



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SECOND YEAR

1997th MEETING: 29 MARCH 1977

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1997)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Report of the Secretary-General submitted under General Assembly resolution 31/62 concerning the Peace Conference on the Middle East (S/12290 and Corr.1)	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.

1997th MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 29 March 1977, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Andrew YOUNG (United States of America).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Benin, Canada, China, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Libyan Arab Republic, Mauritius, Pakistan, Panama, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Venezuela.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1997)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the Middle East:
Report of the Secretary-General submitted under General Assembly resolution 31/62 concerning the Peace Conference on the Middle East (S/12290 and Corr.1)

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Report of the Secretary-General submitted under General Assembly resolution 31/62 concerning the Peace Conference on the Middle East (S/12290 and Corr.1)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken by the Security Council at its 1993rd and 1995th meetings, I invite the representatives of Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization to take places at the Council table, and the representatives of Egypt, Jordan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yemen to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the usual understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when they wish to address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. C. Herzog (Israel) and Mr. Z. L. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took places at the Council table; Mr. A. E. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. H. Nuseibeh (Jordan), Mr. M. Allaf (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. M. A. Sallam (Yemen) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Saudi Arabia in which he requests to be

invited to participate in the discussion of the question now before the Security Council. Accordingly, I propose, in accordance with the usual practice and with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, under the provisions of Article 31 of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

3. In view of the limited number of places available at the Council table, I invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber, on the usual understanding that he will be invited to take a place at the Council table whenever he wishes to address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. J. M. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

4. Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan): Mr. President, on behalf of the delegation of Pakistan and on my own behalf it gives me great pleasure to congratulate you on your appointment as the representative of your great country to the United Nations and on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the current month. The warm welcome that has already been extended to you from all sides, and in which I join my other colleagues, bears testimony to the qualities of intelligence, candour and sympathy you bring to your task. On behalf of my delegation, I offer you our full co-operation and support in pursuit of the common objectives of the Organization.

5. I take this opportunity to express my delegation's appreciation also to your predecessor, the President of the Council for the month of February, Ambassador Murray of the United Kingdom, who conducted our deliberations with his usual skill, urbanity and unfailing good humour.

6. The Security Council now has under consideration the report of the Secretary-General submitted by him under General Assembly resolution 31/62 [S/12290 and Corr.1] on his contacts with all the parties to the conflict and with the Co-Chairmen of the Peace Conference on the Middle East in preparation for the early convening of the Conference.

7. I should like to express my delegation's appreciation of the arduous efforts undertaken by the Secretary-General and the meticulous care with which he discharged the tasks assigned to him. His report describes in detail the steps taken by him and his conversations with all the parties concerned.

8. We endorse the view of the Secretary-General that, in the existing situation, lack of communication and understanding presents a major obstacle in the way of efforts to establish a just and lasting peace in the area. It was precisely this consideration which led the General Assembly to request him to resume contacts with all the parties in preparation for an early convening of the Conference. The Secretary-General's mission of peace to the Middle East in January and February last and his conversations with all the parties concerned were a valuable effort to bridge the communications gap. It is encouraging that the Secretary-General found that all concerned were earnestly desirous of moving towards a negotiated settlement. However, the next stage—and now the most important one—the commencement of a dialogue among all concerned at the Conference, remains elusive.

9. How can this lack of confidence be removed and mutual distrust and fear be allayed when one party to the dispute, Israel, refuses to accept the participation of the other principal party, the Palestinian people, represented by their own organ: the Palestine Liberation Organization? The General Assembly has clearly pronounced itself on this question. The representatives of the Palestine Liberation Organization have been participating in the debates on the question of the Middle East in the Security Council itself. Furthermore, when the General Assembly, by its resolution 31/62, requested the Secretary-General to resume contacts with all the parties, the Secretary-General very rightly interpreted his mandate to include contacts with the PLO.

10. The refusal of Israel to sit with the Palestine Liberation Organization in the peace negotiations at Geneva is unreasonable and justifies the mistrust and suspicion felt by the Arabs about the eventual outcome of the peace negotiations. The attitude of Israel towards the Palestinian people must change if a just and lasting peace in the Middle East is to be achieved.

11. It is our considered view that the resumption of the dialogue among all the parties concerned would create the basic conditions for achieving understanding and accommodation on all sides. But the dialogue by itself will not lead to the achievement of a just and lasting peace. The elements of such a settlement have been enumerated in the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions: First, Israel must withdraw from all the territories it has occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. Secondly, the inalienable rights of the Palestinians, including their right to self-determination and a sovereign independent homeland of their own on Palestine soil, must be recognized and implemented. Thirdly, all States and peoples of the region should have the right to exist in peace.

12. The situation in the Middle East is far from normal. Vast Arab territories remain under Israeli occupation; their inhabitants continue to suffer the rigours and humiliation of foreign occupation, in disregard of the applicable international conventions governing the occupation of territories. The occupying Power, in violation of these conventions and natural justice, is adopting and implementing measures, particularly by establishing settlements, that are aimed at altering the demographic composition of

these areas. Repression of local inhabitants continues unabated.

13. The situation constitutes a threat to international peace and security and must therefore remain under constant review by the Security Council. Above all, it is the duty of the Council to promote efforts to bring about an end to the underlying causes of this dangerous situation by all possible means.

14. Promotion of a dialogue, through the Geneva Peace Conference, remains the primary objective of the efforts of the Security Council and of the Secretary-General. As I said, the resumption of the dialogue will not in itself lead to the achievement of a just and lasting peace. The existing situation in the Middle East, with Israel in apparently indefinite occupation of Arab territories, seems to be considered advantageous by Israel. That is a short-sighted view in the opinion of many enlightened persons in Israel itself. The fact remains that the prevarications and pre-conditions of Israel regarding the Geneva talks are not calculated to facilitate the holding of the Conference or its successful outcome—quite the contrary. It is therefore the duty of the Council, while promoting all efforts for the early convening of the Conference, to reaffirm the basic principles which should govern the Conference, in accordance with its own resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and with General Assembly resolutions 3236 (XXIX) and 3376 (XXX).

15. Mr. JAIPAL (India): My delegation had not intended to speak on this item at present, because we were under the impression that the Council had been convened for the limited purpose of addressing itself to the report of the Secretary-General and working out a consensus statement of a procedural nature. But events have turned out rather differently. A number of Member States, including all the parties directly concerned with the situation in the Middle East, have expressed themselves on a much wider range of matters than those covered by the Secretary-General's report.

16. May I first of all pay a warm tribute to the Secretary-General for his dedicated endeavours in the cause of peace in the Middle East and wish him greater success on his next round of discussions, which must come sooner or later? His report is a model of brevity, precision and lucidity; but, more important, it sets out both the immediate and the long-term problems of building a structure of enduring peace. The Secretary-General's assessment is that if the present stalemate continues, there is a grave danger that the situation may deteriorate again. He is therefore of the opinion that we must maintain the momentum towards negotiations and intensify the search for the means through which the Peace Conference can be convened—preferably in the second half of this year.

17. The Secretary-General states also that all the parties are ready and willing to attend another Conference at any time and to discuss all substantive issues without preconditions. Our consensus statement should reflect this and also, of course, express our appreciation for the Secretary-General's efforts and urge him to continue his discussions and his journeys for discovering ways and means of

establishing peace in the Middle East. But that is perhaps not enough for a consensus statement of the Security Council. Something more has to be said in order to reflect the sentiments expressed by the various speakers, as well as the sentiments which were not expressed by others but which are nevertheless well known.

18. Furthermore, General Assembly resolution 31/62 has requested the Security Council to promote the process towards the establishment of a just and lasting peace. The main obstacle, however, is lack of agreement on the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization at the Peace Conference. Apparently, differences on this question are too fundamental to be bridged by procedural devices. Fortunately, in the Security Council this is no longer a procedural problem, because the PLO has been permitted to participate in our discussions. It is therefore now a question of getting the agreement of all the parties that will attend the Conference to PLO participation. We feel sure that the efforts of the Secretary-General and of the two Co-Chairmen will be directed towards securing that agreement. Unfortunately, some parties are at present disposed to link the question of PLO participation with the future of a Palestinian entity. These two questions are, in our opinion, separate though they may be related.

19. We think that it is unrealistic to fear the worst and use that as an excuse for doing nothing in a situation that is untenable. Equally, we feel that it is unrealistic to use an ideal objective as a precondition for commencement of negotiations.

20. My delegation has examined the results of two attempts to formulate a consensus statement. We feel that there is sufficient common ground to formulate a consensus containing certain basic elements, elements that are well known and generally accepted, such as recognition of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people.

21. It would be a pity, at this intermediate stage of our consideration of the situation in the Middle East, to vote on any draft resolution, with the attendant danger of its being vetoed. We feel that it is necessary for the Security Council to promote the process towards a negotiated settlement at the Peace Conference. That is indeed the view of the General Assembly, as expressed in its resolution 31/62. We think that we could best maintain the momentum towards negotiations by adopting a consensus and, if that is not possible, then by adjourning until a more auspicious moment.

22. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like first of all to welcome you here both as our guide in our deliberations and also as the new representative of a great friendly country. I have been here only two or three months longer than you and I know what I am talking about when I say how much I admire the way in which, from the very moment of your arrival, you discharged your functions as President. I really do not see why you have asked us for our indulgence. I should like to express to you the confidence, support and warm sympathy with which my delegation will accompany you until 31 March. And then, when you are again one of us, you will remain our friend for many reasons: first, as

the representative of a nation and of an Administration which is particularly attached to our Organization; then as a man whose experience will help us to prevent our house from being divided against itself, and will help us to overcome—by negotiation, by persuasion and by action at once warm-hearted and well-considered—the divisions and misunderstandings which separate us. In your struggle, which is a struggle of man for man and not against man, my delegation and my country will be by your side.

23. I should also like to say a few words to some older friends: to Ambassador Murray, for the elegance and authority with which he conducted our proceedings in February, to our colleague from Romania, to whom I should like to extend our profound sympathy on the occasion of the suffering of his country, a country that is so close to France.

24. When the General Assembly, on 9 December last, adopted the resolution on the Peace Conference in the Middle East [*resolution 31/62*], it expressed the desire, largely shared by the international community, to see a resumption in that area of the momentum towards peace, the loss of which had been a source of constant concern. The Assembly took that opportunity to request the Secretary-General to contact once again all the parties to the conflict and the Co-Chairmen of the Conference, with a view to convening that Conference without delay. It also called upon him to submit a report to the Security Council on the results of his contacts and on the situation in the Middle East.

25. The Secretary-General discharged with diligence, devotion and ability the task which we entrusted to him. I should like to take this opportunity to thank him very much. I note with pleasure that the mission that he has just concluded, in a region and among leaders he knows well, was the first of his second term. My delegation cannot but be gratified to see the experience of so a distinguished person, in whom we have unanimously renewed our whole-hearted and well-justified confidence, once again being put to the service of peace in the Middle East.

26. It is only natural that the Organization should choose such a highly qualified person to report to us in detail the results of the contacts that he had with the parties to the conflict at a time when there is hope that peace negotiations may at last begin. Unfortunately, it has been quite a long time since the Council adopted resolution 338 (1973) calling for immediate negotiations. The report which we are studying today contains a certain amount of useful information on the state of mind of the parties and provides us with a framework for reflection. Its descriptive aspect is supplemented by a number of observations and conclusions expressing the views which the Secretary-General has been able to arrive at on ways of resuming the momentum towards peace in the Middle East. His observations encourage us to be optimistic, but we must add that our optimism should be cautious.

27. Among the reasons for satisfaction, we find the desire affirmed by all the parties to progress along the path of a negotiated settlement and to see a resumption without delay of the process of negotiation which seems to us both

desirable and urgent. In a part of the world where, owing to a state of war which has lasted for almost 30 years, passions and tension have built up, this is without doubt an important sign, a trend which the Council should encourage. We should take particular pleasure in the fact that all the interested parties have recognized that it is of vital importance not to lose the momentum which has been won towards the resumption of negotiations and to see to it that efforts continue to that end without interruption. Such attitudes of mind testify to the sense of responsibility of the interested parties.

28. Differences of opinion between parties, however, do continue to exist both with regard to procedure and to problems of substance. While the immediate impediment to the resumption of the Geneva Conference is a problem that concerns the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization, and that in the view of the Secretary-General is unlikely to be surmounted in the present state of affairs by resort to procedural tactics, it is also true that the main elements of the question remain extremely difficult to tackle. In the light of this situation, the author of the report is tempted to conclude that only a certain change of heart on the part of all the parties is likely to improve the chances of success for the Conference. I should add, for my own part, that among those changes, the idea of recognition put forward by the Secretary-General, and also the idea that there can be many degrees of recognition which the parties could agree upon, is important in the view of my delegation. That was recently stressed by the French Foreign Minister and it is among the elements which should be analysed in the utmost detail in order to promote the necessary dialogue.

29. I come now to the feelings of France with respect to the present situation; I should point out first that Mr. de Guiringaud brought back from his own visits in February impressions which are very similar to those of the Secretary-General. The Arab representatives whom he met seemed to him to be motivated by a great desire for peace. Certain extreme expressions used in the past have disappeared from the vocabulary. Progress towards realism seems to be under way. The French Foreign Minister also had the overall impression that conditions might now exist which would promote the search for a peace settlement.

30. Almost a year ago to the day, the President of the French Republic reminded us that:

“... if it is to be just and lasting, a global settlement necessarily should take into account what is fundamental in the legitimate aspirations of all the parties to the conflict: for Israël, the right to live in peace, like all other States of the area, within recognized secure and guaranteed borders; for the Arab States, the right to recover their territorial integrity; for the Palestinian people, the right that is enjoyed by all other peoples, the right to their own homeland. These rights”—as was stressed by Mr. Giscard d'Estaing—“are, in our view, of equal value and should all be taken into account.”

31. In conclusion, I should like to say that the dearest wish of France is to see a strengthening of the timorous hope which we feel this year. I would mention the most

recent efforts which all the parties—and I mean all—must still make if there is to be a convening of the Peace Conference. That prospect is now the dominant factor in the whole question of the Middle East, which we are considering today in the light of the report of the Secretary-General. I hope that we shall not forget that. Nor should we forget, as the report which serves as a basis for our meeting itself states, that: “Neither the parties in the Middle East nor the international community as a whole can afford a continuing stalemate.” [*S/12290 and Corr.1, para. 22.*]

32. Mr. von WECHMAR (Federal Republic of Germany): Mr. President, our colleague and friend the representative of France has expressed our feelings on your joining the Security Council. He did it much more eloquently than I could have. Let me therefore simply say that it is a great pleasure for us to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. Since your appointment as Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, I have had more than one opportunity to participate in consultations with you on important issues facing the Organization. On those occasions I was impressed by your strong personal commitment to the attainment of constructive solutions, your insight into political developments and the friendly candour which you have displayed as President of the Council in your co-operation with us. You may be assured, Sir, of my delegation's full support for your efforts.

33. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully studied the report of the Secretary-General submitted under General Assembly resolution 31/62 concerning the Peace Conference on the Middle East [*S/12290 and Corr.1*]. On behalf of my Government, I should like to thank and commend the Secretary-General for his resourceful efforts and to congratulate him on his valuable report. That report is, in the view of my Government, remarkable for being both imaginative and cautious, both honest and constructive. My Government holds that the report, in clarifying the positions of the parties and in identifying the persisting difficulties and unsolved problems, as well as realistically outlining the possibilities and prerequisites for a solution, has greatly contributed to the prospects of a successful reconvening of the Geneva Conference.

34. My Government is aware of the great difficulties of the task before us. In the interests of a just and durable peace, all parties to the conflict are expected to assume constructive positions. Only if both sides—the Arab side and Israel—are willing to approach the negotiating process in an atmosphere of growing trust and confidence, will progress towards peace become possible. It is one of the merits of the Secretary-General's report that it made this point perfectly clear.

35. During his recent visits to Arab countries neighbouring Israel, my Foreign Minister found an increasing willingness on the part of their leaders to arrive at a settlement which could be accepted as an honourable solution. In my Government's view it is of great importance that the Arab countries involved, including Saudi Arabia, have adopted a common position which facilitates the search for a just and lasting peace. During his recent visit to Israel, my Foreign

Minister conveyed this to the Israeli Government. The talks in Israel have strengthened his conviction that there is a greater chance of a settlement of the Israeli-Arab conflict than ever.

36. On the substance of the matter, it is well known that the nine States of the European Community have developed a joint stance within the framework of their political co-operation. The Federal Republic of Germany has actively contributed to this common policy, on which it continues to base its own Middle East position.

37. Without going into well-known details, my Government, with regard to the central question of the Palestinian people, would like to stress and reiterate only one basic aspect: it continues to be our firm belief that, just as Israel should be ready to recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people within the framework of a comprehensive settlement, so too should the Arab side be ready to recognize the right of Israel to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries. It is gratifying indeed to see this basic and necessary attitude finding its expression also in the report of the Secretary-General.

38. In underlining and supporting the need for an early resumption of the Geneva Peace Conference, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany appeals to the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices with all the parties concerned, with a view to enabling them to bridge the remaining gap. My Government continues to be ready, individually and collectively within the European Community, to contribute actively to the achievement of that goal.

39. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): Mr. President, first I should like to join with previous speakers in offering you our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency. We are delighted to welcome you here, both as our new colleague on the Security Council and as our President for the month of March. If I may say so, in the past few weeks you have already amply demonstrated the great skill which you bring to our consultations and your deep personal commitment to helping to solve the problems at present under discussion in the Council. We look forward to continuing to work in close co-operation with you not only during the closing days of your presidency but also in the months to come.

40. May I also say how sorry I was to miss the opportunity to preside over the activities of the Council during the month of February and to participate in its work during the month of January. I was travelling somewhat. I am grateful to my Deputy, Ambassador Murray, for so ably filling that position and I should like to acknowledge on his behalf the kind tributes that have been made around this table to him.

41. I should also like to join with previous speakers in expressing our deep sympathy to the Government and people of Romania on the tragic earthquake which they suffered earlier this month.

42. Turning now to the business before us, I should like to begin by congratulating the Secretary-General on the

excellent report which we have been considering as well as the very helpful oral introduction which he made earlier in our debate [1993rd meeting]. The report provides an extremely clear and helpful analysis of the main problems and issues which now face us in the months running up to the resumption of the Geneva Peace Conference, which everyone now seems to agree should take place in the second half of this year. It sets out clearly and objectively the positions of the parties on those questions and the main areas of agreement and disagreement between them. It also suggests in general terms in its conclusions the way in which some of those disagreements might be bridged. We believe that this report can only be helpful in preparing the ground for the resumption of negotiations and that the Secretary-General and his staff deserve our most profound thanks and congratulations.

43. In our view, there are two main conclusions to be derived from the Secretary-General's report. On the one hand, it concludes frankly that, on a number of important issues, the parties remain seriously divided in their approach to a resumption of the negotiations and that there will have to be significant changes of attitude on both sides if substantial progress is to be made. On the other hand, it also brings out no less clearly the general desire that now exists on all sides for an early resumption of the negotiating process and, more than that, the realization that the present time offers an opportunity to make progress that may not occur again. We have been much impressed over the past few months, following the restoration of peace to Lebanon, by the demonstration which the leaders of the Arab world have given of their earnest desire, indeed their determination, to get negotiations going again and to bring peace at last to the Middle East. We have also been very pleased to note the readiness shown by Israeli leaders to resume those negotiations. Surely now that there exists, perhaps for the first time, this willingness on all sides to make progress, it should be possible to find a way of overcoming the remaining obstacles to a resumption of the negotiations.

44. This is not the time for me to set out the views of my Government on the requirements for a settlement. These are, I think, sufficiently well known and have been spelled out on many occasions in the past, for example in the statement made by the representative of the Netherlands in the General Assembly on 7 December last¹ on behalf of the nine countries of the European Community and in the statement made in the General Assembly on 5 October² by the then Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary, Mr. Anthony Crosland. Nor do we think that it would be helpful for the Council now to try to provide its own solution to the problems set out in the Secretary-General's report. These are matters on which discussions are still going on among the parties, and which will have to be decided primarily by the parties themselves. What, however, the Council can and, we believe, should do now is, first, to state our conviction that the negotiations should be resumed as soon as possible and, secondly, to urge on the parties the need for moderation and a willingness to compromise in overcoming the remaining obstacles.

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Plenary Meetings*, 91st meeting.

² *Ibid.*, 17th meeting.

45. In the final paragraph of his report, the Secretary-General states his intention of remaining in contact with the parties and the two Co-Chairmen. We welcome this. Even in the short time that has elapsed since the Secretary-General's visit to the area, some significant developments have already taken place. A number of important meetings have taken place, and others are scheduled for the coming weeks and months. A series of high-level visits is already under way. Finally, elections for a new Government in Israel are to take place on 17 May.

46. For all these reasons, we are now inevitably at something of an interim stage. In view of this, we were very pleased to have the Secretary-General's assurance that he intends to continue his efforts, and that he will keep the Council informed of further developments.

47. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Yemen, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

48. Mr. SALLAM (Yemen): Sir, allow me first of all, on behalf of the Yemen Arab Republic delegation, to welcome you and congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of March. In welcoming you to this world Organization and to the presidency of this august Council, we are welcoming a devoted and recognized leader in human rights. Your religious background will certainly influence the taking of decisions which, in your belief, represent right and justice. It gives me great pleasure, therefore, to see you presiding over the Council. It is my deep conviction that the Council, under your guidance and leadership, will uphold the ideals of justice and human rights.

49. The essence of the Middle East conflict is a case of human rights. The Palestinian people, who have been displaced and uprooted from their ancestral homeland, are calling upon this world Council to do them justice in restoring to them their inalienable rights, which are guaranteed by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the principles of international law, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

50. The United Nations has been discussing this issue for the last 29 years. Hundreds of resolutions have been adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council calling upon Israel to withdraw from all the Arab territories occupied by Israel and to recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. The world community has condemned the Israeli aggression and upheld the principles of right and justice.

51. Now provisional steps are being taken to gather momentum for a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East. Arab leaders have expressed their readiness to attend, in good faith, the Geneva Peace Conference. The new Administration in the United States has voiced concern, expressing the view that resolution of the Arab-Israeli dispute is deservedly at the top of its list in foreign affairs. The most outstanding difficulty is the intransigent official Israeli policy, articulated by the Israeli leaders to their population and Parliament, according to which the Golan

Heights are an indivisible part of Israel, Jerusalem is not negotiable, the West Bank and Gaza are Judaea and Samaria, and Sharm el-Sheikh, along with other parts of Sinai, are indispensable to the territorial security of the Zionist State. Furthermore, the Israeli leaders are propagating the position that Israel is not willing to meet with the Palestinians until the Palestine Liberation Organization recognizes the existence of Israel.

52. We are all aware of the prevailing situation in the occupied Arab territories: boys and girls are pulled by their hair and dragged through the streets; students are beaten, arrested and put into crowded gaols without trial. Religious and cultural shrines are being desecrated; land and properties are being confiscated; the historical and demographic characteristics of the land are being changed; educational programmes are being distorted and Jewish settlements in the occupied Arab land are being established.

53. Does Israel expect that the population of the occupied Arab territories will stay calm and content? Of course it will not. Innocent prisoners go on hunger strikes and the people demonstrate against their oppressors to voice an appeal to the world community to relieve them of their accumulated grievances. The Israelis react by exposing children to the most barbaric and humiliating terrorist acts.

54. Daily newspapers print accounts of the grievances of the Palestinian people under Israeli occupation. A detailed testimony was written by Mr. William Farrell in the 25 March issue of *The New York Times*. I need not repeat it, since it was mentioned yesterday by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic [1995th meeting]. Listening to and personally reading that testimony, makes me disdainful of the abhorrent actions which are practised under the observant eye of those who believe in the dignity of man and champion the cause of human rights. Perhaps the Zionists learned those practices from their European persecutors, but to use such humiliating methods on Arab children will only result in spite and hatred.

55. The record of the United Nations speaks for itself: the General Assembly and the Security Council have repeatedly condemned Israel for its violations of the Charter of the United Nations and the Hague and Geneva Conventions. The International Conference on Human Rights has cited Israel's violations of human rights in the occupied Arab territories. The Human Rights Commission has charged Israel with war crimes, and Amnesty International has reported that its own investigation disclosed the existence of practices "abhorrent to the conscience of mankind". Even the Israeli League for Human and Civil Rights has repeatedly charged that Israel has ill-treated its own Arab citizens and the inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories, in flagrant violation of the Geneva Conventions. In short, no Government represented in this world Organization has ever shown greater contempt for world opinion.

56. Confronted with the Arabs' genuine desire for peace, Israel refuses to accept the fact that the Palestine Liberation Organization, whose representative is sitting in the Security Council, right beside the Israeli representative—the PLO which is the sole representative of the Palestinian people—is the main party concerned in the question of

Palestine and one of the main parties concerned in the Middle East conflict. It is only the PLO that can speak for the Palestinian people if it is desired that real peace and tranquillity should prevail in the Middle East. But if Israel chooses to continue ignoring the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and pursuing its policy of expansion, intimidation and humiliation of the Arab people of Palestine, Israel, which was created on the basis of a mythical account, should recall that history repeats itself and that its existence can only retain material form through justice and respect of the rights of others.

57. It is my delegation's conviction that the Council, in discharging its responsibilities, should act in accordance with the Charter with a view to restoring to the Middle East its peace and tranquillity by forcing Israel to withdraw from all the occupied Arab territories and recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination, sovereignty and independence.

58. Withdrawal from the Arab territories is not a concession, as the Israelis would like to call it, but rather a commitment that should be implemented in accordance with the principles of international law and the Charter whose provisions Israel pledged to respect when it was accepted as a Member of this world Organization.

59. It is therefore imperative that the Council should call upon the Soviet Union and the United States to reconvene the Geneva Peace Conference as soon as possible with the participation of all parties concerned including the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole representative of the people of Palestine, who have suffered for many, many years—to borrow the words of Mr. Carter, the President of the United States.

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

61. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): It heartens me to see a young gentleman in name and in fact occupying the President's chair in the Security Council. Judging by all appearances, we find that Mr. Andrew Young is far from being highly strung. He has been taking the arduous task before the Council in stride, without a vestige of the false pride that sometimes characterizes the representative of a super-Power. In other words, Mr. Young has struck me as being a man adorned with innate modesty and one prone to having a mind of his own. Comparatively young in years, he is not lacking in native intelligence and a wide range of experience derived from his multifarious contacts and, no doubt, subtle negotiations with erstwhile fellow congressmen in Washington.

62. As an old-timer, I am happy to greet a newcomer who, let us hope, will have a freer hand than his predecessors to turn over a new leaf in the handling of international affairs—a new leaf on which he will record a policy based on fair play, peace and justice. Good luck, my dear Mr. Young, because you certainly need it, no less than we do, so that we may together initiate a new approach to international affairs, lest we all ultimately founder and leave the world worse than we found it when each in turn makes his final exit from this earth.

63. I have been addressing myself to this question for over three decades at the United Nations, and I was not inactive with regard to the Palestinian question between the two world wars. When in 1922—I was 17 years old—we found that the victorious Powers of the First World War had partitioned part of the Arab world amongst them in the form of mandates—and a mandate was colonialism in disguise—many of us rebelled. I thank God that my rebellion was not with arms but with words. But I am finally realizing that the word is not mightier than the sword, in spite of what an Arab poet said many years ago.

64. Today our work here is regulated by power. Those who exercise power have their own way. We are sitting around this horseshoe table to deliberate and argue a case, but what do we find? We find that we are merely window-dressing for those who elaborate the policies in our respective capitals, and more so in the capitals of the powerful nations, of the super-Powers. Do you think the Chinese were the first to call them "super-Powers"? I did so before the Chinese joined the United Nations.

65. Years ago when I lived in London, between 1929 and 1939, I marvelled when I went to Hyde Park Corner to listen to the speakers who vented their emotions and expressed their criticisms against the Governments of those days. I marvelled and wondered, but then I understood that it was a sagacious Anglo-Saxon ploy to let the people talk, under the epithet of freedom of speech, so that the Government might know what they had in mind and to let them get it off their chests. In some of the northern countries, they say "It is not permitted". In German it is "*verboten*". I do not know the Russian. It is because of the climate. It is the way they have to live. If the people rebel, they reason with them. If they do not listen, they are punished. In the so-called democratic world they are punished too, but under the guise of the ritual of democracy.

66. I am saying this not as a digression but because I want to be forthright and come to the point. The First World War allegedly was fought against militarism—then it was said to be the militarism of the Kaiser—but we found out in the 1920s that it was fought against German mercantilism, because the Germans came late on the scene to colonialism and had to depend on their discipline. They created an industrial country that competed with the rest of Western Europe. Of course there had to be a motivation for war. Not that the Germans were angels—they were like the rest of them—but there had to be a motivation. A great figure of your own country, Mr. President, Woodrow Wilson, came forth with the principle of self-determination in his 14 points, but did the late Clemenceau and Lloyd George heed his advice when he went to Paris, before the League of Nations was established? Finally, he was told to go back home, and he came back a broken man.

67. The Second World War was allegedly fought for the four freedoms. (I remember Mr. Roosevelt, very well; I shook hands with him during his last inauguration.) They were freedom from fear—that was laudable—freedom from want and so on and so forth. There is more fear nowadays in the hearts of men than before the Second World War. Freedom from want? There are more impecunious people

in the world today. Time and again the right of self-determination has been called a principle, and I remember when the principle of self-determination was enshrined in the Charter. I told the then Foreign Minister of Saudi Arabia, none other than the late King Faisal—may God rest his soul in peace—that if there was anything worth while to us who were fighting against colonialism it was the principle of self-determination. That was in 1945, and in 1947 we argued at Lake Success. I was present and was entrusted by many of my Arab colleagues with the task of approaching Mr. Warren Austin to see whether we could postpone the partitioning of Palestine and place the Mandate, as it was called, under the Trusteeship Council pending the finding of a solution which would perhaps bring solace to many of the Jews who were driven, we thought, by a religious sentiment to go to the Holy Land of Palestine. Pressure groups in the great United States of America were at work. Although I am repeating myself, there is nothing that I would invent. When the State Department advised Mr. Truman that the partitioning of Palestine would create problems which would not be in the best interests of the host country—that is, the United States—Mr. Truman said something to this effect, and it can be found in the second volume of his *Memoirs*.³ “Gentlemen, tell me how many Americans of Arab origin do I have in my constituency?”. President Truman no doubt had many good qualities, and far be it from me to touch upon his character. He was a good family man and he served his country. However, with all due respect for him, what right has a man hailing from the Middle West, 7 or 8,000 miles from Palestine, arbitrarily to bring pressure in order to create this problem? This is a political aspect of the matter.

68. Mr. President, I have heard that you are a man of many parts and, *inter alia*, a minister of the Church, and I respect you for that, because anyone who has the fear of God in his heart is to be trusted and respected. The Palestine question has to be looked at from three angles: the historical, the religious and the political. Let us take each aspect one by one.

69. We shall start with the historical. As you well know, in the Old Testament of the Bible, Palestine was called the land of Canaan. The word “Palestine” as an appellation came later in history. It sprang from the word “Philistine”. The Philistines, incidentally, were not Semites but originated on the island of Crete and they had settlements in what today is the Gaza region. The land of Canaan was later called Palestine because of those Philistines, but the whole of Palestine and also eastern Syria constituted the land of Canaan, and the patriarch of all, Abraham, was from the Ur of the Chaldees in western Mesopotamia, which is today Iraq. Those people depended on the grazing of cattle. Sometimes there was drought, and they had to move, as certain tribes still move in the desert, seeking pasturage. Jacob and his 12 sons were legendary characters and we do not know their history exactly, but we include the Bible in that historical phase. The Semitic language that was used in the Bible is very flowery, full of metaphors and figures of speech. I would tell you, *inter alia*, how the words of the Bible became intelligible to the tribal people, who were

illiterate. The Bible says there was a very clever serpent that came to Eve and told her “Eat of that apple”. We have no apples in the Middle East. I do not know where they got that apple in the translation of the King James version. There are plants, there are cacti, but we do not have apples. So we are not dealing with truth now, but anyway, they called it an apple. The serpent said “Gain wisdom, eat”. Then Eve gave it to our ancestor, Adam, and we fell into sin; we are still in sin to this day. These are symbolic figures of speech. They have a meaning that was understood by the common people. I am not making fun of them. Symbolism was used as a way of expressing certain ideas.

70. They came, and we know what happened. Those tribes finally had the upper hand in Palestine. Joseph was sold into slavery, and he ended up, as you know, in Egypt. The people we call Jews today were known as Hebrews. “Hebrew” is a better appellation because the word “Jew” derives from the fourth son of Jacob, Judah. But “Hebrew”—what does “Hebrew” mean? It means the people of the mules. It is not derived from “*habarra*”, which means “to cross”, as some people think, believing it refers to crossing the River Jordan. The Hebrews came in a perpendicular line from the north down to the south. The Jordan runs perpendicularly too, zig-zagging a little after the Litani river. They depended on mules, just as the Arabs of the desert depended on camels, whose pads were shaped as though made for the desert. But where there were rocks the hoofs of the mules were able to withstand the rigorous terrain. I am talking about our Jews—not the Jews from which the gentleman beside me is descended, but our Semitic Jews. He is a Khazar, most likely. Yes, I can see he is a Khazar, a member of the thirteenth tribe as in the book by Koestler. People came to me and asked “Did you read Koestler?” I said “What did Koestler say?” I know Koestler is a good author from England. He happens to be a Jew, but I do not judge an author by his religion. One of my favourite authors when I was young was Stefan Zweig. He was a Jew. I believe he was one of the greatest biographers. I believe the Secretary-General will agree with me. Stefan Zweig hailed from Austria, did he not? He was a humanist.

71. I am talking of our Jews and of the historical aspect of the question. In the eighth century, when there was a confrontation between Byzantium and the Arab world—let us call it the Moslem world, because Islam had arrived on the scene—there were tribes that hailed from the northern tier of Asia, to the east, near Mongolia. They were of Turko-Finnish origin—Turko-Finnish because the Finnish language and the Turkish language have something in common and are derived from those tribes. They were called Khazars. We know them from the Arab historians. They came, and Byzantium wanted them to become Christians, but they were sagacious enough to know that if they became Christians they would come under the wing of Byzantium. They were hardy tribesmen; many of them went as far as southern Russia, to what later was known as Bessarabia. This was ten centuries before Rurik came on the scene—Rurik, the king from whom a royal family descended before the Romanovs.

72. But let us talk about the eighth not the first century. The Jews, our Jews, the Arab Jews, were rightly so called

³ *Years of Trial and Hope* (Doubleday and Company, Inc., Garden City, N.Y., 1956).

by some of my predecessors. There is no difference between us and the Arab Jews. They speak Arabic. We eat the same food, we have the same customs and traditions. They were later known as the Sephardic Jews—the real Semites. They are real Semites. They had a Semitic religion, Judaism. An Arab who is a Christian is also a Semite and has a Semitic religion, Christianity. And a Moslem who happens to be Arab—and many of them embraced Islam to get rid of Byzantium's harsh rule—is also a Semite and has a Semitic religion. But the Khazars are like the British or the French or the Germans. They embraced Judaism because they did not want to embrace Christianity or Islam and thought that, from a political point of view, it would be better for them to embrace Judaism. They have a Semitic religion, just as a Frenchman, or a German, or a Briton might have. But that does not make them Semites. A Nigerian may be a Moslem. Most of the Nigerians are Moslems. And Indonesians are Moslems. They have a Semitic religion. But they are not Semites. And these people want to make themselves Semites by force of circumstance based on power.

73. That gives you the background, Mr. President. You are, I hope, going to be with us for at least four years now that Mr. Carter is in office. If you want eight years, that is your problem. I have to educate you in this matter, just as I was educated. Do not think I was born educated. You are our President, and we are proud that, after all, the President is not a "wasp" [*white Anglo-Saxon Protestant*]. They call them "wasps", I do not know why. It is to the great honour of America that racism is dying out.

74. Well, with the vicissitudes of time the Arabs had three empires; they got drunk with power and wealth and fell. And when they were at the nadir of their history there came a wave from Europe. Remember that the Pope was the spiritual as well as the temporal power of Europe. None other than Urban II, in 1087, in order to divert nationalistic feeling, diverted the attention of his vassals, who were princes, into a war called the Crusades. To do what? To take the Holy Sepulchre from the hands of the infidel, and by infidel he meant the indigenous people of Palestine, many of whom had embraced Islam. There were Jews there too, our native Jews, and there were Christians. He should have known that the Koran mentions Jesus as being of the spirit of God. So the Crusaders used religion as a motivation for political and economic ends. There was a drought and a dearth of food in Europe, so he diverted attention to the Middle East. There were 250 years of misery. Even when the Crusaders thought they were sinners and that was why they could not consolidate their power in Palestine, they sent the Children's Crusade, and on the way the children were sold into slavery. Do not think the whites sold only black slaves. They sold one another into slavery.

75. In fairness to the Christians, it must be said that the Moslems too tried to use religion as a means to a political end. The Caliphates, whether Arab or—later, when the Arabs gave way to the Turks—Ottoman, wanted to spread their temporal power over non-Semitic, non-Arab and non-Turkish Moslem people. They failed. Now it is the turn of our friends the Zionists. They are using religion as a means to a political and economic end.

76. I have researched the question of the Balfour Declaration.⁴ I lived in England between 1929 and 1939. I had ample time to do this research when I was fighting—with words, not with the sword—against the French and British Mandates in our part of the world.

77. In 1917, our British and French friends were losing the war. They said it was because of German militarism. But the biggest military Power at that time was France and the biggest naval Power was Britain. The Germans, however, were more disciplined. The French and British said that they were fighting against the Kaiser's militarism. I repeat that they were stronger than the Kaiser, but the discipline of the Germans was superior and that is why the Germans almost won the war. The Zionists, who were well organized in England and in the United States, railroaded the United States into the First World War. That is what happened, *inter alia*. Had the United States not entered the war, the Germans would have won—and we would not have had Hitler. Indeed, I wish the Germans had won because we would not have had Hitler and we would therefore not have had a Palestine question. But that is hindsight. I remember the post-war period in Europe and here, in the United States. I came here in the late 1930s.

78. The Balfour Declaration stated—and I am paraphrasing—that His Majesty's Government looked with favour on the creation of a national home for the Jews, provided this did not prejudice or jeopardize the civil, political or religious rights of the indigenous population. Now, at that time, the indigenous population constituted 93 to 94 per cent of the entire population. Mr. Herzog talks about the sacredness of Jerusalem. Let us leave aside the sacredness of Jerusalem. The fact is that, for 2,500 years before our Jew, Joshua, came on the scene, Jerusalem had been populated by Semites, who were a hodgepodge of Canaanites, Amorites and all kinds of other tribes. The tribes, whether Jewish or non-Jewish, fought among themselves, but for 2,500 years Jerusalem had been a town of peace. Indeed the word comes from *Uru*, meaning "town", and *Salaam*, *Shalom* or *Salim*—the words come from the same root—meaning "peace"; in other words "the town of peace". That is the historical insight into Jerusalem.

79. But the Jews of Central Europe and Eastern Europe were being maltreated by the Christians. Mr. Theodor Herzl witnessed what happened in France during the Dreyfus affair. He had been sent to Paris by one of the major Vienna newspapers to report on the Dreyfus affair. He was a Hungarian by origin and came from a well-to-do family. He was a Utopian. He said to himself "Look at this civilized country, France, and at these Frenchmen divided among themselves about whether Dreyfus was a spy". And here I would say that the free spirit of France really manifested itself in persons like Emile Zola, who wrote "J'accuse", the famous article that swayed France towards examining the justice of the case. Herzl felt that there was no life for the Jews in Europe because they were being persecuted. What happened? He wrote a book entitled *The Jewish State*, in which he said that all the Jews of the world should have refuge in Palestine; in other words, a State based on

⁴ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Supplement No. 11, vol. II, annex 19.*

religion. Incidentally, the Jews that lived in Spain and went north to what today is the Netherlands were descended from our Jews, and they had nothing to do with this. The Jews Herzl had in mind were the Jews descended from Khazars, those who embraced Judaism—the Hungarian Jews, what would today be called the Polish Jews, the Central European Jews. They were different from the Jews of Western Europe.

80. And the Second World War came. We decry what happened during the Hitlerite period. I hold no brief for Hitler, although I know that I will be called an Arab Nazi for what I am about to say. I do not care; let them call me whatever names they wish. Hitler had seen some of the greedy Jews during the Weimar Republic. Of course, there are greedy Gentiles too. But Hitler had seen that some Jews with connexions outside Germany were breaking currency regulations and so forth. Not all the Jews were, doing that. It is always the poor innocent Jews who suffer because of what the greedy ones do. So Hitler developed a complex against the Jews.

81. Many of my Gentile friends from Western Europe have told me “In the post-war era we developed a sense of guilt about the Jews”. All right; that is their problem. Why should a new sense of guilt now be developed because of the scattering of the Palestinians? That would be to go from one guilt to another guilt. It is no answer to say that the Jews suffered. It is only fair to say that the Christians of Europe also suffered at various times in history. We all know about the Inquisition—before Protestantism came on the scene. We know that people were burned at the stake. That was the age of religious intolerance.

82. So, in order to get rid of the guilt about the Jews, the remnants of these poor Jews who suffered at the hands of Hitler are dumped in Palestine, displacing the indigenous people of Palestine. Incidentally, one day I put the following question to Mr. Kissinger, the former United States Secretary of State: “Who left Germany in the days of Hitler?” And I told him that it was the affluent and the influential who had left, although there may have been some, like his father, who were not so affluent and influential. I told him “You are lucky”. Mr. Kissinger was amazed when I put that question to him. And then I asked him “Who left Palestine after the Romans destroyed the Temple in the year 70 A.D.?” You see, we Arabs are tenacious; we are like the Jews—very tenacious. We thought too much about religion, custom and tradition. The Romans were like the British in Victorian days. The British did not tamper with the traditions and ways of the colonies; all they wanted was the power. The Romans got fed up. Nebuchadnezzar was a Semite. He got fed up with our Jews and with us. The First Temple was destroyed by him and, in 70 A.D., the Romans destroyed the Second Temple. I asked Mr. Kissinger “Who left Palestine at that time?”. The affluent and the influential. The rest remained—the tailors, the farmers. Then many of them became Christians because they were fed up with the Philistines. Then they became Moslems to get rid of Byzantine rule. Those Khazars who came were the people who, using religion as a motivation for a political end, drove out the ethnic Jews. Ethnologically speaking, the latter were the Jews of Palestine—a lot of them, not all of them,

because some of them descended from Canaanites and Aramaeans. Incidentally, Jesus was an Aramaean. That is both the historical aspect and the religious aspect.

83. We come now to the latest development of the political aspect. Why did this country, the torch-bearer of liberty, freedom and self-determination, support the Jews? It was because of pressure groups. Those Zionists are well organized. We come from the south and we are a bit lazy like the Mediterranean people. Whereas the Germans and Russians are northern people and well disciplined. We represent *laissez faire*. So what did they do? They used Judaism as a motivation for a political end before the First World War in order to gain ascendancy in an area which lies astride three continents: Asia, Africa and Europe. Rothschild, to whom the Balfour Declaration was addressed, accepted the words “national home”, preferring them to the word “State”, which Mr. Weizmann wanted to see included in the Declaration. I was told by friends of the Rothschilds in France in the 1930s that the Rothschilds were afraid that, if there were to be a State and if it were successful, there might be a resurgence of anti-semitism and many people would say “You Jews go to your country”. They were wise. They started in Frankfurt and became money-lenders and branched out. They became the scions of finance in Western as well as in Central Europe.

84. In the late 1940s and the 1950s it fell to me, with a few friends, including Mr. Bokhari of Pakistan and Mr. Pazhwak of Afghanistan, to elaborate the principle of self-determination into a full-fledged right. As members know, the right of self-determination appears as the first article in both international human rights Covenants. Our Latin American friends wanted to include economic rights and I begged for it on their behalf, but I did not succeed because the Western Powers were afraid that it might mean nationalization without compensation. Finally, we worked out a formula.

85. In 1919, barely more than 7 or 8 per cent of the population of Palestine were Jews and half of them, if not more, were of Semitic origin—Arab. The time came when our British friends could no longer cope with the situation, and the British had had a hard time in Palestine. I remember, in the 1920s, when they hanged British Tommies from the trees because they had told the Zionists “Well, let us see how we can settle this question”. The Zionists said “No, Palestine is ours”. The British felt that they had made a mistake, especially Mr. Bevin, of the Labour Party, whom I knew personally. If the Zionists could have crucified him, they would have done so. They killed Lord Moyne. Then when Count Bernadotte was sent from the United Nations, he was killed—by the Arabs? You know who killed him—the Zionists. Then, to intimidate the Arabs, they wiped out Deir Yassin, a village. That explains the exodus of so many Palestinians who became refugees. Overnight, between 250 and 300 people were wiped out, Joshua-style, as we called it, because they also killed the animals and cut down the trees of the area. And now they say that the Palestinian Arabs initiated what they call terrorism.

86. As Mr. Nuseibeh said [1995th meeting], it was a land of peace, a land of pilgrimage. Everybody was welcomed to

Palestine because the indigenous people depended for their livelihood on the pilgrimages. Do not let the Zionists put anything over on you, members of the Security Council, and especially you, Mr. President.

87. We have been told again that, because of the political aspect, this is a *fait accompli*. We are told about those poor Jews—and I agree, they are human beings. What shall we do with them? They are there. There is no such thing as a *fait accompli* and there is no such thing as *status quo*, because the world is based on change. What shall we do? Mr. Herzog says “They do not recognize us; they want to destroy us”. In the heat of war and conflict many things may be said by anyone, whether Jew or Gentile, Arab or non-Arab. I believe the mere fact that the Arabs want to go to Geneva means that they are ready for negotiations. But again the core of the whole question is the Palestinian people. The Zionists ask “Why have they not been dispersed in the Arab world?” Suppose they do not want to be dispersed? They want their land; they dream of their land. Look at the Red Indians in this country. They put them in reservations, which is unfortunate for the Red Indians. But we are not Red Indians, with all due respect to their chivalry and their illustrious history. As I have learned from American books written by white men, it was always the white men who broke the treaties with the Indians. We are not Indians; we are Arabs, and we are tenacious. The Zionists come here and tell us that we want to destroy Israel. It is they who are in the process of destroying, but they cannot destroy the Palestinian people.

88. Here I want to say something which I have mentioned before and which is significant in dealing with this problem. Believe me, I am known for my bluntness and frankness. I am not doing anything to intimidate. Our respective Arab Governments, from the Atlantic to the Gulf, would not dare to act differently, even if they wanted to, because the Palestinian people dispersed amongst them—the educated and the informed—have permeated the Arab people, like leaven, to such an extent that they would rebel against their Governments if, so to speak, they were to sell Palestine down the river. Believe me, because I have spoken to them. They would topple our Governments and they are able to do so; they are activists.

89. There are four categories of activists today. There are those who espouse causes, wrong or right causes, but they possess the seeds of martyrdom. There are the politicians—and there is no dearth of them—who activate the people. There are the mercenaries, and we see them now in Africa, in the Far East and everywhere. I do not wish to name them, but members know who they are. And there are the intelligence agents, subverters with money.

90. The big Powers cannot afford confrontation because that would mean a holocaust. So what do they do? They subvert one another in the adversary's sphere of influence, so to speak. We saw it in 1956 in the Balkans. This country poked its fingers into the Balkans a little bit—to free Europe. About 20 years ago, there was a large placard across the street from Headquarters describing the plight of the Czechs, the Romanians, what were called the captive nations. Of course, the Russians as such—and forget about ideology, because we have found out that ideology, like

religion, is not sufficient motivation and has lost its credibility—were also doing their little bit in our area and other areas. And who suffered? The people that were in the spheres of influence. That is why in my preface I mentioned that I hoped there would be a new approach to international affairs. This is the old approach, which has boomeranged and foundered.

91. There are pressure groups. Does the Council know that 75 Senators toed the line during the Nixon Administration and did what they were “commanded” to do. By whom? By the Zionists. I am getting poor; the United States is getting poor. It now takes \$5 to purchase what I could purchase for \$1 when I first came to this country. Why? Because the United States sows its money freely. It has given the Zionists \$30 billion. And why? To lord it over us. Currencies are now based on the dollar; they have to be because there is no more gold. The United States, a great nation, is impoverishing itself.

92. I do not blame our Russian friends because they are using the same approach as was used by the United States: you interfere in my sphere of influence and I shall interfere in yours. That is why we need a new approach. They tell me “If the Americans are not in the Middle East, the Russians will come there”. But we do not want either the Americans or the Russians. We shall respect each country if it remains within its borders. Why should they make a victim of us in their spheres of influence? Look at the British. They are happier now they have lost the Empire. They are now happier and relaxed. No more of that pomp and circumstance. With all due respect to my friends the Russians, I would tell them to leave us alone, just as I tell the Americans to leave us alone.

93. This brings me to what the Zionists want. They have come out with it, but I have been saying it for 20 years. They do not want only a political peace. The Zionists want economic and financial peace, because if they do not trade with the hinterland, with Africa and with Asia, they will finally become insolvent—they are insolvent already. And how long will your country, Mr. President, be able to siphon, through taxes, hard-earned dollars to a people which is lording it over the Palestinians? What sense does that make? Why? What have we Arabs done to you Americans? We have many a time said that to the British, but we do not repeat it to them any more because nowadays we are in sympathy with them. What have we done to you Americans that you should bolster up the Zionists? We have opened our economic gates to you—our oil. Ninety per cent of those who do business with us are from Western countries. Why are the Americans treating us like that? Are they afraid of the Russians? The new Ambassador from the Soviet Union was very reasonable in one of his statements. He wants to have an understanding with the Americans. The only thing is that our Chinese friends are afraid of some sort of accommodation between both of them.

94. I do not know what is happening. It is the old game of power politics and spheres of influence. All of us are human. I am not a communist; I am a monarchist; and one of my best friends here was Ambassador Yakov Malik. I did not say that he was red, blue or what have you.

95. Please come together at Geneva, as our brother the new Ambassador from the Soviet Union suggested, and let us reason. He said "We shall guarantee the frontiers". But the Americans will tell our Arabs "Now, look, they will communize the Arab world". So, we shall ask the Secretary-General to establish a committee in order to set a code of ethics to prevent the injection of any ideology into the issue. We can find ways and means.

96. The Zionists can rest assured that they will not be molested in the State that, as unjustly allotted to them by partition, was much smaller. The partition gave the Arabs, who in 1947 comprised two thirds of the population, only 44.21 per cent. And is the Council aware of how much was acquired by the Zionists after the armistice in 1947, beyond the lines of partition? It was 77.47 per cent; the Arabs were given 22.53 per cent. They have been disobeying the United Nations from the beginning, although it was the United Nations which created their State because certain groups brought pressure to bear on the Western Powers, the Latin American Powers and others.

97. Let us be reasonable. How can the Palestinians recognize the Zionists when the Zionists have scattered them? If the Zionists talk to them at Geneva, there will be a possibility--and, as an old-timer in these matters, I shall personally encourage the Palestinians to live side by side with them. But let it be on record that the Zionists want to impose a condition: they want the Arab world to trade with them.

98. The following is a quotation from an Office of Public Information press release:

"Mr. Herzog said that it was sobering indeed to reflect that one day's oil production in the Arab States would suffice to resolve the entire Arab refugee problem."

But the Palestinian refugees do not want to settle in Arab lands. I have already said that if we should try to tell them to settle in our lands we would incur their enmity. Let me say that there is nothing worse than the enmity of brothers. To incur the enmity of a stranger is bad enough, but nobody dares make an enemy of a brother. They are our brothers and they want to return to their land. Let the Zionists recognize them, and we shall take issue with our Palestinians if they refuse to recognize the Zionists.

99. I said that I hoped the United States had turned over a new leaf. Our politicians—including the Arab politicians and your politicians, Mr. President, and you hobnob with them in Washington—base their policies on expediency and not necessarily always on justice. With all the personal goodwill they may have, they always find an excuse by saying "Well, there were circumstances that militated against doing what we promised you". They always have an excuse; otherwise, they would not be politicians. But that is cheap politics; that is the politics of the past; it cannot be the politics of the future. Because, should there be any miscalculation on the part of the major Powers, we might have a holocaust by miscalculation.

100. For heaven's sake, my dear friend—if you will allow me to call you so—look into the matter objectively, not in

the framework of old political arrangements. Not "Scratch my back and I'll scratch yours"—no. "My country, right or wrong"—no. As for human rights, if we examine our countries we shall find that many of us live in glass houses. So let us not throw stones at one another. Let us, as individuals—and you as a minister know very well that this is the way—restrain ourselves before trying to correct our brother. Then we shall have a better society. Let us collectively try to reform ourselves and repair the damage in our respective countries, not barring mine. Then I think we shall become a good example instead of preaching to others, seeing the mote in our brother's eye and neglecting the beam in our own.

101. Let us be frank: this question of human rights which is being dragged into the First Committee and here should not be discussed there or here. There is a Third Committee, for social, humanitarian and cultural questions. That is where we deal with those questions. I have suggested several times that we should have national committees for human rights that would be protected by the United Nations, and then regional committees—not a high commissioner, such as your President has been told to mention. All the United Nations buildings here would not be able to accommodate the thousands of pieces of mail from every part of the world, including your own country, about violations.

102. Let us set our house in order. I happen to be—not an expert, because I do not like that word—a little knowledgeable on these matters and the mechanics of them. So, for heaven's sake, you Russians, leave the Americans alone, and I am sure they will leave you alone about human rights. Try, each one of you, as we try—I try too, in my own humble way—to reform your countries, to the extent possible, and do not inject these remarks here. Of course, our Zionist friends are always wont to say "Those Russians are ogres", and this and that. Everything should be judged on its own merits. Do not make scenes together.

103. Sir, you have a sample now of my statements. They say Baroody talks a lot. I can talk more: what is our stock in trade if not talk? If we do not talk, we fight. You say the big Powers talk less. They do not have to talk at all: they have the power. I am reminded of the Hyde Park Corner speeches. By speaking we get it off our chests, so we are not as dangerous as some of us sound. We just tell you what we think. And you sitting in that chair as the representative of a great country that exercises power, it is up to you and your generation and the one that comes after you to set an example for us so that we may set our house in order and bring peace, and not base our policies on makeshift expediency. That is the gist of my speech.

104. I wish that the representative of the Israeli delegation sitting here would convey to Ambassador Herzog that we do not hate you; you are human beings like us. Anyone who hates hates himself. He who hates his brother—and we are all brothers in humanity—hates himself. We wish you well, but we do not want to make despots of you; we do not want to make usurpers of you. We try to reason with you. You cannot put it over on us, you Zionists, by continued pressure through your mass media that permeate the Western countries, and you cannot put it over on us by pressure groups, which you use to influence the legislators,

including in the host country. I could cite many quotations as to what is going on in this country; how you try to brainwash some politicians; how you can—I do not like to use the word “corrupt” or “bribe”—entice them by paying their expenses for election. You have a hundred and one ways of doing things; we are tired even of enumerating them.

105. We feel sorry for you, because you cannot live in peace, and you are afraid that you will be assimilated. And one day you will be assimilated. What is wrong with being assimilated? We shall all get to be one people. But in the meantime, the Palestinians will recognize you if you let them go back in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations. If you do not, the conflict will be protracted and go on and on and on. The people of the region have seen a lot of conquerors. I always start with Alexander the Great and the Seleucids and the Romans; then the Byzantines, the Mongols, our brothers the Turks, and then the British and the French Mandates. Where are they now? Gone. Are we going to be worried about this handful of Zionists, for whom we feel sorry? I do not want to use invective or the sardonic tone in which this central European Khazar descendant, representative of Zion, political zionism, has replied to a reasonable man like Ambassador Abdel Meguid or another very reasonable gentleman, the representative of Jordan. No, I feel sorry for you. I have tried to knock some sense into you and I shall feel sorry if you continue to persist in that abortive policy, because in the end no power remains except that which is wielded in the name of justice.

106. The PRESIDENT: There are no further names inscribed on my list of speakers in the general debate, but before calling upon those whose names are inscribed to speak in exercise of right of reply, I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

107. I should take this opportunity to thank the members of the Council for their generosity and the kind words of great hope expressed about my tenure as the Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations. I have certainly enjoyed the friendship and the warmth and wisdom which you have shared—especially my colleague from Saudi Arabia. I thank him for that generous lecture; I look forward to continuing it with him, in private, on many occasions.

108. Seldom in the long history of the Arab-Israeli dispute has there been a period of such intense diplomatic activity as we are now experiencing. This in itself is a source of hope. We believe it reflects a determination on all sides to give peace a chance, as well as a hard-headed assessment that there now exists a realistic potential for success through negotiations. While there are voices in the Middle East which reject peace, the creative forces of reason and conciliation have never been stronger than they are today. Wise and capable leaders on both sides have set in motion a process of peaceful accommodation which could in time yield the just and durable peace which we all so fervently desire. Nevertheless, the passions remain. If we do not quickly and forcefully seize the present opportunity for peace, it may be irretrievably lost.

109. The issuance of the Secretary-General's report is an appropriate moment to reflect on what has been accomplished so far and on where we appear to be heading. We believe that the Secretary-General has made a major contribution to the negotiating process with his systematic and thorough examination of the procedural questions relating to the reconvening of the Geneva Conference. His consultations have revealed substantial differences of view on these questions and he has not minimized the difficulties which lie ahead. None the less, the Secretary-General has given us a kind of agenda of the work which must be done in the next several months, and this should prove highly useful to us all.

110. I need not recapitulate here the diplomatic activity of the United States in recent weeks in regard to the Middle East. These are matters with which representatives are familiar. No interest of the United States is served by stalemate or continued conflict in the Middle East. Therefore this Administration will work vigorously and creatively to assist the parties to move forward at the fastest possible pace, consistent with the principle that nothing can be achieved by any of us except through the efforts and with the consent of all.

111. The Secretary-General has summarized in his report his discussions with Secretary of State Vance as to the results of Mr. Vance's consultations with Middle East leaders during the period from 14 to 21 February. I should like to stress that we were encouraged by one fundamental fact which emerged from those discussions: that all the leaders with whom the Secretary of State talked believed strongly in the need for peace; all agreed on the importance of reducing military expenditures so that scarce resources might be devoted to the economic and social betterment of their peoples. With this common need and common hope, we are launched on an effort to transform an area of recurrent conflict to one of peace, progress and prosperity.

112. As representatives are aware, the United States is continuing the intensive bilateral discussions initiated by Mr. Vance's trip. The Secretary of State is at present in Moscow for talks which include consultations with the USSR in its capacity as Co-Chairman of the Peace Conference on the Middle East. President Carter has begun a series of personal meetings with leaders of the Middle East nations. We hope, through these intensive consultations, to identify common ground among the parties and find ways to bridge the wide gaps that exist. If we are to achieve our common goal of returning to Geneva in the second half of this year, flexibility must be shown by all parties in the weeks and months ahead on the key issues involved.

113. We are now concluding our third day of debate on this question. We have heard once again from both sides and are convinced ever more firmly of the importance of furthering the peace process through the early reconvening of the Peace Conference. The Secretary-General's report makes an active and positive contribution in that direction.

114. My Government once again pledges its utmost efforts to the goal of peace, which we recognize will only be achieved through the sustained determination and cooperation of both sides. I should like to say that I,

personally, believe that the problems of the Middle East are related to other global concerns. As we tackle one set of problems, we can expect to see benefits in other areas. I want all representatives to know that I personally shall lend my time, energies and continued support, as a matter of first priority, to a solution of these problems. I would urge that, as we look ahead, we not let the problems cloud our vision of the dream. The dream has been approached before; it is not beyond our grasp now.

115. Speaking now as PRESIDENT, I call on the representative of Israel who has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

116. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): Mr. President, if you had any doubts about what I meant when I said yesterday [1995th meeting] that the Council's time was being wasted, you have just had, before your speech, a classic object lesson of what I meant. I realize that the Council is entitled to its lighter moments, but this is surely going beyond all limits of reason.

117. But, Mr. President, you have not only had the opportunity today to be introduced to the realities of a debate on the Middle East in the Security Council; you have also had a taste of the inevitable surrealistic dimensions of these discussions. How else can one describe the bizarre pseudo-historical aberrations which are invariably imposed on this forum whose intelligence is being insulted. And how can one describe Yemen's self-righteous concern for human dignity? I was indeed deeply moved by the concern for human rights expressed by the representative of Yemen, a country which is somewhat removed from the concept of human rights as we understand it. I trust that the weekly executions by beheading on Fridays no longer take place in the main square at Sana'a, but have been moved to a more secluded spot. I must say, in this connexion, that my colleagues will be interested in the following item from the report of Amnesty International about conditions in Yemen, which is of definite professional interest to all of us here:

"According to the information available, it would appear that non-violent political opponents or critics of the Government are not usually subjected to long-term imprisonment. Those in ministerial or official positions are either dismissed from their posts or dispatched abroad as ambassadors or placed under house arrest."

118. As we were being regaled with the speech just before yours, Mr. President, I was reading a take from Reuters, from Jeddah, describing how three men convicted of crimes had been stoned to death and a fourth decapitated at Al-Hasa, in eastern Saudi Arabia, according to an official statement made today.

119. I have decided to ignore most of the slanderous false statements made by the representatives of the Arab States before the Council, although it must have been obvious to everybody that a debate such as this one must inevitably deteriorate into an exercise in mutual slander and name-calling. For what purpose we are engaged in a debate in the context of peace negotiations in the Middle East heaven only knows. I do not, and neither do most members of the Council.

120. However, I cannot leave some of the remarks that were made without some form of reply. Not that I feel that I can in any way change the attitude of the Arab representatives, but I can at least endeavour to set the record straight, especially having regard to the fact that I have invariably to cope with not one Arab attack but a parrotlike repetitive chorus with everybody trying to get into the act.

121. As regards *apartheid*, the Government of Israel has time and again made its position amply clear. Our position has been completely straightforward and free from the hypocritical overtones of those who accuse us. While my Egyptian colleague feels so free to attack Israeli-South African relations, I read with interest a report published in the *Sunday Times* of South Africa some months ago:

"South Africa is believed to be building closer ties with Egypt. A senior government official has made several secret trips to Egypt in recent months and Cairo is mentioned as one of the Arab cities to be visited later this year by a top-level South African delegation . . . Covert ties between the two countries have strengthened markedly since Cairo's break with Moscow . . .".

I think it would be intriguing for the Council to receive further details of the educational links between the Government of South Africa and the Government of Egypt which were referred to in *Al Gumhyriya* on 26 August 1976, when a statement made by the Minister for Education of Egypt, Mr. Mustafa Kamal Hilmy, was reported. I think we are also entitled to receive more details from the Egyptian representative about Colin Legum's very interesting and revealing article in *The Observer's* Foreign News Service, entitled "Arabs expand trade with South Africa", which, *inter alia*, mentions the negotiations conducted at Cairo by a well-known South African tour operator, TFC, with the aim of taking tourists to Egypt. Indeed, the Arab Governments' duplicity on this issue has begun to arouse the anger and protest of certain left-wing revolutionary Arab circles. This was expressed as follows in *Al Hadaf*, the weekly newspaper of the so-called PFLP, led by George Habash:

"The reactionary Arab circles have achieved great success in their attempts to conceal the fact that South Africa is receiving Arab oil."

The Egyptian representative then mentioned Israeli co-operation with South Africa in the nuclear field. That is a bare-faced lie and the Egyptian Ambassador knows it. It is but another indication of the degree of veracity we can attribute in general to his words.

122. I really do not want to enter into any polemics with the Syrian representative, but he seems to have a very short memory when he says: "What is not true is Israel's description of the PLO as a terrorist organization" [1995th meeting, para. 90]. Whom does he represent? Syria or the PLO? Let me quote the following statement issued by Radio Damascus on 26 September 1976:

"Before dawn on 27 September 1976, three PLO terrorists, captured after they attacked the Semiramis

Hotel in Damascus, were hanged in a public square of that city, where their bodies remained suspended for hours.

"The terrorists admitted under interrogation that they belonged to the El Fatah wing of the PLO."

Commenting on the attack, President Assad declared: "We condemn this act of terror, committed by a gang of traitors and criminals. We refuse to bargain with them." Referring to those who sent the terrorists to Damascus, he added: "The only thing these PLO leaders wanted was to attack Syria, despite its sacrifices on behalf of the Palestinians." From an article signed by General Mustafa Tlass, the Syrian Defence Minister, in the official Syrian Army newspaper, *Tishrin*, dated 10 September 1976, I quote the following:

"My Palestinian comrades, the Moslems of Lebanon have begun to hate you because you are interfering in their daily life and their personal liberty. What then is the aim of your liberation? Is your sublime target the massacre of the Lebanon? Or perhaps your grand design was to slaughter the residents of the Semiramis Hotel in Damascus? You are mistaken, Palestinian comrades, because you arouse nothing but disgust among all honest Arab citizens . . .".

Then he goes on to state: "no régime will ever accept the illegal acts of the PLO within its borders". That is a statement with which Israel, incidentally, is completely in accord and which reflects our position too. So, if Ambassador Allaf maintains that we are not being truthful in describing the PLO as a terrorist organization, it might be helpful if he were to reconcile such an assertion with the official statements of his leaders. I know what he will say. He will pass it off as just an innocuous family quarrel which is none of our business, despite the fact that it almost destroyed the Lebanese State, leaving 50,000 dead, 100,000 wounded and over one million refugees. Somehow I feel that the members of the Council are past buying this sort of double talk and the sooner this world body makes this clear the better.

123. Lastly, in reply to my Jordanian colleague, I would say this. There surely must be a limit to the rewriting of history such as he indulges in in this body. Let me again put the record straight. It is untrue to state as he did:

"We did not drive the Jews out of the Arab countries. In fact, the Arab States are willing today to welcome back any Arab Jews with open arms, if they choose to come." [*Ibid.*, para. 223.]

The Jews who were driven out of the Arab countries together with their children now number approximately 1 1/4 million. I have not noticed any inclination or enthusiasm on their part to go back to the Arab countries. They know what life for a Jew in an Arab country means. They only have to look at the tortured existence of the small Jewish community of 4,500 in Syria. They can still recall the public hangings of innocent Jews in the main square at Baghdad. Two of those hanged in that dastardly manner in public for the amusement of the mob at Baghdad happened to have been relatives of members of my

delegation. So I say to Mr. Nuseibeh, please do not lecture us about Arab solicitude for Jews in Arab countries—especially you, the representative of a country whose citizenship law No. 6 of 4 February 1954 states in paragraph 3, subparagraph 3: "Any man will be a Jordanian subject . . . if he is not Jewish." That is just another example of the inherent Arab racism. I would ask Mr. Nuseibeh not to lecture us on these matters. Why does he not meet the representatives of the Jewish refugees from Arab countries who have now organized themselves world-wide in order to press their claims against the Arab Governments? They will clarify for him in what circumstances they left the Arab countries.

124. He has the effrontery to deny the destruction by the Jordanian occupying forces of synagogues in the Old City of Jerusalem in 1948. Colonel Abdulla el-Tal, who then commanded the Jordanian Arab Legion in Jerusalem, describing the destruction of the Jewish Quarter when Jordan, in defiance of the Charter of the United Nations, attacked the city of Jerusalem in 1948, wrote in his memoirs, published at Cairo in 1959:

"The operations of calculated destruction were set in motion . . . I knew that the Jewish Quarter was densely populated with Jews who caused their fighters a good deal of interference and difficulty . . . I embarked, therefore, on the shelling of the Quarter with mortars, creating harassment and destruction . . . Only four days after our entry into Jerusalem the Jewish Quarter had become their graveyard. Death and destruction reigned over it . . .

"As the dawn of Friday May 28, 1948, was about to break, the Jewish Quarter emerged convulsed in a black cloud—a cloud of death and agony."

That was a Jordanian description of exactly how it happened, written by the commander of that operation.

125. After the cease-fire had entered into force and normal civilian administration had been restored at Jerusalem in June 1967, a shocking picture unfolded of the results of that policy of wanton vandalism, desecration and violation perpetrated during the period of Jordanian occupation from 1948 onwards. In the Jewish Quarter all but one of the 35 Jewish houses of worship that graced the Old City of Jerusalem were found to have been wantonly destroyed. The synagogues had been razed or pillaged and stripped and their interiors used as henhouses and stables. In the ancient historic Jewish graveyard on the Mount of Olives, tens of thousands of tombstones had been torn up, broken into pieces or used as flagstones, steps and building materials in Jordanian military installations and civilian constructions. Large areas of the cemetery had been levelled and converted into parking places and petrol-filling stations. I myself, in June 1967, found the graves of my great grandparents and my grandparents profaned and desecrated on the Mount of Olives.

126. Finally, a word of advice to Mr. Nuseibeh. Please do not put statements about Jordan into my mouth or into the mouth of any Israeli representative. We do not suggest and never have suggested the obliteration of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. We have no plan of aggression against

the sovereignty and people of Jordan, as he put it yesterday. He is tying himself up with conflicting statements, becoming confused and forgetting who said what. The statements on Jordan to which he refers were not made by any Israeli spokesman. They were made by the spokesman of the PLO, in 1974, when Yasser Arafat said:

“Jordan is ours, Palestine is ours, and we shall build our national entity on the whole of this land after having freed it of both the Zionist presence and the reactionary traitor presence.”

—meaning his monarch, King Hussein. Or as Mr. Kaddumi put it, as I pointed out yesterday [*ibid.*, para. 54], in the Beirut weekly *As Sayad*, in which he made a statement to the effect that the PLO “demands a political and military presence in Jordan”, an objective which, in his opinion, would “necessitate a change of régime in Jordan”. Or we may take the 10 point declaration of the Palestine National Council of 8 June 1970, point 5 of which calls for a struggle against the present Jordanian régime and point 8 of which reiterates that proposal.

127. Finally, I can only ask again what was the purpose of this debate? Was it for the Arab delegations to score points against us and for us to do the same against them? Where will it lead us? Does anybody here sincerely believe, whatever his political instructions, for reasons of expediency or otherwise, that this is the way to move towards peace?

128. We are aware of an apparent internal struggle at the highest level in Egypt on matters of policy. This was highlighted by, *inter alia*, conflicting emphases in enunciations of policy made on the same day at Cairo by the President of Egypt, on the occasion of the recent visit of the King of Spain, and by his Foreign Minister, when addressing a joint meeting of three parliamentary sub-committees. If the Foreign Minister of Egypt wishes to promote his independent policy, I suggest that he should find some other arena in which to do it and not use the Council chamber. As I said yesterday, the Council does not have to serve a domestic political function in Egypt.

129. Let us have done with this futile exercise in name calling. Let us set out on the road towards peace by reconvening the Geneva Peace Conference with its original participants and by commencing the process of peace which means face-to-face negotiations. There is, in the final analysis, no alternative.

130. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic wishes to exercise his right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

131. Mr. ALLAF (Syrian Arab Republic): First of all I should like to admit that it is very difficult to answer the lies and fabrications continually uttered by the representative of the Zionist régime. As a matter of fact, when I asked to be allowed to speak to answer some of his fabrications of yesterday, I did not know that minutes before I did so we should again hear a new set of lies and a new set of fabrications. I do not intend to answer all of

them, but with the Council's permission I shall set the record straight at least as far as some of them are concerned.

132. The Zionist representative has today repeated the big lie about the Arab Jews who, he says, were driven out of their homes by the Arabs and obliged to leave their countries. Everybody knows that the Arab countries have always been a haven and refuge for all minorities, for all groups. As a matter of fact, this excess of tolerance on the part of the Arabs is the source of their tragedy today, the source of their problems. We have always opened our hearts and arms to all oppressed people from everywhere in the world, and that is how we have so great a number of small minorities, of groups of all faiths, of all races, of all origins, who live in our countries in complete equality with our peoples. If the Arabs were not that tolerant or generous, no Jewish Zionist problem would exist today in the Middle East. As we heard from Mr. Baroody before the Zionist speaker repeated his distortions, the real tragedy of the Palestinians and Palestine was the invasion of Palestine and the Arab lands by those refugees, who came to us in order to escape discrimination and anti-Semitism in Europe and found open hearts and arms in the Arab countries, because we feel we also are Semites and our land, which is the land of the birth of three heavenly religions, is the land of tolerance, of brotherhood and of love. But this the Zionist mentality cannot understand.

133. That is how the Jews first came to our countries. They lived there for centuries in complete brotherhood and equality. It was not the Arab countries which drove out the Jews. It was Israel, the Zionists. As a matter of fact, the late Ben Gurion considered every Jew who did not go to live in Israel, in occupied Palestine, to be committing a sin against his Jewishness, against his religion. And the Zionist régime is still doing this very same thing. That is why they are now trying to ingather Jews from all over the world—Jews who are Jews by religion alone, since they belong to different races, to different civilizations. They want the Soviet Jews to go and settle in Palestine; they want the European Jews to go and settle in Palestine; they want the South African Jews to go and settle in Palestine.

134. We do not believe that religion is a national identity. We believe that religion is the relationship between man and his God. We Moslems do not think we have to ask our Pakistani Moslem brothers to come and settle in Palestine or in Syria in order to be good Moslems, nor do we ask that of our Chinese Moslem brothers. We do not consider the link between us and our Turkish Moslem brothers a link of nationality. There is a certain affinity, a certain affection between people of the same faith. But religion is one thing and nationality and race are something else. And that is why we cannot base our policy on religious discrimination. We cannot discriminate against our citizens just because they happen to belong to the Jewish faith. We are, at least, not accused of doing that to our co-citizens of the Christian faith. If we have to discriminate against Jews, why do we not discriminate against Christians?

135. I have said before and I repeat now that the Palestinians struggling to liberate their country are, many of them, Christians. And there are now Jews struggling against

the Zionists. I have already said that the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization sitting to my left is not a Moslem. He is a Christian. He does not distinguish between Moslems, Christians and Jews. But all this the Zionist mentality cannot understand.

136. The Zionist representative was even unable to avoid contradiction in his very statement. On the one hand, he said that the Arabs had driven out the Arab Jews—800,000 of them—from their countries, and a few pages later he said that Syria was imprisoning Jews and preventing them from leaving Syria. How can we at once be accused of driving out the Jews and of keeping them from leaving the country? He has to choose one of the two lies, either one or the other.

137. The truth is that Israel wishes to kill three birds with one stone by engaging in all these fabrications about the Arab Jews.

138. First, the Israelis want to settle the occupied territory. They need more people in order to uproot more Arabs. They want to replace Arabs by aliens, just because those aliens are Jews. Their plans for the future call for 5 or 10 million additional Jews in Palestine.

139. Secondly, they wish to make propaganda war against the Arabs. They want to accuse the Arabs of engaging in discrimination against the Arab Jews.

140. Thirdly—and this can be seen very clearly from one brief sentence in Mr. Herzog's statement—they want to avoid responsibility for this crime of uprooting the Arabs, even Arab Jews, from their original homes, the responsibility for uprooting the Palestinian Arabs from their homes. They want to say "We are not responsible. All that has happened is a major exchange of population." That is how the Zionist representative put it. They say "We took the Jews from the Arab countries and we drove the Arabs out of Palestine; so let us just forget about our responsibility in regard to the right of the Palestinian refugees to return to their homes or the right of those who do not want to return to receive compensation." That is their mentality.

141. I would make one other comment in this connexion. The aim of the Zionist régime to drive the Arabs from Palestine and ingather the Jews from all over the world is not new. That has been the aim since the first Zionist Congress, held at Basel. Even at that time, Jewish personalities present at that Congress admitted that the Zionist leaders were making a mistake in trying to uproot the Arabs and replace them by Jews from all over the world. The great Jewish philosopher Ahad Ha'am said the following, after he had attended the first Zionist Congress:

"In Basel yesterday I sat lonely among my brothers, like a mourner at a wedding . . . This new enthusiasm is an artificial one, and the results of treacherous hopes will be despair . . . The salvation of Israel"—by that he meant the Jewish people—"will come through prophets and not through diplomats . . . One thing is clear to me: we have destroyed much more than we have built up."

142. That same great philosopher came to Palestine himself as a settler, and wrote the following in the Jewish newspaper *Haaretz* in regard to what he had seen with his own eyes: "Our people wanted no part of this barbarous life . . . What shall we say now if this is really true?" He was referring to the murders of innocent Arabs at Deir Yassin and elsewhere. He continued:

"My God, is this the end? Is this the goal for which our fathers have striven and for whose sake all generations have suffered? Is this the dream of a 'return to Zion', to stain its soil with innocent blood? . . . And now God has afflicted me to have lived to see with my own eyes that I apparently erred . . . If this be the 'Messiah', then I do not wish to see His coming."

143. In an article written by a number of Jewish thinkers and philosophers and published in 1961 in the Jewish magazine *Ikuda's Ner*, the following was stated about the uprooting of the Arab people—the Palestindian refugees—from Palestine:

"Only an internal revolution can have the power to heal our people of their murderous sickness of causeless hatred [for the Arabs]. It is bound to bring complete ruin upon us. Only then will the old and the young in our land realize how great was our responsibility to those miserable Arab refugees in whose towns we have settled Jews who were brought from afar; whose homes we have inherited; whose fields we now sow and harvest; the fruits of whose gardens, orchards and vineyards we gather; and in whose cities that we robbed we put up houses of education, charity and prayer, while we babble and rave about being the 'people of the Book' and the 'light of the nation'."

144. That is what happened to the Palestinian Arabs. Nothing like it happened to the Arab Jews. As a matter of fact, the Arab Jews now regret that, openly or secretly, they left their original countries. The Arab Jews are now regarded as second-class citizens in occupied Palestine, because they are Oriental Jews and the leadership comes from the Sephardim—the European Jews—from the Khazars, to whom Professor Baoddy referred.

145. That was what I wished to say in regard to the Arab Jews.

146. The Zionist representative referred also to our patriots, to the Arab prisoners who, by the thousands, are living in the ugliest and severest conditions in Israeli gaols. He referred to them as "criminals" and as "common murderers". That is a real insult. It is an insult not only to human dignity and human rights: it is an insult to every one of us here. The only crime these people committed was to try to resist the alien occupier, the occupier of their territory. Sometimes they resisted with their bare fists, sometimes with stones. Ninety per cent of them are in their twenties or thirties, young boys and girls, teenagers. The sole crime they committed was to try to oppose the prolonged occupation of their own country. If these people are criminals and common murderers, then that is true of every resistance fighter. It is an insult, really, to every resistance fighter. These people are no different from those

heroic members of the resistance in Europe who fought against the Nazis in the Second World War. They are no different from our brothers who are struggling against *apartheid* in South Africa. They are no different from the people in your own country, Mr. President, who throughout their great history have fought against the invaders and the foreigners. I think the real criminals are those régimes that come and settle the territory of others. The Zionist representative is himself an expert on this matter of repression of innocent people. Mr. Herzog was the first Military Governor of the West Bank after the 1967 aggression. So I can well understand why he chooses to leave this chamber every time an Arab representative speaks. A criminal does not want to listen to a description of his crimes.

147. I do not wish to enter into details in regard to the other lies uttered by the Zionist representative, including his further attempt to drive a wedge between Africans and Arabs and between the Arabs themselves. He was at such pains to go to the records in order to find a statement by one Arab leader against a member of the Palestine Liberation Organization or a statement by one Arab country against another Arab country. Ambassador Abdel Meguid of Egypt said that we Arab countries did have differences, but that most of these differences were the result of the Israeli aggression, the Zionist aggression, against our countries. The Zionist representative mentioned Lebanon and the stand that we have taken in Lebanon. We are not like the Zionists, who are afraid to admit their mistakes. When we believe that some of our brothers are not doing the right thing, we are not afraid to say so. In Lebanon we have tried to say to our Arab brothers from all factions and all sides that they are making a mistake in fighting each other, that the only beneficiary of that is the real enemy, Israel. Israel wanted the massacre and the civil war to take place in Lebanon. As a matter of fact, it is no secret that when peace was restored in Lebanon, with the help of Syria and other Arab countries, the Zionist leaders admitted that now the danger to Israel was very great, because the Arabs would be reunited again and would turn their attention to the occupied territories and to the real danger, which is the Zionist aggression against the Arab countries. The only one that benefited from what was happening in Lebanon was Israel and it was Israel which started it all. Israel's air raids against the refugee camps, civilian towns and villages in Lebanon were the source of all the trouble and all the conflict which erupted after that in Lebanon. So let the Zionist representatives not try to benefit from what takes place between brothers from time to time.

148. As Ambassador Abdel Meguid, my brother from Egypt, said the other day [1995th meeting], the mere fact that we are here sitting side by side—the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the representative of Syria, the representative of Egypt, the representative of Jordan, the representative of Saudi Arabia, the representative of Yemen—indicates that we are one united front against aggression. And we are not alone. We are supported by our African brothers, by our Asian brothers, by our Latin American brothers and by freedom-loving people in Europe, America, the Eastern countries and everywhere in the world.

149. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Saudi Arabia has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

150. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I shall not engage in mud slinging or name calling. I am a man who can really get angry, but I never lose my temper to such an extent as to use invective and cast aspersions at members of the Council or at those who are invited to address the Council. Our upbringing is different. Therefore, I must reply to Mr. Herzog simply by saying that the Zionists are engaged in a process of genocide, and not necessarily only by trying to intimidate the Arabs, by having wiped out Deir Yassin, to which I referred, by killing even the animals and by cutting down the trees of that village. There is genocide by attrition, when a people, who are used to living in homes, are dispersed and their children suffer and die of typhoid or any other disease. Genocide does not have to be carried out by the sword or by the gun. I am reminded of a line written by Oscar Wilde in his *Ballad of Reading Gaol*. As many members know, Oscar Wilde was imprisoned for something which was then a crime but which today happens to be considered not too unusual. But we shall not go into that. And in gaol he must have hobnobbed with all kinds of criminals. He spoke about murderers and about some who committed crimes that might not warrant their being hanged at that time. This is the line: "Some do it with a dagger; others with a smile". In other words, some commit murder with a dagger and others with a smile. Here the word "smile" means that while a person may be smiling in his brother's face, he may cause him to be killed, not necessarily by him, directly or right away, but by some plot. The Zionists have caused the death of many Palestinians not necessarily only in Deir Yassin, but by having evicted them from their country.

151. With respect to Mr. Herzog's reference to capital punishment, in some countries of the Arab world, including my own—I do not know how well versed Mr. Herzog is in Islamic law, but if he has had the time to do research he would know this—even a murderer is treated with mercy and given a chance to live, if the relatives of the victim so decide. That is in Islamic law. He is allowed to live if the relatives agree—if he has children and if he pays an indemnity. In that case, the Government will not hang or decapitate the man.

152. I am not making a comparative study of the law-books of Islam and the Talmud, but we know very well that in the Bible the Mosaic law is "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth". At least Islam tempered that. Christianity prescribes something which is very idealistic, although unfortunately the Christian countries do not practise it: love thy enemy. It is the most practical thing that Jesus said: if you love your enemy you will make him your friend.

153. I do not know why Mr. Herzog should have delved into such practices. Of course we kill. I personally do not think that one should take the life of another. But sometimes I wonder—if you treat the murderer in the sort of way that is advocated by the always-do-gooders, does it

not encourage others to murder and what about the victims? Are they not human? I shall not go here into the controversy of whether or not we should have capital punishment. This is not the place to go into the law of nations pertaining to punishment—whether capital punishment or any other kind. Nor would we solve the problem by pointing to the mote in our brother's eye and not seeing the beam in our own, as I quoted earlier from the New Testament. That will get us nowhere.

154. Mr. Herzog's attitude is, to say the least, aggressive if not arrogant. He said that we Arabs were liars. We are not used to such invective. We may be wrong, but he calls us liars, fakes and so on. I have never used such invective towards him because I was not brought up in that manner. But it is his right to use whatever language he wishes.

155. Suffice it to say that the Zionists have engaged in a slow process of genocide, but they will not succeed for the simple reason that the offspring of the Palestinian refugees, who now number 3 million, are more intransigent than their grandfathers and grandmothers who were evicted from their land or who found that the better part of wisdom was to flee, lest they be subjected to the fate of the people of Deir Yassin who, as I said, were wiped out Joshua-style, in the old tribal way.

156. What does Mr. Herzog want? A Geneva Conference or no Geneva Conference? I want to tell him humbly and not arrogantly or with pretensions that there will be no peace in the Middle East until the Palestinian people's rights are restored.

157. He always mentions mammon—money—what we are earning from our oil. Since he puts so much emphasis on mammon, perhaps we should speak to our leaders and suggest that they should collect money, and we shall buy Palestine from the Zionists, although they took it, and then give it back to the Palestinians. That, I think, is the only way left.

158. There are many non-Zionist Jews in the host country who approach me and say "Why are they behaving like this?" I tell them "Go and talk to your leaders". They are tired of paying taxes through the nose. The host country is becoming like the communists, although it calls itself capitalist. The communists are using the mechanics of capitalism in order to service their debts, and the host country is becoming communist by attrition. There is nothing wrong with that. Be communists at once and be done with it, and then perhaps our question will be solved. Honestly, I am not saying this in jest.

159. Do the Zionists want to drive the United States into a conflict with us? Let me repeat what I said three or four years ago. We have had oil for some 60 years only. Before that time, some Arabs were urban and others were tribal. We have had three empires, which fell, and rightly so, when we got drunk with power and wealth. Now we are emerging, not only because of wealth but also because there is an upsurge of Arab culture in all of us. In 1922, I was one of the first pan-Arabs. Long live Arab unity and even Arab union.

160. But what if the host country, this great United States, took it into its head to chastise us—because the Zionists are very influential. We would rather have all this oil go up in flames. That would be better for us. We should be happier even if we had to go back to tents. We would live the simple life. The United States would not dare to send anyone. It tried that in Viet Nam. It tried it in Korea, and now there is a stalemate.

161. What have we done that those people should egg you on? I am speaking very frankly. Why should I keep it to myself? I am speaking out man to man. Please tell them that we do not hate the Jews. I started to tell Mr. Herzog, but he made fun of me and did not understand what I was saying. I think he has a psychosis. Since Freud, there have been many psychoanalysts. We will send him to one. I do not hate him. I wish him and the Jews in Palestine well. But let them restore the rights of the Palestinians and maintain their Judaistic make-up.

162. The other day [1995th meeting] Mr. Nuseibeh mentioned the old story of how the Caliph Omar, the Patriarch, refused to go and pray in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. I told this story of Moslem tolerance years ago. He refused, saying "If I did, those who come after me may desecrate this place, and I do not want this Church to be touched."

163. Mr. Herzog spoke of "democracy". There are 1 billion Christians in the world, to many of whom Jerusalem is a hallowed place. There are between 600 and 700 million Moslems. There happen to be only 16 million Jews. By what democratic yardstick should the self-styled leaders of these 16 million Jews—and many of them are not Zionists, many of them are good Americans and good Frenchmen—have suzerainty over the Holy Land? If anybody should have suzerainty over Jerusalem, it should be the Christians. But the Christians tried it and renounced it. It is the indigenous people of Palestine who should have it. Many of the Palestinians are Christians and some of them are Jews. So why should the Jews have a monopoly? Because they are the chosen people of God? Does God practise discrimination? God does not discriminate. We are all descendants of the hominid. We know that. We are called *Homo sapiens*. That is a misnomer, because I do not think we act "*sapiens*". They say "On the basis of religion, we want to create a State." That was tried before and did not succeed. Furthermore, many of the Jews in Palestine are secular Jews. They went there because they thought that they would find a refuge. And, as we know, because of the depression in Israel, many are now leaving.

164. And what about "a people without a land and a land without a people"—that rubric, that slogan the Zionists used in the past when they sold the idea that Palestine was a land without a people? I do not say that was a lie—I do not want to be impolite. But it is untrue that Palestine was a land without a people, or that the Jews themselves were a people without a land. Good Lord, did they forget the real estate they owned in Europe, in the United States—everywhere? Many Jews are nationals of States to which they are loyal; but the Zionists want an ingathering of all the Jews. This is the philosophy of political zionism. I say "political zionism" because I differentiate between that and

spiritual zionism. (I visited Mount Zion near Jerusalem in 1925.) They want every Jew to come to Israel. Yet the Jews of Israel are leaving Israel because they cannot make a go of it. The Zionists want to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to release a million and a half Jews. I checked privately with many of my Russian friends, who told me that many Jews are in high places and enjoying a good life in the Soviet Union. Many of them are better off than many other Russians because they are technocrats. They belong to a minority that loves science and they are professors and academicians. Of course, there are a few disgruntled ones. But there are a few disgruntled ones in your country, there are a few disgruntled ones in Saudi Arabia, there are a few disgruntled ones in Germany. Everywhere, there are people who are not satisfied with their lot. It is nothing unusual if some Jews in the Soviet Union are not happy. Some people in other countries are not happy, regardless of the religion to which they belong. Therefore, that is no argument.

165. Let us argue with the Israeli representative, through you, Sir, and tell him: if they want peace, the Arabs—including my country—are ready to encourage the process of peace, provided the Israelis recognize the Palestinian people and restitute the land to them, preserving their entity if they can. But here is the catch: they know that unless they trade with the Arab States, with the African States and with the Balkan States—all those States are in the area, because Palestine is at the crossroads of three continents—they will become insolvent, and they feel that the United States cannot keep feeding them with arms—which cost money—and with aid; nor can the wealthy American Jewish Zionists continue sending them tax-free dollars through the foundations they form. Ask me about it. Somebody in the Navy, not of Arab origin, told me 20 or 25 years ago “I’m burned up”. I said “What’s wrong with you? Why?” He said that at 785 or so Fifth Avenue, the Zionists had formed an American foundation of sorts to receive money for research and development—as if we lacked universities here—but that 90 per cent of that money was being siphoned off to the Hebrew University. I said “Why are you telling this to me?”—and I have never mentioned this; this is the first time—“Go and tell it to your Government. You are an American citizen of Anglo-Saxon origin, too. Why are you telling me this?”

166. This is to show you that we are approaching the point of no return. I sympathize with the innocent Jew who is a victim of that political movement. But the people who consider themselves leaders in Israel should open their eyes and ears and not let what is said in the New Testament and also in the Koran apply to them: “They have eyes and do not see; they have ears and do not hear”. They are human. We do not want any harm to come to them. But at the same time, we cannot afford, officially or unofficially, as Governments, to see our Palestinian brothers sacrificed. Even if we forget that they are Arabs, they are human beings; they have been living in our area since time immemorial, and many of them, ethnologically, were Jews and became Christians or some of them Moslems. We cannot afford to see our Palestinian brothers sacrificed because they will subvert us. I am the one who blurts this out. My Arab colleagues, out of a sense of propriety, may not mention it—as if we were weaklings. But I hasten to

assure you that our Governments do not harbour the design of leaving the Palestinians in jeopardy. But assuming they did take the attitude that they were fed up with those Palestinians, the Palestinians would get rid of our respective Governments. I say “assuming”; I do not say it is a fact.

167. Now, please, I say to my American friends and my Jewish—I do not like to call them “foes”—but, rather, Israeli trouble-makers: take into account that the Arabs cannot afford to see their Palestinian brothers sacrificed, because our Governments would be toppled. But our Governments do not harbour any ideas of leaving our Palestinian brothers to the fate of what one might call European Zionist Khazar machinations. We cannot afford it, and you cannot afford it; your Governments cannot afford it; nor can the Western Powers afford it.

168. Now, what is the alternative? Come and make peace. It is not a peace with the Arab Governments, unless they are what you call “directly concerned” because of the occupied Arab territories, the problem of which emanated originally from the Palestine question. To speak figuratively, you do not kill the serpent of trouble by chopping off its tail; the head is still there. In order to solve the difficulty, we have to crush the serpent’s head. I am speaking figuratively now, mind you. I say this so that Mr. Herzog or his alternates will not think I am speaking aggressively. We have, as you say in English, to take the bull by the horns; we have to crush the serpent’s head. The difficulty can be resolved if the people of Palestine are allowed to exercise their right to self-determination. And if he, or anyone wants to raise the question of human rights and of what type of government each country should pursue and what others should do, well, you know very well, Sir, having been a minister of religion, that many people worship only ritualistically. Otherwise, people would not hate one another or kill one another, especially in Christianity.

169. The ritual of democracy cannot be used in order to hurl invective at people who do not follow the same ritual. Our democracy emanates from the tribal democracy: the chief of the tribe is the servant of the people and, if he is not serving the people, they replace him. And he does not have to be of any party. Those who serve the people best are their leaders. And their leaders are their servants.

170. But we are not here to show our wares. We have our own system. We are not proud of it, nor can you be proud of yours. Sometimes there are certain deviations, not necessarily in the system, but in applying it. But we are trying as human beings to live, to the best of our ability, by respecting the human person and his dignity.

171. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Yemen has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

172. Mr. SALLAM (Yemen): The Zionist representative spoke about Yemen and said that Yemen was very underdeveloped. I cannot deny that. Yemen is an underdeveloped country, true, but we are fighting that underdevelopment. The country was neglected for a long time

during a past era under the Governments of that time. But since 1962, the Yemeni people have had a revolution. Since then, they have been taking one step forward after another. I wish to tell the Zionist representative that this year we have a surplus of \$600 million which came from our people abroad—here in the United States, in Saudi Arabia and in other countries.

173. I should like to remind the Zionist representative that the people who left Yemen in 1947—our Yemeni Jews—did so because the Zionists came to Sana'a and made an agreement with the King of that time to the effect that they should leave. The Yemeni people did not deny them what they wanted. They wanted to leave, but the people were weeping when they left the country because the Yemeni Jews left behind so many things that they used to do and which the Yemeni people did not—for example, all the commercial businesses were in their hands—and we were very sorry that the Yemeni Jews left the country at the time.

174. The Yemeni Jews here in Brooklyn asked me to come and see them during Passover. I went and met them; we ate together; they played the same music that we play in Yemen and we spoke Arabic. We have everything in common with the Jewish people of Yemen but the representatives of the Zionists have nothing whatsoever in common with them.

175. The Israeli representative spoke about some people who had been arrested by the Government. I have no idea whatever from where he got his information. I am sure that it is all fabrications and lies. There is no one under house arrest and there are no political prisoners in Yemen. Those people have become accustomed to telling many lies in the Security Council.

176. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

177. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): In the course of my statement yesterday I mentioned that the Palestine National Council had adopted a resolution, which states:

“Bearing in mind the important achievements accomplished on the Arab and international levels . . . the Palestine National Council decides:

“ . . . To affirm the right of the PLO to participate in all international conferences, forums and efforts dealing with the problem of Palestine and the Arab-Zionist conflict on an independent and equal footing . . . ” [1995th meeting, para. 142].

178. When we came to the Council, we were certain that the Council would endorse the mandate given by the General Assembly to the Secretary-General to pursue the possibility of a conference in order to achieve peace in the area. We did not come here to waste anybody's time. Please do not let us leave this place disillusioned.

179. The Palestine Liberation Organization was referred to as a batch of terrorists. All I can say is that name calling is no substitute for rational discourse. Name calling is an admission of intellectual bankruptcy.

180. The reason why the Zionists do not want peace is very, very clear. Moshe Dayan has said it, David Ben Gurion has said it, Golda Meir has said it, and let me just quote this statement by Moshe Dayan to some American Jewish college students in the summer of 1968:

“During the last 100 years our people have been in the process of building up the country and the nation, of expansion, of giving Jews additional settlements in order to expand the borders here. Let no Jew say that the process has ended. Let no Jew say that we are near the end of the road.”

181. It is quite evident that Tel Aviv is adamantly opposed to any move towards peace.

182. I should like to make a passing reference to the Nationality Law. In time I shall address a letter to the President about the Nationality Law in the land where Palestinians have become non-persons.

183. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): I should like simply to place on record a statement on behalf of my delegation and Government.

184. My delegation has not participated in the current debate in compliance with our previous position regarding the item entitled “The situation in the Middle East”, a position that we have explained on a number of occasions in both the General Assembly and the Security Council.

185. We believe that the following principles constitute a suitable framework for reaching a just solution of the Palestine problem:

—First, the Palestine question is the core of the Middle East problem and, without a just solution of that question, peace can never be achieved in the region. The Palestine question can be solved only when the Palestinian people regain their right to return to their homeland and exercise their right to self-determination.

—Secondly, Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) cannot in any way constitute a framework for any just or lasting solution to the Middle East question. They have been bypassed by events and developments in the attitude of the United Nations and international public opinion.

—Thirdly, the General Assembly adopted a proper attitude in dealing with the Palestine question in adopting resolutions 3236 (XXIX) and 3237 (XXIX) reaffirming the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, resolution 3376 (XXX) proposing means designed to enable the Palestinian people to achieve their national rights, resolution 3379 (XXX) condemning Zionism as a racist movement and resolution 31/20 regarding the implementation of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to return to their

homes and properties and to achieve self-determination, national independence and sovereignty.

186. Those resolutions of the General Assembly reflect profound and important changes. Basically, they call for a review of the entire question and of the ways of dealing with it. For that reason, we did not participate in the

debate concerning the situation in the Middle East and the report of the Secretary-General submitted under General Assembly resolution 31/62—more particularly, since we also did not participate in the debate or in the vote concerning that Assembly resolution.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.