



Security Council

PROVIS IONAL

S/PV.2726
8 December 1986

ENGL ISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 8 December 1986, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. WALTERS

(United States of America)

Members: Australia
Bulgaria
China
Congo
Denmark
France
Ghana
Madagascar
Thailand
Trinidad and Tobago
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
United Arab Emirates
United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland
Venezuela

Mr. WOOLCOTT
Mr. TSVETKOV
Mr. YU Mengjia
Mr. GAYAMA
Mr. BIERRING
Mr. de KEMOULARIA
Mr. GBEHO
Mr. RABETAP IKA
Mr. KASEMSRI
Mr. MOHAMMED
Mr. BELONOGOV
Mr. AL-SHAALI
Mr. BIRCH
Mr. FABON GARCIA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 4.50 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE OCCUPIED ARAB TERRITORIES

LETTER DATED 4 DECEMBER 1986 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ZIMBABWE TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/18501)

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings on this item, I invite the representative of Zimbabwe to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco and the Syrian Arab Republic to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber; I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe), took a place at the Council table; Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Netanyahu (Israel), Mr. Salah (Jordan), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Slaoui (Morocco) and Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber; Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Mr. GBED (Ghana): I should like, Sir, to convey to you the sincere congratulations of the Ghana delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of December. You are a highly acclaimed diplomat with an enormous power of persuasion. It is our hope, therefore, that under your experienced and esteemed guidance the Council will reaffirm its central role in the maintenance of international peace and security.

I wish also to pay a tribute to Sir John Thomson, Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, for his energetic and skilful leadership of the Council during the month of November.

The Security Council has convened in response to the tragic events that have

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

unfolded and are still escalating in Jerusalem, in particular the unfortunate events of 4 December 1986. The importance and urgency attached to Security Council consideration of the current situation stem not only from the tragic loss of human life in the city but also from the real potential that the increasing violence has for the breach of international peace and security. The Ghana delegation hopes, therefore, that the Council will act decisively in pursuance of its solemn mandate.

A few days ago, on 4 December to be exact, Israeli occupation forces armed with submachine guns and tear gas opened fire on a group of Palestinian students from Bir Zeit University in occupied territory. Reports indicate that two Palestinian students were killed and 15 others wounded. The two dead suffered fatal bullet wounds in the head and chest. It is alleged that in related incidents Israeli security forces abducted from hospitals some of the Palestinian patients undergoing treatment. The display of Israeli force, it is further reported, was in response to defenceless students' demonstrations.

The latest incidents have their immediate cause in the attempt by occupation forces to suppress Palestinian student protests against aerial, artillery and naval attacks on Palestinian camps in southern Lebanon and to acknowledge the solidarity felt by the rest of the world. As Council members are fully aware, these incidents occurred in the wake of violent intercommunal clashes a fortnight earlier in the vicinity of the old city of Jerusalem. My delegation is therefore not surprised that the demonstrations on 4 December ended in violent confrontation.

Since the Council began consideration of this important and urgent matter last Friday, 5 December 1986, my delegation has listened with keen interest to the debate, and especially to the statement of the Permanent Representative of Israel, who gave an account of the events leading to the tragedy as his Government saw them. It is now clear that the main ingredients of the incident on 4 December have been established: that is, Palestinian students congregated at the Bir Zeit University on the fateful day to hold demonstrations, which the Israeli authorities

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

feared might end in violence; the authorities therefore took measures on that day to block the main road to the University, threw canisters of tear-gas at the students and finally opened fire on them.

Without wishing to dwell too long on details, let me state that, as far as the Ghana delegation is concerned, it finds the Israeli handling of the situation far from satisfactory, because it lacked the distinct impression of an effort to avoid and defuse tension in a timely fashion. The Permanent Representative of Israel confirmed to the Security Council that his Government had been in possession of prior intelligence reports to the effect that students at the University would demonstrate. Even if the occupying authorities had not possessed this information, they could also not have failed to infer that Palestinian students, who overwhelmingly rejected and denounced the Israeli presence in Jerusalem, were likely to hold demonstrations on a day devoted by the international community to the expression of solidarity with the Palestinian people. Was it impossible to take peaceful steps among the community to ensure that the day would be marked without violence? Were such peaceful initiatives impossible among a population that the Permanent Representative of Israel has said was the happy beneficiary of Israeli munificence and enlightenment? Or was Israel reacting angrily to what it perceived to be international support for Palestinians? These are judicious questions.

Furthermore, the representative of Israel told the Council that the occupying forces were under instructions to fire at the feet of the students. How then does he account for the fatal wounds to the head and chest of the deceased and what action has been taken to establish the reason for injuries sustained by unarmed and defenceless students to various parts of their bodies other than their feet? One cannot but conclude that perhaps excessive force was used to clamp down on what was tantamount to an annoying but peaceful ventilation of a political viewpoint.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

It is quite clear that the Israeli authorities, true to character, sought confrontation on this unhappy occasion as a reminder in order forcibly to maintain compliance with its dictates in that part of Jerusalem.

Viewed also against the background of other events in the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, one is easily convinced that the Israeli occupying authorities unfortunately put greater faith in the violent punishment of their subjects than in the exploration of peaceful avenues for peace. This is indeed regrettable as it also has serious connotations in international law.

Accumulated Israeli actions of indiscriminate killings, abduction, administrative arrest and harassment of the Arab population of Jerusalem and other occupied territories violate the spirit and terms of the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. Israel is obligated by law to fulfil the terms of this international Convention with regard to its responsibilities to the Palestinian population in the areas under its occupation. This very Council has in the past found Israel in breach of the Convention and has held it to obligations under the Convention. The Council therefore must unequivocally condemn what has become Israel's habitual breach of the terms of international law and seek immediate rectification of that country's practices in respect of the captive population in the occupied territories.

My delegation is particularly exercised by the current situation because escalating tensions in Jerusalem, the West Bank and Gaza Strip are symptomatic of the permanent state of violence afflicting the region resulting from the brutal suppression of Palestinian national rights by the occupying Power, Israel. Each act of violence, indeed each death, deepens the level of antagonism and confrontation. Each act of injustice invokes vengeful retribution. Each bullet fired sows the seed of international confrontation in the area.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

In the context of the deteriorating situation in the Middle East as a whole, the events in Jerusalem and the occupied territories must alert the Council to assume its proper role in facilitating proposed international arrangements to address comprehensively the question of peace in the Middle East which has at its core a just settlement of the Palestinian question. For I fear that the intractable combination of forces prevailing in the region and the drift towards confrontation may once more leave the Council as a well-intentioned bystander after the fact.

The logical question in the present circumstance is: what can the Security Council do to facilitate the early return to security and political normalcy? My delegation believes that the Council must make a quick and objective assessment of the present violent conflict and proceed to the adoption of a resolution which would unequivocally condemn the unnecessary shooting of Palestinians by the occupying Power, request the release of all those detained in order to defuse tension, call for respect by Israel of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, its withdrawal from all parts of the occupied territories, and respect for the international character of Jerusalem. I hope also that the Council will act in concert in order to bring its collective authority to bear on the volatile situation prevailing in the occupied territories.

In this regard, let me state for the consideration of the Council that it would be infinitely more appropriate to adopt such an imperfect resolution than to do nothing and therefore indirectly condone the steady deterioration in the occupied territories with its dire consequences for international peace and security.

My delegation considers it important to address a specific appeal to the many friends and allies of Israel, both in this Council and outside it, to abandon the unhelpful posture of seeking unilateral arrangements outside the Council which

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

have had the effect of bolstering Israel in its pernicious disregard of Palestinian national rights. After all, Israeli's policy over the years of resorting to unilateral military bravado has not produced the atmosphere of peace and security which are the sine qua non for good-neighbourliness and the settlement of the conflict generally in the subregion.

The lessons of recent history now more than ever validate the call for concerted international action under the auspices of the United Nations to achieve a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East crisis without preconditions. I hope that representatives on the Council can respond positively and urgently in this case.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Ghana for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. de KEMOULARIA (France) (interpretation from French): What a pleasure it is, Mr. President, to see you presiding over the Security Council, and what can we say, after what others have said? A general, a diplomat, a man of government, a friend of many, speaking seven languages - and I shall not compare it with my own French when I even doubt my own grammar sometimes - a friend of France: I can only express my delegation's gratification at seeing you presiding over the Security Council with your well-known talents.

I should also like to recall - and since Sir John is not here, I should like to ask his alternate to be kind enough to say - that we admired his diplomatic qualities and the advice which he lavished on us, the subtlety which he showed in presiding over the Council for the last month. I hope this will be conveyed to him.

With your permission, now I should like to return to the very serious subject which we have to deal with.

(Mr. de Kemoularis, France)

For many weeks now, tension has been mounting once again in Jerusalem and on the West Bank and particularly around the University of Bir Zeit. This heightened tension was highlighted on 4 December 1986 by tragic developments: two students aged 22 were shot dead by an Israeli military detachment while the University had been closed down for three days.

Furthermore, last Friday, a youth of 14 years was killed at about noon, shot dead by an Israeli patrol in the refugee camp of Balata, near Nablus. According to the spokesman for the Israeli army, the patrol was attacked with stones.

Finally, we learned that this very morning, in the same camp, a young boy of 12 years was shot through the head in identical circumstances.

The French Government has publicly expressed its grave concern at these bloody events. It deplores the escalation of acts of violence and repression. It would recall that it is the duty of the Israeli authorities to respect the Fourth Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949 on the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War.

Needless to say, these acts of violence draw attention to the urgent need to bring about a comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East which is both lasting and just.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of France for his statement and for his excessive and kind words addressed to me.

Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): I should like to extend to you, Sir, our sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December. Aware as we are of your well-known political and diplomatic experience, I am convinced that under your leadership the Security Council will discharge the heavy responsibilities that it faces this month.

I should also like to pay a tribute to the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, Sir John Thomson, for his competent and effective guidance of the Council during the month of November.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria fully shares the profound concern of the international community on the continuing deterioration of the situation in the Middle East where every single incident can lead to the gravest and most uncontrollable consequences, even to the outbreak of a further bloody confrontation. This very dangerous turn of events recently in that part of the world, one of the most dangerous hotbeds of tension over the past 40 years, requires this world Organization to take urgent and effective measures to bring about the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

My delegation accordingly supports Zimbabwe's request, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, for the Council's immediate consideration of the situation in the Israeli-occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories, including Jerusalem.

As the world knows full well, Israel's policies and practices of repression in the occupied Arab territories have more than once been the subject of consideration and condemnation by the international community, as well as by the Security Council, as demonstrated by the numerous resolutions on this subject. However, Israel continues to trample underfoot the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine. This is made clear by the news emanating daily from that part of the

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

world about alarming cases of arbitrary action; mass arrests; closure of universities, schools and roads; punitive actions and air raids against civilian targets or Palestinian refugee camps, resulting in a growing number of casualties. Furthermore, attempts are still being made to effect illegal changes in the legal status, the demographic structure and historical character of Palestinian and other occupied territories, including Jerusalem. Those territories have been subjected in particular to a campaign of expansion and mass colonization on an unprecedented scale.

Against that background, the international community has expressed deep indignation in condemning the latest incidents at Bir Zeit University and the resulting bloodshed in which two students were killed and dozens wounded.

No specious arguments about safeguarding security and the fight against terrorism, no demagogic declaration on Israel's so-called peaceful intentions, and its alleged desire to improve the living standards of the inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories can serve to justify such acts by the State of Israel. The Members of the United Nations have, by an overwhelming majority, quite clearly and unambiguously declared on many occasions that such irresponsible acts by Israel are in flagrant contradiction with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, the elementary rules of international law, the existing international conventions, and in particular the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. Such acts also increase tension in the region and constitute a serious obstacle to the attainment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. That view was reaffirmed once again most vigorously in the recent discussion in the General Assembly of the question of Palestine and the situation in the Middle East. The vast majority of the States Members of the United Nations are at one in believing that it is high time for

(Mr. Tavetkov, Bulgaria)

Israel to yield to the will of the international community and to implement the relevant Security Council resolutions, which so far it has taken upon itself to ignore with impunity.

The developments in the Middle East and the debates of the past few days clearly demonstrate the importance and urgency of finally arriving at a comprehensive solution to the problem of the Middle East that will put an end, once and for all, to the suffering of the sorely tried Arab population, in particular the Palestinian Arabs. The solution must be based above all on Israel's complete and unconditional withdrawal from all Arab territories occupied since 1967 and the implementation of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to its own Palestinian State.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria is convinced that such a comprehensive settlement of all the complicated and interrelated problems of the Middle East, that takes into account the interests of all States of the region, will come about only through an international conference with the participation on an equal footing of all the interested parties, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions and decisions.

For that idea to become a reality - an idea which the majority of States have welcomed - a preparatory committee within the Security Council should be set up immediately, with the participation of its permanent members, and entrusted with the preparation of that conference.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Bulgaria for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. BIRCH (United Kingdom): First, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. You have already shown that you will conduct our affairs with your customary skill

(Mr. Birch, United Kingdom)

and expedition. I would not want to add to the tribute paid by the representative of France, except to say that it brings my delegation a special pleasure to note that the foundation of your skills was laid during your education in England.

I should also like to thank those colleagues who have said very kind words about Sir John Thomson for his conduct of the Security Council last month.

The violence and tension of recent days in East Jerusalem, Bir Zeit and other parts of the occupied territories are a matter of grave concern to my Government. The killing of a Jewish student in the Old City of Jerusalem on 15 November was deplorable. So, too, have been the activities carried out by Jewish extremists against the Moslem population of the Old City, both before and after that incident. Those activities continued despite appeals by the authorities for calm. The spiral of violence thus created has led inevitably to more deaths, injuries and disturbances, and has spread to other parts of the occupied territories.

(Mr. Birch, United Kingdom)

We condemn recourse to violence by whatever side and for whatever motive. We have heard with concern reports of the use of excessive force by the authorities of Israel, the occupying Power, including the use of live ammunition against unarmed protesters. We recall that, in our view and that of the Security Council as a whole, the part of Jerusalem occupied by Israel since 1967, like the remainder of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, constitutes occupied territory to which the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War are applicable.

The permanent representative of Israel said that he could not see a more benign military administration in history. My Government is opposed to the continuance of Israeli military occupation, but as long as that military occupation continues, and in the absence of a political settlement it is incumbent upon the Israeli Government to ensure that its administration is indeed as benign as claimed. The killing by the security forces of two students of Bir Zeit University on 4 December and that of a young boy at Nablus on 5 December seem to have been an overreaction and are greatly to be regretted. This underlines the need for the greatest restraint by the security forces if the serious situation is not to be made even worse. The only ones to benefit from a worsening of the present tense atmosphere on the West Bank would be the extremists on both sides.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for his kind words about whatever qualities I may have that he attributed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Israel. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): It is useful to ask the purpose of this debate. If the purpose is the discussion of the restoration of civil order, or the method by which civil order can be restored, that is one possible agenda. One should then consider whether it is appropriate for this Council. I think that the fair-minded countries represented at this table would consider that that, potentially, is the only subject for discussion here today.

However, even under that more rigorous agenda item, there is no place to discuss it, simply because we are dealing here with a definite provocation, a systematic provocation, to which the Government has reacted. We are dealing with a situation that the Government is + to pacify as best it can and to get calm and order restored. It is very c the convening of this meeting is intended to achieve the exact opposite.

I shall not belabour this point, because it would indeed be possible to sit here and to recount all the gory incidents and bloody wars that are taking place at this very moment not very far from us in Israel, but that are not brought to this table. Yet I must say that, even under the narrow agenda of the restoration of civil order, there is no place for this topic at this meeting.

However, that is not the purpose of this meeting, because those who asked that it be convened have a broader agenda. It is a political, propagandistic agenda that consists essentially to haul Israel in, put it before a makeshift tribunal and subject it to political attacks, ostensibly on the questions of Judea, Samaria, the so-called West Bank, but really on the whole legitimacy of Israel's existence. I do not think that is the wish of the fair-minded countries, but it is very clear from the direction the debate is going that that is the underlying purpose behind it.

Now, there have been so many things said around this table within this distorted agenda - the broader political attack against my country - that I am

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

forced to make a few elementary points. The most elementary of those points is that the reason we have a problem in the first place is because the hostility of those in the Arab world who reject Israel began before there was a State of Israel. They attacked the right of the Jews to their own homeland before there was a State of Israel. They launched an attack on us in 1948. In the so-called West Bank, they destroyed the Jewish communities that had lived there since the time of Abraham and David and the Bible and the thousand-year history after the Bible and the thousand-year history after that - the 3000 years of Jewish continuity in the Jewish homeland in communities like Bethlehem, Hebron, the old Jewish quarter in Jerusalem destroyed by those who opposed any sort of Jewish existence, any sort of Jewish independence. That was the 1948 attack. It did not work. Thus our first crime: we survived.

Then came the second great attempt in 1967. That attempt was launched from the territories occupied - and I use that word, for it applies - by the Jordanians to attack Israel. That did not work either, and, as a result of that attack, those territories used for the proposed second annihilation of Israel came under Israeli control. Israel and the Jewish people returned to the places from which they had been kicked out by the Arab occupants during the only part of their history there, namely, the 19 years of rule under Jordan. That is the second crime.

Now we are asked by the people who used those territories - and by the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) specifically, which was set up in 1964 before the Six-Day War, before those territories reverted to Israeli control - to vacate those territories so that they may annihilate us once again.

I listened very carefully as Ambassador Mahsouh went to great pains to explain to us that that is not the PLO's goal. Let the PLO speak for itself. It claims in all its statements - including those pamphlets fresh off the mint and including that map that shows "all of Palestine" - all of mandatory Palestine, including

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

Jordan. But right now they are concentrating on the 20 per cent of it that is Israel, and they wish, as they did in 1964 when the territory was in Arab hands, to annihilate the Jewish State. This is what we are talking about.

We obviously do not intend to be annihilated, and we also would like to have the opportunity to settle politically the status of those disputed territories. I have heard voiced around this table the extraordinary notion that any military administration is negative from the start. On that basis, one could take the example of Nazi Germany, which first of all used its territory to attack other countries, was occupied by the Allies for a good period of time in what I would think was, by any consensus, a benign military administration, and some of whose territories were then returned to their former owners while other reverted to German control after a period of administration. There was, however, a military administration by the Allies in that country that launched an aggressive war.

Jordan, supported by the PLO, launched an aggressive war against the Jewish State, not with the intention of conquest, but with the intention of annihilation, at least on the part of the PLO. That failed.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

So we are awaiting the day when our immediate neighbour to the east, in particular, will change its objective. Until that day comes, we have not acted unilaterally; we await a political settlement in direct negotiations with our neighbours. Until that time, we - just like others on other occasions in history - have to administer that territory. We administer it, true, with a military administration, but we have gone well beyond the normal provisions of military government. We have assured freedom of access, freedom of religion, freedom of movement, academic freedom. We have opened universities, which did not exist before. We have opened banks. We have improved the living standards in a way beyond comparison with any other administration in history.

We are asked, how we can talk about the munificence of Israeli occupation. That is not what I am talking about. Nobody is suggesting that this particular Arab minority wants to live under Israeli sovereignty or Israeli rule. This is something that has to be negotiated. I would say this: if any minority here did not want to live under the majority that runs its host country, if this rule were accepted around this table, there would be civil war and worse, irredentism of the worst kind, in at least half the countries represented in the United Nations. That is not the point. The point is that while we are awaiting a political settlement, we try to institute the most tolerant, the most humane rule that is possible.

The interesting question is, while people are saying things around this table, what do the people on the ground say? There is a very useful indicator to what people really think. It is not what they say, it is what they do, and it is what they do with their feet. One million crossings, 500,000 in each direction, have

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

been registered over the Allenby Bridge and other bridges along the Jordan. If the situation were the terrible one described here, why would these people keep coming back with their families, not only to the territories - Judea, Samaria, the so-called West Bank - but to visit Israel? They come from Jordan, Saudi Arabia, hundreds of thousands of tourists. They come to take their summer vacation, to do business, to go to university. This is the reality; this is what we are trying to do.

But we still are faced with a most serious problem, and that is the refusal of our neighbours to the east to negotiate with us. And we are still faced with the intention of the PLO and others to annihilate Israel. I heard it said here that the PLO had had an intellectual and historical reconciliation - with Israel, it was said, and then I think it was corrected: "No, with the Jews." I suppose that means they have allowed those Jews born in or who came to Palestine, like most Arabs, before 1917 to stay there. By the time we have the negotiations there will be about three left. Maybe it means the kind of reconciliation with the Jewish people that is registered in calendars such as the annual 1966 calendar that the PLO published, which celebrated the Munich massacre and the Ma'alot massacre. There has been no such reconciliation, I am afraid. There has been a stated policy, on the part of the PLO since its inception of engaging in terror and terror tactics to provoke a war to lead to the annihilation of Israel. If that war and that strategy require first that Israel be reduced to the indefensible 1967 boundaries, so be it. If that strategy requires, further, that diplomacy be adopted as a complementary means to terrorism, so be it as well.

What we are witnessing here is, in fact, a dual strategy. The dual strategy essentially goes like this. You fight with terror; you attack Jews relentlessly, remorselessly, anywhere in the world and especially in the Middle East; and you

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

come to the international forums and wave a bogus olive branch. You try to get Israel into a political box, if you will, using diplomacy to extract from it what you cannot achieve on the ground, to extract from it, in fact, a return to indefensible boundaries so that you can deliver the coup de grâce.

This is not a new system; it was used earlier in the century by the mentors of the PLO. The Mufti had a close association with Hitler, and I think that aside from the terror tactics and the virulent hatred of Jews they picked up another idea. That idea was that you could couple diplomacy with war. It is a very effective means, a very effective combination.

That is the whole idea of the international peace conference, because the PLO has not changed its objective one iota. The objective of an international peace conference, supported by the PLO, called for by the PLO, called for by the likes of Syria, which repeatedly reiterates its intention to fight Israel to the finish, to annihilate Israel, is not peace. What they seek is not reconciliation. What they seek is a larger Munich massacre, and this is something we will not lend our hand to.

So, we have a festering problem. We have a refusal by our neighbours to negotiate in good faith, to enter into direct negotiations. We have at the same time the provocation of terror and riots, the attempt to drag Israel into a larger war with its neighbours, and the attempt by countries that do not have Israel's goodwill or for that matter the goodwill of peace to exert international pressure and orchestrate a forum to which Israel would be brought and hanged, drawn and quartered - and after an unfair trial to boot. This is something that the United Nations, the General Assembly and certainly the Security Council should not acquiesce in.

If the draft resolution that we have seen is indeed adopted by the Security Council, it will confirm our judgement that the Security Council is allowing itself to be abused in the worst possible way.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, on whom I now call.

Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Again I might pose the same question and ask what we are discussing here. While we deliberate, as mentioned earlier by the representative of France, a 12-year-old boy, Ramadan Mohammad Zeiton, has been shot dead this afternoon. Four others were wounded, some of them seriously, when the Israeli occupation forces opened fire on the refugees in the Balata Refugee Camp. What we are discussing is not whether or not Israel will respect the Fourth Geneva Convention, but how and who will undertake to ensure respect for that Convention. This is the issue with which the Council is faced.

I do not want to recall all that has happened in the last four days. We have all read about it in the press and watched it on television. We have watched Jewish and Arab students in the university together protesting at and condemning the force used in the iron-fist policy of the occupying Power. But what has happened today? In Jerusalem, for example, in the girl's school of Al Mamouniah and Dar-al-Awlad Israeli troops threw gas canisters on students who were protesting at the violence used by the occupying Power and at the arrest of some of their colleagues, seven boys and five girls from the school. In the Al-Sawahra area, just east of Jerusalem and in the old city of Jerusalem Israeli occupation forces confronted with the iron fist and with force demonstrators who were expressing their rejection of the perpetuation of occupation.

The Israeli army of occupation has besieged the following schools today: the Ramallah Secondary School, the Aziz Shaheen Girls School, the school in the refugee camp of Al-Am'ari, the Bireh School, and in the Am'ari camp the forces of the Israel army have raided the school in "self-defence". In the Jelazon refugee camp again the Israeli army, that so-called benign army, has sealed the entrances to the

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine
Liberation Organization)

refugee camp. In Nablus again the army has confronted the demonstrators who were venting their rejection of the practices of the iron policy, and by 9 o'clock local time this morning the army had arrested 22 young people at Nablus. In the Balata refugee camp the army imposed a curfew, but of course the people there had opposed and challenged that curfew, and walked out in a demonstration, using stones again, to confront the Israeli army of occupation.

In Gaza again the burial of the martyr who was killed in the Bir Zeit turned into a demonstration. Of course the army was there to open fire in the air and gas canisters were thrown. And when the ambulances came to carry away those who were injured, the army stopped the ambulances from taking them to hospitals.

In the Arab refugee camp near Hebron, as well as in Bethlehem, similar confrontations with the army of occupation have taken place. In Hebron itself the Polytechnic School was also the scene of the same confrontations between the army of occupation and the students, who were also venting their opposition to the permanence of occupation. In the Al-Rhadar village near Bethlehem the settlers joined together with the forces of occupation and attacked both the boys' school and the girls' school of the village. Now all these occurrences, attacks, crimes - call them whatever you wish - only go to show that prolonged occupation necessarily engenders resistance. Then, the real issue is occupation and the prolonged occupation. And I must tell you that we Palestinians will remain there like sitting ducks. We shall resist.

Unfortunately, our weapons are no more than a stone, an empty bottle, a homemade bottle-explosive, sometimes a dagger. But we will not simply sit there and be killed.

A lot has been said about this country, my country, where I was born and raised, and where I am denied the right to be in my own home, and so are millions of Palestinians.

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine
Liberation Organization)

What is the solution? But in the meanwhile, what are the responsibilities of the occupying Power? Naturally, in 1949 the international community developed some sort of mechanism that would govern the behaviour of occupying troops and occupying Powers. That is what we usually refer to as the Fourth Geneva Convention. Of course on the question of Jerusalem, as we said, a yeshiva student was stabbed to death. But was he just stabbed, or was that the result of continuous provocations by the students in that yeshiva school, as admitted by the chief of Israeli police? Then, in the final analysis, who is responsible? According to article 29 of the Geneva Convention:

"The party to the conflict in whose hands protected persons may be responsible for the treatment accorded to them by its agents irrespective of any individual responsibility which may be incurred."

The occupying Power had failed - and I would go beyond that and say that the occupying Power prepared the atmosphere and the ambience for these provocations, because had that occupying Power respected the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention, we would not have that yeshiva school in the whole city but simply because the violation started there, that was the inevitable result of the violation. So it is a chain and not a cycle. And the chain started with the occupation itself.

We are being told all the time that we should have a peaceful and political solution. But I ask: why did the Palestine Liberation Organization come to the United Nations in 1974 in the first place? Was it not very clear from the statement made by the Chairman of the Executive Committee, Yassar Arafat, when he said: I come with an olive branch. Of course he had to maintain the machine gun as well of the freedom fighter. But the olive branch was rejected. By whom? By those who still occupy and violate the basic rights of our people.

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine
Liberation Organization)

Again on 1 October 1977, when the United States and the Soviet Union had a joint communiqué about the peace efforts - I should like to have it very clearly on record that the only party to the conflict in the Middle East that welcomed that was the Palestine Liberation Organization - and I would underline "the only party". And what did that joint communiqué say? It said that the United States and the Soviet Union "believe that within the framework of a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem, all specific questions of the settlement should be resolved, including such key issues as withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied since the 1967 conflict, the resolution of the Palestinian question, including ensuring the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, termination of the state of war, and the establishment of normal peaceful relations on the basis of mutual recognition of the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence".

That communiqué goes on to say:

"The United States and the Soviet Union believe that the only right and effective way for achieving a fundamental solution to all aspects of the Middle East problem in its entirety is negotiations within the framework of the Geneva Peace Conference, specially convened for these purposes, with the participation in its work of the representatives of all the parties involved in the conflict, including those of the Palestinian people, and legal and contractual formalization of the decisions reached at the Conference."

That was on 1 October in 1977, a call for a peace conference, at which all the parties, including the representatives of the Palestinian people, would sit together and consider a peace effort. The Palestine Liberation Organization welcomed that call, because the representative of the Palestinian people is the Palestine Liberation Organization.

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine Liberation
Organization)

That is how we sit here, and that is why we sit here. That is what Palestinians say. All these demonstrations, all the activity and all the referendums that are undertaken in the occupied Palestinian territory say it without any ambiguity: the PLO is the Palestinians' sole and legitimate representative. It may be that some people do not like the PLO, but if it is the wish of the Palestinian people that the PLO represent them at least the international community should show respect. And the international community has shown respect, although it may be that some have not done so, for the will of the Palestinian people. Perhaps that is another reason why the war continues, because some people refuse to respect the will of the Palestinian people, the principal party to the conflict.

Again, Sir, in 1983 we were among the first to support the call for the convening of an international peace conference, and that is why we are sitting today in the Council Chamber. It may be, Sir, that under your presidency we can start the process, but that process has been obstructed. Moreover, with no ambiguity whatsoever, the Palestine Liberation Organization, through a statement and a message by its Chairman, Yasser Arafat, has said - and this has been conveyed to the Government of the United States -

"In view of our genuine desire for peace we are ready to negotiate, within the context of an international conference, with the participation of the permanent members of the Security Council and with the participation of all concerned Arab parties and the Israeli Government, a peaceful settlement of the Palestinian problem on the basis of the pertinent United Nations resolutions, including Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and the first step to that would be an affirmation by the United States of Palestinian self-determination."

That offer by the Palestine Liberation Organization has been rejected. To us that means that the prospects for peace have been rejected, because an imposed

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine Liberation
Organization)

peace seems to be in the offing and in the making. Thus we wish to state very clearly here that while we are discussing all these issues, and while we are deliberating whether we like one word here or one word there, more people are being killed because of the violation by the occupying Power of its obligations under the Fourth Geneva Convention. Other such incidents may be happening all around the world - and we do not deny that they do happen - but this is the only case where the behaviour of the occupying Power is governed by a convention known as the Fourth Geneva Convention, and we trust that this Council will ensure respect for that Convention.

The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers inscribed on my list and there has been no draft resolution as such presented, to my knowledge. The next meeting of the Security Council will, in the light of the discussions going on, be communicated to members by the Secretariat.

Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) (interpretation from French): My delegation, Sir, would have liked to have had more normal conditions in which to offer you our congratulations.

I should simply like, on behalf of the non-aligned group of the Security Council, to suggest that since we no longer have any speakers - as you have just said - and since it seems that, given the rate at which consultations are proceeding, the Council is almost ready to take a decision, the Council could meet at the latest tomorrow morning to take a decision on the draft resolution, rather than holding up the work of the Council any longer.

The PRESIDENT: Consultations are still under way and we will communicate the time of the next meeting through the Secretariat as soon as we have arrived at it.