israeli authorities to desist from acts which infringe these rights.

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

89. Mr. HA VAN LAU (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your accession to the responsible post of President of the Security Council for the month of March. I hail you as the eminent representative of Nigeria, a country with which my own enjoys excellent relations, both bilaterally and within the non-aligned movement. Your diplomatic talents, your competence in international problems and your untiring devotion to the cause of the struggle for the elimination of *apartheid* are well known to everyone and will doubtless assist you in discharging your arduous task.

90. I take this occasion, too, to pay a tribute to Ambassador Bishara of Kuwait for the competence and devotion he evidenced in leading the Council's work last month.

91. The problem before the Security Council is not new. It is one which has been a matter of concern throughout the world for the past three decades and which has many times been considered by the Council, the General Assembly and other international forums with a view to arriving at a comprehensive, just and lasting solution. Important resolutions have been adopted, but the problem is far from being settled and is becoming ever more serious, so much so that the survival of an entire nation is threatened.

92. My delegation has followed very attentively the major statements made by the representatives of Jordan, the Palestine Liberation Organization, the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and other speakers who preceded me.

93. In our opinion, the fact that Israel continues to pursue its policy of expropriation, to resort to terrorism and torture against Arab nationals, to multiply new settlements aimed at altering the legal status, geographic character and demographic composition of the Arab territories occupied since the war of 1967, including the city of Jerusalem, clearly shows that Israel is striving to eliminate the Palestinian nation and to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Arab territories.

94. These Israeli Zionist actions are flagrant violations of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, in particular General Assembly resolution 32/5 of 28 October 1977 and the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. That also constitutes defiance by Israel in the face of the condemnations of the whole of mankind. In spite of everything, they continue to pursue their policy of aggression and expansionism, with the political and material support of the United States of America.

95. We think that this is a very grave situation, which poses a serious threat to the survival of the Palestinian people, the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Arab countries as well as to international peace and security.

96. In view of the explosive situation prevailing in the Middle East, the Security Council is in duty bound to

reaffirm its position on the problem of the Middle East and Palestine in strict conformity with its relevant resolutions and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, in particular Council resolutions 242(1967) and 338(1973) and Assembly resolutions 3236(XXIX) and 32/5, and to take an appropriate decision.

97. In our opinion, the solution of the specific problems enumerated above is inseparable from a comprehensive, just and lasting solution of the entire problem of the Middle East, the crux of which is the Palestinian issue, one which must reflect the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian and Arab peoples that are the victims of the policy of aggression and expansionism of Israel. They are: first, withdrawal by Israel from all Arab territories illegally occupied since June 1967, including the city of Jerusalem; secondly, restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to return to their homes, its right to self-determination and its right to create an independent State; and, thirdly, the right of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, to participate on an equal footing in any settlement of the Palestinian problem.

98. Those principles have many times been reaffirmed by the non-aligned countries and, most recently, by the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries held at Belgrade. At that Conference, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs stressed that a just peace in the Middle East could only be established on the basis of the total and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories, the restoration of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people and the exercise of those rights, particularly the right to repatriation, self-determination and the establishment of an independent State in Palestine and the right of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, to participate independently and equally in all international conferences, activities and forums concerned with the question of Palestine.

99. Faithful to its abiding policy of active support for the struggle of peoples for their independence and freedom, the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam has always supported and will continue unreservedly to support the just and legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian and Arab peoples in their struggle for their fundamental national rights and their sovereignty and territorial integrity and the just position of the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries.

100. In this spirit, we hope that the Council will take due account of the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian and Arab peoples, in particular those expressed before the Council by the representatives of Jordan and the Palestine Liberation Organization, and also the position of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of non-aligned countries and the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, in its decision on a problem of such importance to international peace and security.

101. It is in the same spirit that, while reaffirming our support for the struggle of the Palestinian and Arab peoples for the complete recovery of the territories illegally occupied by Israel, we welcome any effort aimed at restoring peace and halting war in the Middle East. A lasting peace in that region must completely remove the causes of aggression; such a peace must involve the restoration of the fundamental national rights of the Palestinian people and the complete sovereignty of the Arab peoples over their territories. Thus we consider that any attempt to resolve the problem of the Middle East without the participation of all the Arab countries and the Palestine Liberation Organization can only encourage aggression and run counter to peace in the region.

102. In conclusion, we are convinced that a just and lasting solution to the problem of the Middle East is possible only if the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly are respected by all the parties concerned and if the decisions taken by the Council fully reflect the legitimate aspirations of the Arab peoples, including the Palestinian people.

103. The PRESIDENT: I call now on the representative of Israel, who has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

104. Mr. BLUM (Israel): It is a paradox that Sudan should have joined the ranks of those attacking Israel in this debate: Sudan's record, when it comes to human rights, is shocking and would best not be repeated here. None of us has forgotten the agonies of the millions of southern Sudanese who were slaughtered or were turned into refugees by their Moslem brothers to the north. No doubt the Sudanese representative will claim that those atrocities are a thing of the past. Unfortunately, they are not: the world press continues to comment on them, and I refer Council members to *Le Monde*, which on 5 August 1976 wrote that President Nimeiri now presides over the bloodiest régime in modern Sudanese history.

105. Another participant in this debate today was the representative of Viet Nam. His inordinate interest in the Middle East is most puzzling: either he wishes to convince the Council that his own country has no problems of its own which constitute a threat to international peace and security, or else he is attempting to divert attention from the continued activities of his country in Cambodia. Indeed, for the Vietnamese representative to speak of "occupied territories" in any form at the present time is the height of hypocrisy. Of course, it has never been easy to obtain information from closed societies. But one brutal human fact cannot conceal that something is rotten in the State of Viet Nam. I speak, of course, of the countless Vietnamese refugees desperately seeking sanctuary, crowded aboard freighters and fishing boats in the South China Sea, fleeing in a mass exodus from repression. The spectacle of unwanted refugees wandering from port to port in search of refuge is too recent in Jewish memory for us to ignore this human misery. Hence my Government readily rescued and accommodated a group of Vietnamese refugees aboard a stranded ship in June 1977 and this year again opened its gates to more hapless refugees from Viet Nam.

106. *Le Monde* recently gave some insight into the problem when it accused the Vietnamese Government of the crimes of repression, corruption and the destruction of its society and economy. The paper states:

"The Government of Viet Nam has instituted a system of political repression and economic mismanagement more severe than anything known under the previous Governments of South Viet Nam. As many as 800,000 persons are still in the camps, living in primitive conditions, short of food, often doing dangerous work, and allowed only rare visits. The death-rate in some camps is high."

And the representative of this Government then sanctimoniously preaches to the Security Council about Israel and the Palestinian Arabs.

107. Last night, Somalia too leaped into this debate. Somalia is a country which for years has had a rather turbulent relationship with its neighbours. It is gratifying to note that amidst all its foreign preoccupations and excursions it has found time to come here and participate in this debate, apparently as a member in good standing. The *Daily News* of Kenya, on 17 September 1977, accused Somalia of using Islam for its expansionist aims in Africa. A week or so later, on 23 September, an editorial in the same Kenyan newspaper condemned the hypocrisy of the policies advocated by Somalia which call for "African brotherhood and fraternity" and at the same time publicly display in Somali embassies abroad a map of the "greater-Somali nation", which incorporates parts of two other African nations.

108. I should like to come now to the statement of the Jordanian representative. The first part of his statement, while openly conveying an unwelcome message of warmongering, and while rejecting any participation in the ongoing peace process in the Middle East, was still structurally coherent. It seems it was composed at Amman. Coherence, however, did not characterize the second part of that statement. The more I listened to the Jordanian representative, the more I thought that I had been overgenerous yesterday in giving him a credibility rating of 9 per cent. He surpassed himself today when he suggested that there were only two synagogues in the Old City of Jerusalem before 1948. Such an assertion is rather like claiming that there are only two churches in Rome. He surely does not expect the Council to take him seriously. If he so wishes, I should be happy to supply him with a full list and with details of the 58 synagogues in the Old City of Jerusalem which his Government destroyed in 1948.

109. The representative of Jordan claimed once again that the distance between Bethlehem and the twin towns of Ramallah and Bireh is a stretch of 40 kilometres, even though the distance is actually 22 kilometres, as any map will show. He puts the discrepancy down to "new roads". It needs a very tortuous mind, as well as a very tortuous road, to stretch the distance between these two towns to twice what it has been for centuries.

110. Let me point out some further assertions made by the Jordanian representative here today which, I submit,

signify a further and total erosion of his credibility rating. The Jordanian representative described what he called the "few peaceful demonstrations" which Arabs staged in 1947 to express their dismay with the General Assembly resolution of 29 November. Now, what is the truth? I can do no better than quote from the first special report to the Security Council, dated 16 February 1948, submitted by the United Nations Commission on Palestine set up under that resolution of 29 November 1947. In that special report the Commission informed the Council that:

"Powerful Arab interests, both inside and outside Palestine, are defying the resolution of the General Assembly and are engaged in a deliberate effort to alter by force the settlement envisaged therein."⁴

Some seven weeks later, in its report dated 10 April 1948 and addressed to the second special session of the General Assembly, the Commission had the following to say on the peaceful demonstrations alluded to by the Jordanian representative. I quote:

"Opposition [by the Arab Higher Committee] to the resolution of 29 November 1947 has taken the form of armed resistance. . . . It is not only the Arab State, envisaged in the resolution, which cannot now be constituted . . . the establishment of the Jewish State and of the international régime for the city of Jerusalem are also obstructed by the Arab resistance.

"Arab opposition to the plan of the Assembly has taken the form of organized efforts by strong Arab elements, both inside and outside of Palestine, to prevent its implementation and to thwart its objectives by threats and acts of violence, including repeated armed incursions into Palestinian territory."⁵

Some peaceful demonstrations!

111. The Jordanian representative also treated the Council to a rather tortuous and original description of the circumstances surrounding Jordan's aggression against Israel in 1967. I regret I have to inform the Council that in so doing the representative of Jordan openly repudiated his King because this is what King Hussein had to say about the circumstances surrounding Jordan's entry into the 1967 war. In an interview published in the Hamburg weekly magazine *Der Spiegel* of 4 September 1967, King Hussein acknowledged the receipt of an Israel message to the effect that

"...if we do not attack we shall be spared the otherwise unavoidable consequences. However, at that time we had no longer any other choice. We had to do everything possible to aid our allies in Egypt and Svria."

I should also like to refer the Jordanian representative to pages 64 and 65 of King Hussein's book *My "War" with Israel*,⁶ as told to and with additional material by Vick Vance and Pierre Lauer.

⁴See *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, Special Supplement No. 2*, document S/676, sect. I, para. 3 (c).

⁵*Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Special Session, Supplement No. 1*, pp. 9 and 10.

⁶William Morrow and Company, Inc., New York, 1969.

112. Incidentally, General Odd Bull, Chief of Staff of United Nations Truce Supervision Organization until 1970, on his return to his native Norway in August 1970, gave an interview to the Oslo daily, *Aftenposten* which was published on 22 August 1970 and he had the following to say on the issue here before us:

"I was summoned to the Israeli Foreign Ministry and on arrival at about 9 a.m."—that is on 5 June—"I was asked to convey a message to King Hussein and the Jordanian Government. It amounted to the following: if Jordan remained passive during the war Israel would do nothing. On the other hand, if Jordan joined Egypt, Israel would use all means in its power to fight Jordan. The message was conveyed through our cease-fire apparatus. As far as I can understand it reached King Hussein at 10.30 a.m. and the exchange of fire in Jerusalem started about an hour later."

113. The representative of Jordan has gone through extraordinary strictures in an attempt to suggest that Israel has extended out of all proportion the municipal boundaries of Jerusalem. I should like to remind him that in May 1967, that is a month before the six-day war, the Government of Jordan considered a proposal to extend the municipal boundaries of Jerusalem and include within them an area much greater than Jerusalem with its present boundaries under Israel. For reasons of municipal planning and municipal services, the Jordanians proposed to include in Jerusalem a series of Arab villages—Kufr Akab, Ar-Ram, Hizma, Anata, Isawiya, El-Eizariya and Abu Dis—all of which are not included in Jerusalem's present boundaries. That Jordanian proposal came one month before the six-day war in 1967 and less than two months before Israel's much more modest demarcation of the municipal boundaries.

114. I find it hard, therefore, to understand the force of the arguments adduced by the representative of Jordan when his own Government had had far greater designs on the city than Israel has ever entertained. Let me remind members also that, contrary to the claims of the representative of Jordan, Jerusalem, within its present boundaries, does not represent one fifth of the territory of Judaea and Samaria. As I said in my statement yesterday, the area of Jerusalem is 108 square kilometres, which makes it less than 2 per cent—to be precise, 1.8 per cent—of the total area of Judaea and Samaria, which is 6,000 square kilometres.

115. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Jordan, who has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

116. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I shall not impose on the precious time of the Council by elaborating on some of the statements that have just been made by the representative of Israel, except to bring to your attention that he has deliberately tried to quote out of context what I said in my statement earlier. When I said that the Palestinian Arabs were dismayed at the dismemberment of their country, that was during the first three to four days after the partition plan had been approved by the General Assembly and the Palestinian people did nothing

more, and I repeat, did nothing more than hold a few meetings and demonstrations to protest the dismemberment of their country.

117. What the Israeli representative has tried to beguile you with is with talk about February. Of course, having been subjected to relentless attack from November to February, obviously the Palestinians, like any other people, went out of their way to sell their jewellery and to use their savings to buy a rifle with which to defend themselves, at a cost then, in 1947, of £120 sterling. The price of a bullet was a shilling. The report that he quoted to the Council refers to what happened two or two and a half months after the initial response of the Palestinians. All I said was that the Palestinians had done nothing more—in fact they could not have done anything more—than simply to protest the dismemberment of their country, which they had every right to do. But, in the face of the barbarous Israeli action everybody, of course, tried to buy a weapon and most people went to the western desert to buy old rifles left after the Second World War in the western desert. Many of them were rusty. But we had no alternative. We did not have the supplies that the Israelis were getting from every part of the globe. Therefore, I stand completely by my statement that the Palestinians did no more during the first few days that followed the partition plan than protest and demonstrate against the dismemberment of their country against their will.

118. With respect to another point, which I shall mention also in passing, namely, the war of 1967. I do not think that any Jordanian or Palestinian had ever seen the Straits of Tiran and we did not have the slightest intention of getting into that war. But we did have an obligation to sister countries to come to their aid in case they were attacked. It was the Israeli air force which triggered the war by destroying the Egyptian air force on the ground. I might add here that around 10 o'clock on that fateful day of aggression, the "Pearl Harbor" of Israel, the inner circle of the Israeli Cabinet held a secret meeting to decide whether or not to divulge the information about the destruction of the Egyptian air force, for fear that perhaps Jordan might change its mind

and renege on its obligation towards its sister Arab countries. They decided that they would not divulge the information until they had made certain that Jordan was in the war. It was definitely a deliberate ploy to get Jordan into the war, because the main aim of the Israeli aggression of 1967 was, as I said earlier, to take over the Holy City of Jerusalem and the rest of the Palestinian territories.

119. The third point mentioned by the representative of Israel related to the expansion of Jerusalem. There is a basic and fundamental difference between expanding one's own city for one's own citizens and its expropriation by alien colonizers who are not entitled to it under either international law or the Geneva Convention. Therefore, the fact that we were thinking in terms of extending services to some of the villages surrounding Jerusalem was our own business, because it was our own little part of the city which had been dwarfed after Israel had occupied and usurped two thirds of western Jerusalem, which is totally Palestinian Arab. We had to find a way of accommodating the people who wanted to live there. There is a basic difference between our own people living on their own land in their own territory and Israeli colonizers who deny those Palestinians the right to expand or live on their own soil.

120. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, who has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

121. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Judge Lauterpacht of the International Court of Justice states:

"The administration of the occupant is in no wise to be compared with ordinary administration for it is distinctly and precisely a military administration."

Thus, we see no grounds for the analogy between the plans of the Jordanian Government with respect to Jerusalem and the designs of the illegal forces of occupation that are in that country now.

The meeting rose at 1.55 p.m.