

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

NINTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records

2nd
PLENARY MEETINGFriday, 29 January 1982,
at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Ismat T. KITTANI (Iraq)

AGENDA ITEM 5

The situation in the occupied Arab territories

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): Before calling on the first speaker, I should like to propose that the list of speakers be closed on Monday, 1 February, at 6 p.m. May I take it that the Assembly agrees to this proposal?

It was so decided.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): I now call on the first speaker in the debate, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic, Mr. Abdul Halim Khaddam.

3. Mr. KHADDAM (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, I should like to thank you for your efforts in conducting the work of the General Assembly and organizing its business so that the Assembly will fulfil the objectives of this session.

4. I take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, on the confidence that has been placed in him by the international community in electing him to this high post. The objectivity, wisdom, seriousness of purpose and neutrality characterizing Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar in his handling of the issues make us hopeful and optimistic. I wish to assure him of our co-operation, especially in matters related to right and justice and the furtherance of peace and security in the world.

5. I am also in duty bound to praise, in this forum, the outstanding qualities of the outgoing Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, who for a whole decade devoted his time and efforts to the United Nations. He well understood the major problems of the world, particularly the problems of the third world. He also understood the Palestine issue and the complicated problems resulting therefrom. He realized the dangers that would arise from that issue if the international community failed to establish a just peace in the Middle East. I hail him from this rostrum and wish him good health and happiness.

6. This special emergency session of the General Assembly is being held in grave and extremely complicated international circumstances. The potentials of confrontation have emerged after the phase of détente. The world is now experiencing a new state of fear and anxiety in view of the possibility of a world collapse that would undermine the relative stability achieved by the peoples of the world in the years since the Second World War.

7. In this turbulent international atmosphere, Israel has taken a new aggressive step by enacting a law annexing to the Israeli entity the occupied Syrian Arab territories in the Golan Heights. The Assembly undoubtedly realizes the grave implications of such a law. On the one hand, it constitutes a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and of Security Council resolution 338 (1973).

On the other, it represents usurpation of part of the national soil of the Syrian Arab Republic. That Israeli step manifests the aggressive and expansionist objectives of the Zionist entity in Palestine, which aims at establishing a State extending from the Nile to the Euphrates at the expense of our existence, our future and our national interests, as well as at the expense of peace and security in the region and the world.

8. We have chosen to resort to the international legitimacy represented by the Security Council so that the proper position is taken in order to tackle this dangerous situation. We have done so because of our desire to consolidate the role of the international Organization and out of consideration for international security and peace. The repercussions of the situation in the Middle East will not be confined to the territorial boundaries of the region but will extend to the international situation, because of the region's location and its strategic and economic importance.

9. The Security Council has debated this dangerous situation, and in its resolution 497 (1981) of 17 December 1981, it stressed the gravity of the problem and of the Israeli decision. The Council emphasized its rejection of the Israeli decision and considered it null and void. It called upon the Israeli Government to rescind it forthwith, and decided to resume its work within two weeks in order to take the appropriate measures in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

10. After the fixed period had elapsed, the Council met to discuss and adopt the appropriate measures. The majority decided on a draft resolution¹ which, it believed, represented the necessary minimum for tackling this dangerous situation, which constitutes a real threat to peace and security. That draft resolution was, however, frustrated by the veto of the United States,² and thus, as a result of the American decision to exercise the veto, the Security Council failed to adopt the appropriate resolution.

11. Faced with the inaction to which the Security Council had been reduced, the majority had to resort to the General Assembly,³ availing itself of the Council's right to refer the issue to a body in which no veto could be exercised to block any resolution.

12. The Israeli decision to annex the occupied Syrian Arab territories of the Golan Heights is but one chapter in a long series of aggressive, expansionist Israeli actions. It exposes the real character of that aggressive, racist entity and necessitates a responsible discussion in depth by the international community, represented by the General Assembly. The discussion should result in the adoption of measures and resolutions that will uphold international peace and security and preserve the United Nations Charter and its purposes and principles.

13. In this respect, the following facts must be borne in mind. First, since 1948 the Zionist movement has obstructed the work of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine. The Zionists declared a State on part of Palestine, and the Israelis then assassinated the international mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte.

14. Second, since 1947 the Zionist movement has committed atrocities against Palestinian Arab citizens, leading to their expulsion from their homeland—atrocities such as the massacre of Deir Yassin and other massacres. The United Nations dealt with that situation in Security Council resolution 194 (1948), of 11 December 1948, but Israel refused to implement that resolution.

15. Third, after 1948 Israel began a process of gradual annexation of Arab lands. The aggression of 1956 against Egypt was an important stage in that process of expansion.

16. Fourth, on 5 June 1967 Israel waged war on three Arab States and occupied the rest of Palestine and parts of the Syrian and Egyptian territories.

17. Fifth, since 1967 the international community has made successive efforts to establish peace in the Middle East although they were thwarted by Israel. The following were the most important such attempts: the initiative of international mediator Gunnar Jarring, which was proposed to Egypt, Israel and Jordan, and which Egypt and Jordan accepted, while Israel rejected it; the initiative of the six African "wise men", which was hindered by Israeli obstruction; the initiative of the United States Secretary of State, Mr. William Rogers, in June 1970, which was accepted by Egypt and rejected by Israel; Security Council resolution 338 (1973), and the obstruction of the Peace Conference due to Israel's refusal to accept the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO] in the Conference and Israel's insistence on a policy of expansion, thus refusing to abide by the United Nations resolutions; the obstruction of the movement towards a just and comprehensive peace in accordance with the United Nations resolutions, as a result of the two Camp David accords.⁴

18. Sixth, Israel's incessant attacks on Lebanon have led to the occupation and control of part of Lebanon's land. Israel's intensive bombardment of Lebanese cities and villages and the Palestinian camps is aimed at the displacement of the population from southern Lebanon. Israel is now preparing for a new aggression against Lebanon and the Palestinian presence there, with the aim of occupying more land and creating new situations within the framework of the Zionist policy.

19. Seventh, Israel has enacted a law to annex Jerusalem.

20. Eighth, Israel has raided the Iraqi nuclear centre, which is an economic establishment for the purposes of development and progress.

21. Ninth, Israel's latest measure is the decision to annex the occupied Golan territories.

22. After outlining these facts we should like to pose the following questions: Is Israel a peaceful, peace-loving State? Do Israel's acts conform to the United Nations Charter and resolutions? Do those acts threaten peace and security in the region?

23. I am certain that we all have the same answer. Even Israel's friends, who are a minority in the international community, are unable to justify and defend its aggressive, racist policy.

24. We must point out that this racist entity would not have been able to persist in those acts and commit those crimes had it not been for its growing military strength, provided by the United States of America—this super-Power which was entrusted by the Charter of the United Nations with a particular responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The United States, however, set aside its commitment to the international community and consigned its potentials and capabilities to an aggressive, racist entity whose only

concern is expansion, aggression and the displacement of millions of Arabs. This is exactly parallel to the United States support and backing of the racist régime in South Africa.

25. In following that policy the United States not only fails to comply with its international commitments, but also stabs the heart of the Arab homeland and puts the future and interests of that part of the world in a critical situation which can neither be tolerated nor overlooked. I believe it is high time that the United States realized that pursuit of this hostile policy against the peoples will put the United States and its interests in the region in a crucial position which it will have brought upon itself. The American administration will thus burden its citizens with problems and difficulties that will not serve their vital interests or their national security.

26. I submit to the Assembly these historical facts exposing the continuous aggression by this racist State, which has been imbued with an aggressive spirit from the very beginning of its existence, and I ask what is to be done to face this situation?

27. I should like to remind the Assembly of the grave consequences of acquiescing in those conditions. The best example in this respect was the acquiescence of the international community in the Nazi annexation of the Czech Sudetenland in 1938. The official recognition of that annexation in the Munich Agreement encouraged the Nazis to take further expansionist measures in the south and in the east. Those measures led to the outbreak of the Second World War, the consequences of which we are still suffering.

28. Should Israel be allowed to behave like this, with no international deterrent? Should the only option open for confronting this abnormal situation be a serious conflagration in the region, which could embroil the world at large? Does anybody think that the Arabs will sit with their arms folded and continue to receive such blows? Is there any doubt that the continuation of this situation will not impel the Arabs, whether Governments or peoples, to secure the minimum requirements for defending their existence? As for those who have interests in the region, do they believe that those interests could possibly continue to flourish under the impact of occupation and aggression?

29. If the Security Council has so far failed to take appropriate measures because of the attitude of the United States, should that failure extend to the General Assembly, thus jeopardizing international legitimacy, obstructing its action, leaving only force and violence as the sole means of action in international relations?

30. I believe that the world today faces a choice which may be difficult but which should be adopted, namely, to seek means to deter the aggressor in order to safeguard the aims of the international Organization, the peace, security and interests of all the peoples of the world. Herein lies the importance of adopting decisive resolutions to impose deterrent sanctions that would compel Israel to review all its policies, decisions and measures and to abandon the spirit of aggression and racism or to stay outside the international community in the limbo of its own aggressive acts and racist nature. The sanctions we propose are as follows.

31. First, in view of Israel's violation of the Charter of the United Nations and its failure to honour the obligations assumed before the General Assembly in the 1949 session, when it pledged to adhere to the Charter and to implement Assembly resolutions 181 (II) and 194 (III), and since it has renounced those pledges and has continued to pursue a policy of aggression and war against

the Arab countries, committing acts that jeopardize peace and security in the region, all the foregoing necessitates the adoption by the Assembly of a resolution to suspend its resolution 273 (III) of 11 May 1949, by which Israel was admitted to the United Nations.

32. Secondly, a resolution should be adopted in order to stop dealing with Israel in all military, political, economic and cultural fields.

33. Thirdly, the Government of the United States of America should be called upon, for the sake of safeguarding the Charter and protecting right, justice and international peace and security, to desist from offering support of any kind to Israel.

34. The successive acts of Israel, the latest of which was the annexation of the Golan, are acts of sheer aggression, in the light of General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974, which defines aggression. Article 3 of the annex to that resolution states that the annexation of a territory or part of the lands of a State by the armed forces of another State qualifies as an act of aggression, whether or not the annexation was accompanied by a declaration of war. Israel's act falls within the scope of Article 39 of the Charter, which defines the kinds of acts that are dealt with by the Security Council.

35. The Security Council did try to remedy this dangerous situation, but the abuse of the veto paralysed the Council and consequently this matter was referred to this Assembly—the representatives of the peoples' aspirations for freedom and justice—for you to determine the truth expressing the world's attitude to these acts of aggression.

36. If Israel thinks that it can provide itself with security and peace through military force, aggression and expansion, it will undoubtedly make the same mistake as the Nazis, who resorted to all kinds of acts of violence and oppression. That led to the end of both nazism and its acts of violence and oppression.

37. In matters related to their national rights and interests, peoples may remain patient but never oblivious. Throughout history the forces of injustice, oppression and aggression have never prevailed or survived. They have always been annihilated through their own acts of aggression, injustice, suppression and brutality. Occupation never brings peace or security to the occupier, no matter how great his power may be, because the power of freedom is always greater than that of all the forces of injustice and aggression. The displacement of peoples, the violation of their rights and interests never provide the aggressor with stable or continuous security. Such acts, rather, lead the aggressor to a dark future in which he is doomed, as all aggressors have been doomed throughout history.

38. If there are certain quarters that believe that their protection of Israel in such acts of aggression will drive the Syrian Arab Republic to give up its own national rights or the national rights of the Palestinian Arab people, those quarters should realize that no part of Arab soil is subject to either compromise or blackmail. None of the Arab Palestinian rights can be a commodity for barter. We shall never sell one iota of Palestinian rights to buy one iota of Syrian rights. The Arab rights in the occupied Arab lands are not for sale, nor are those of the Palestinian territories, simply because the peoples' rights can neither be bought nor sold. The greatest insult to a nation is to place its rights on the bargaining table, for sale or barter.

39. Those quarters should realize that this is not the path of peace. Their practices, whether in connection with the Camp David agreements, Israeli acts of aggression or the huge military and economic aid they give to Israel,

are in fact closing the doors on peace and putting out the flame of peace, in which the hopes and aspirations of all the peoples of the world are placed.

40. The search for peace cannot be conducted through sheer, brutal military force or through occupation, aggression or the threat of occupation and aggression. This is a blocked path. We should learn from the lessons of history.

41. Any peace imposed at the expense of the peoples' rights is nothing but a surrender, whose fate will be exactly the fate of that deceptive peace signed by Philippe Pétain, the Marshal of France in the Second World War, who did not give peace to France. Nor did the Nazis gain any security through that sort of peace.

42. Having outlined this dangerous situation—and bearing in mind that all Members have condemned the Israeli decision, considering it a grave act, and have called for it to be rescinded—we urge Members to shoulder their responsibilities to uphold the principles we all accepted and committed ourselves to when we joined this international Organization. The upholding of these principles requires practical stands and measures that are bound to deter the aggressor.

43. We are convinced of the wisdom of Members and of their loyalty to mankind and to the principles of right and justice.

44. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The General Assembly would not have been meeting today—nor, for that matter, would the Security Council have had to meet last December and this month—on the issue before us were it not for the relentless enmity of Arab régimes towards Israel ever since Israel's establishment as a sovereign State. The attitude of these enemies of my country has been one of persistent and adamant refusal to recognize Israel, to negotiate with it or even to maintain any semblance of tolerable neighbourly relations. This uncompromising hostility has led a long succession of Arab régimes since 1948 into repeated acts of armed aggression against Israel, with the attendant destruction and suffering on both sides.

45. One of the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations is contained in Article 2, paragraph 4. It requires States to refrain in their international relations from the use and even the threat of force. If a State violates this fundamental principle of the Charter, as the Syrian Arab Republic and other Arab States have done without interruption since 1948 by alternately using and threatening force against Israel, such a violation certainly does not create any rights for the violator. Moreover, under Article 2, paragraph 3, of the Charter, it is incumbent upon all Members to settle their international disputes by peaceful means. This, too, the Syrian Arab Republic and other Arab States have adamantly refused to do.

46. There is certainly no justification for an aggressor, such as the Syrian Arab Republic, having once been defeated in war, to go on for well over a quarter of a century engaging in relentless hostilities against its neighbour—hostilities punctuated by two further wars of aggression initiated by it. And there is certainly no justification for that aggressor State to be allowed to perpetuate the state of war for decades, or even centuries, on end.

47. The United Nations has been discussing the Arab-Israel conflict for over 30 years. Had this Organization encouraged the Arab States to live up to their commitments under the Charter, this conflict could have been peacefully resolved long ago through dialogue and negotiation. Had the Organization followed the precept of Article 1, paragraph 4, of the Charter—"To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment

of these common ends”—this conflict could certainly have been resolved long ago. The United Nations, however, has long permitted itself to be exploited by those opposed to peace in the Middle East. These forces have not only set out to block any progress on this issue but have also sought to inflate the conflict by adding an ever-increasing number of features to their Middle East repertoire.

48. We all know that almost every item on every agenda of each General Assembly is invariably distorted and abused by Arab delegations and their supporters in their vicious campaign against Israel. We know, too, that some of those who sit through this charade are overwhelmed by the endless repetition of untruths, half-truths and myths with which most of these items have become encrusted.

49. In this Hall, my country has been subjected to an unending tirade of invective, to an unceasing stream of repetitive speeches and to an ever-growing accumulation of equally repetitive resolutions, passed from one international conference to another, from one committee to another, from one year to the next.

50. That all this is totally divorced from reality, that it is in flagrant violation of the Charter, which instructs the Organization to promote international peace and security—not to obstruct them—all of this is, of course, irrelevant to the sloganeers. The United Nations has detached itself from reality by cloistering itself in its own surrealistic world.

51. The matter before us serves to highlight the absurdity of the proceedings here as a result of the anti-Israel obsession and fixation of the enemies of my country and their supporters, and their constant attempts to divert attention away from the real emergencies in the world.

52. Where is the emergency special session to consider the threats to the sovereignty, national independence and territorial integrity of States in South-East Asia? Where was the emergency special session to consider Iraq's aggression against and invasion of Iran over one year ago? Not only has a war been raging between those two countries, but over two million persons have been uprooted since the outbreak of hostilities, creating a vast refugee problem. Where was the emergency special session to deal with the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya's invasion of Chad? Why has no emergency special session been convened to discuss the Syrian Arab Republic's unending rape of Lebanon? Why is it that no organ of the United Nations has been convened to consider the situation in Poland? Who but the perpetrators of the Polish tragedy and their fellow-travellers would deny the centrality of the Polish crisis to international peace and security?

53. We all know why there has been no emergency special sessions convened to consider any of these and other major crises involving grave threats to international peace and security: a certain super-Power and a certain group of States have made sure that they would not be discussed here. They have abused the Security Council in recent weeks for their diversionary purposes, just as they are exploiting the current emergency special session as a subterfuge.

54. One need only look at the list of speakers of the Security Council debates from 16 December 1981 to 20 January 1982⁵ on the same matter we are now considering in order to appreciate the transparent attempt of the Soviet Union and of its satellites and adjuncts to exploit the Arab obsession with Israel in a concerted effort to divert world attention from international crises which they have masterminded.

55. The alleged “emergency” we are considering here is a contrived one, conjured up in the vivid imagination of those who have constantly tried and been unable to destroy my country through war and repeated acts of aggression.

56. In their relentless warfare against Israel, the enemies of my country have also swept aside the requirements of the Charter of the United Nations and the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, just as they ride roughshod over elementary norms of parliamentary and diplomatic propriety. This deliberate perversion and manipulation of the means and machinery of the United Nations has been evident also in the manner in which this contrived emergency special session was convened. Let me refer in this connection to my statement of yesterday in the Security Council,⁶ in which I pointed out some of the irregularities—on the formal and substantive levels alike—that have accompanied the *mise-en-scène* of this session. May I also refer representatives to my letter of yesterday to the President of the Security Council.⁷

57. The sponsors of this phoney emergency session did not take the trouble to maintain even a semblance of propriety. In requesting the Security Council to convene an emergency special session of the General Assembly they could have been expected to behave as if they believed that an emergency situation existed. One would have expected them to submit their request immediately after the Jordanian draft resolution¹ failed of adoption in the Security Council last week. Instead, it took them a whole week and more for “consultations” on a variety of questions related to their phoney emergency, including, among other things, the question as to the exact timing at which their contrived emergency would become so urgent as to require this extraordinary abuse of United Nations procedure.

58. The magnitude of this alleged emergency can also be readily gauged from the fact that none of the sponsors of this exercise was ready to speak this morning. We also understand that this phoney emergency will be suspended for the duration of the week-end so as not to interfere with the week-end plans of all those involved.

59. Let me therefore state here today that the proceedings of this session, as well as any resolutions that may emerge from it, will of necessity be tainted by these and other flaws and irregularities.

60. Let us have a look at the background of this not-so-special, so-called emergency session. The Golan Heights are a small plateau comprising only about 450 square miles. Ranging in altitude from nearly 2,000 feet to about 3,000 feet above sea level, the Golan overlooks the upper Galilee, the Hula Valley and the Sea of Galilee.

61. As far back as 1947, Jewish villages and kibbutzim in the Hula Valley were attacked by the Syrian army. Following Israel's independence in May 1948, the Syrian Arab Republic was in the forefront of the Arab countries that invaded our newly-established State, while Syrian guns on the Golan wrought havoc on the agricultural and fishing communities below.

62. Ever since 1948, Syria has claimed that no international boundary exists between it and Israel. Thus, Syria has maintained its rejection of the former mandatory frontier, insisting that the Israel-Syrian Armistice Agreement of 20 July 1949⁸ should have included a clause to the effect that the armistice demarcation lines were defined without prejudice to the ultimate settlement.

63. When the Armistice Agreement of 1949 was eventually signed, its preamble indicated that its purpose was “to facilitate the transition . . . to permanent peace”. Syria, however, adamantly refused to conclude peace with Israel.

64. Thus, since Israel's establishment in 1948, Syria has regarded itself as being in a state of war with my country. Syrian tanks and artillery on the Golan Heights harassed everyone from fishermen to farmers to children. Writing in the London *Daily Telegraph* of 1 June 1973, its Middle East correspondent, John Bulloch, accurately described some typical aspects of daily civilian life in the northern part of Israel under well-entrenched and trigger-happy Syrian gunners:

"Before 1967 the Syrian gunners were up on the plateau; their guns could deal death up to a range of 20 miles. No fishing was then possible in the Sea of Galilee, farmers had armour plating on their tractors and children slept in shelters at night."

65. Among those who visited the Israel-Syrian frontier in those days was Sir Alec Douglas-Home, a former Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. He himself wrote in the London *Daily Mail* of 22 April 1974:

"A few months before the 1967 war I was visiting Galilee, and at regular intervals the Russian-built forts on the Golan Heights used to lob shells into the villages, often claiming civilian casualties. Any future pattern for a settlement must clearly put a stop to that kind of offensive action."

66. The Golan Heights were of paramount importance for Syria in its sinister designs against Israel. Syria made the Heights the most advanced bridgehead for aggression against and harassment of Israel and its population. The Golan Heights were transformed by Syria from a peaceful agricultural area into a gigantic army encampment.

67. Between 1948 and 1967, Syria turned the Heights into one of the most fortified, well-equipped military strongholds in the Middle East. The firepower concentrated in this miniscule area was truly unprecedented. At the same time, the civilian population of the Golan Heights was placed under the direct command and administration of the Syrian military authorities.

68. Not only were major parts of Syria's mobile armoured and artillery divisions often deployed on the Golan Heights, but the Syrian army actually turned scores of tanks, heavy mortars and artillery pieces into permanent gun emplacements, which further added to the firepower of Syria's army on the Heights. The Syrian military concentrations on the Golan Heights and Syria's logistic and strategic military infrastructure there served Syria as a launching-pad for its attack against Israel in June 1967.

69. In the course of that war, Israel was ferociously bombarded from the Golan Heights. Israel fought back in self-defence because, had the Syrians been able to descend from the Heights, the possible outcome was and remains too terrible to contemplate. As a matter of fact, Syrian army documents were captured there which detailed an operational plan for the conquest of northern Israel, up to Haifa.

70. During that campaign in June 1967, in the face of lethal fire the Israel Defence Forces stormed the fortified Heights in order to eliminate the entrenched positions Syria had constructed there. We paid a heavy price, but after some difficult fighting the Heights were captured, thus ending 19 years of Syrian harassment of and aggression against Israel. As a result of the Syrian aggression in that war, the Syrian army was thus forced back to a range that no longer permitted it to threaten directly Israel's villages in the Galilee and the Hula Valley.

71. Over the last fourteen and a half years, Israel has repeatedly appealed to Syria to come to the negotiating table and make peace with us. Syria adamantly refused to do so. The Syrian attitude is that peace with us is unthinkable.

72. There is, of course, something symbolic in the ridiculous walk-out of the Syrian delegation from this Hall. It highlights the root cause of the Arab-Israel conflict, that is, the refusal of Arab States to come to terms with Israel's existence. But Syrian absence right now from this Hall also highlights the fact that it is precisely the same States which have put themselves on the sidelines of the mainstream of real developments in the Middle East, which have become bystanders, somewhat neurotic bystanders, to the peace process in our region. Delegations like that of the Syrian Arab Republic, engaging in such childish exercises, seem to believe that by walking away from the truth, truth itself will walk away. They are badly mistaken. Truth will follow them even to the sidelines and dark passages of this Hall, from where they prefer to listen to my statement. We are supposedly here to listen to one another and to reason with one another. We are here to talk to each other—not to talk at each other. Let the Syrian absentees ponder this on the sidelines.

73. Syria has repeatedly announced that it would not negotiate with Israel, that it did not recognize Israel and that it would not recognize Israel. Syria consequently refused to accept Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which affirms the right of every State in the area to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

74. Instead, Syria unleashed another war of aggression against Israel from the Golan Heights in October 1973. In the early stages of Syria's sneak attack on Yom Kippur, the holiest day of the Jewish calendar, advance columns of the Syrian armed forces broke through our defences, and at one point it seemed as though they might succeed in advancing further in their thrust towards the Galilee. It was only Israel's control of the Golan that prevented the Syrians from penetrating deep into Israel territory and wreaking untold havoc and casualties on Israel's civilian population.

75. Since Syria had been defeated in the Yom Kippur War, it was greatly interested in reacquiring the territories it had lost as a result of its aggression against Israel. It therefore ostensibly accepted Security Council resolution 338 (1973) of 22 October 1973.

76. Israel, in its quest for peace, made a substantial withdrawal from territory captured in its defensive operations during the wars of October 1973 and June 1967. Israel was hopeful that once it had withdrawn from these territories Syria would finally decide to settle the outstanding differences between the two countries through negotiations aimed at establishing peace, as called for by Security Council resolution 338 (1973).

77. Despite all this, in disregard of resolution 338 (1973) and in open rejection of Council resolution 242 (1967), Syria has refused to go beyond agreements on a cease-fire and a disengagement of military forces.

78. In the signing of the Agreement on Disengagement between Israeli and Syrian Forces⁹ at Geneva on 31 May 1974, the Syrians made sure that they were represented only by army officers in order to stress the fact that, from their point of view, there could be no negotiations with Israel beyond a military agreement. What is more, they refused to sign even that agreement with us directly and had the Egyptians sign it on their behalf.

79. It must be pointed out that that Disengagement Agreement—which is still in effect—did not relate to the subject of the international boundary between our two countries and thus has no bearing on it.

80. Whenever Israel indicated its willingness to make peace with Syria, the latter invariably responded with its

typical bellicose attitude. That attitude has been reflected over the years in countless declarations made by the leaders of that country.

81. On 1 November 1954, Faris al-Khoury, then Prime Minister of Syria, stated on Radio Ramallah that:

"It should be clear that the implementation of . . . United Nations resolutions will not oblige the Arab States to make peace with Israel."

82. On 31 May 1956, the representative of Syria to the United Nations, the notorious Ahmed Shukairy, who later became one of the founders of the terrorist PLO, emphasized that:

"Everything enacted by the United Nations since 29 November 1947 should be written off: the establishment of Israel, its membership in the United Nations and all other resolutions will have to be revoked."

83. In the same vein, at the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly on 17 July 1967, George Tomeh, another Syrian representative to the United Nations, indicated that: ". . . on behalf of all the Arab delegations . . . we now confirm, as we have stated in the past, our non-recognition of the State of Israel . . ." [1556th meeting, para. 42]; and ". . . that denial of recognition to that State should be reaffirmed time and again . . ." [ibid., para. 44].

84. In one of the most revealing commentaries to be broadcast over Damascus Radio, on 22 December 1976, the Syrian Government-controlled broadcasting station pointed out that:

"The map that the Arabs are presenting to Israel includes not only Jerusalem, Nablus, Gaza, Sinai and the Golan, but, first and foremost, Tel Aviv, Haifa, Jaffa and Nazareth. In other words, the Arabs are not merely demanding to get back the West Bank and the Gaza Strip as Palestinian soil; rather, they are demanding their rights throughout their occupied land since 1948. The slogan of 'the restoration of the Palestinian people's rights' has found a more favourable reception at the international level and in world public opinion than the slogan of 'the liberation of Palestine'—meaning the liquidation of Israel. It must be noted, however, that these two slogans mean one and the same thing."

85. This same idea was reiterated in a slightly different fashion by Syrian Minister for Foreign Affairs Abdul Halim Khaddam on 13 September 1980 to the Qatar daily *al-Raya*, and I quote:

"We are not concerned merely with the Golan or the West Bank. There is a matter of basic principle connected with the presence of the Zionist entity in the Arab homeland . . . The problem must be viewed as part of the over-all struggle with the Zionist foe. And the Arab nation will retrieve every inch of territory in and outside Palestine."

86. More recently, on 17 November 1981, as reported on Radio Damascus, Syrian Prime Minister al-Kassem declared:

"The Syrian masses and the whole nation declare: no recognition, no peace and no negotiations with Israel."

87. Similarly, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Syria stated only two months ago, on 25 November 1981, at the abortive Arab League Summit held at Fez, Morocco:

"To speak of coexistence with Israel would be tantamount to granting Israel legitimacy, and talk of withdrawal to the 1967 lines would be tantamount to recognizing Israel's right to four fifths of Palestine."

He therefore suggested that the Arabs should wait 100 years or more until Israel is weakened, and then the Arabs could act.

88. In an apparent attempt to show that he would never allow himself to be outdone by his subordinates, President Assad of the Syrian Arab Republic recently declared: "Even if the PLO were to recognize Israel, Syria would not be able to recognize it." That was reported by the Kuwait newspaper *al-Rai al-Amm* of 13 December 1981.

89. The amount of time that any country can live under such threats is not without limits, especially when these threats are backed up by considerable military might and the political will to use it.

90. Israel could not be expected to maintain indefinitely a military administration on the Golan Heights merely to accommodate Syria's interest in persistent conflict. In essence, all daily life on the Golan Heights is with Israel. Thus, it would have been incongruous to continue applying Syrian law there.

91. The Syrian Minister for Foreign Affairs would presumably have wanted everyone living in the Golan to wait 100 years and more to register births, marriages and deaths. Quite clearly, Israel had to regularize the situation on the Golan Heights by applying Israeli law, jurisdiction and administration there.

92. The Israeli law on the Golan Heights does not in the slightest manner diminish the rights of the people living there, including, of course, their property rights and their right to education and religious worship according to their traditions. All these are fully safeguarded.

93. It is unconscionable that a State like Syria be permitted to unleash repeated acts of aggression with the aim of conquering and even destroying a neighbouring country and then, having been repulsed, should be permitted to manipulate the means and machinery of the United Nations, to invoke international law in a selective and distorted manner, and to find fault with legislation which seeks, in the absence of peace or even of negotiations aimed at reaching peace, to normalize the situation in the region in question.

94. I should like once again to express the hope that any further consideration by the Organization of this matter will constructively focus on the attainment of peace through negotiations between the States directly concerned, and on the prevention of the threat or use of force. The Golan Heights Law in no way precludes or impairs the prospect of such negotiations.

95. On behalf of the Government of Israel, I call upon the Syrian Arab Republic from this rostrum to put an end to its hostility towards Israel and to start negotiations directly with us with a view to achieving an agreed settlement on all the outstanding issues between our two countries, including the question of the international boundary between them. This can only be attained through honest dialogue and negotiation, not through rancorous tirades and diatribes, or through childish walk-outs.

96. It is in this spirit that I appeal once again to the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic, through you, Mr. President, due to the absence of the Syrian delegation, to abandon the path of confrontation and hatred and to face up at long last to the realities of the region. It is time for Syria to realize that Israel is there to stay and that it is with Israel that Syria will have to share a negotiated frontier in the years to come. I express once again Israel's readiness to start immediately and without any prior conditions negotiations with Syria for the settlement of all the differences between us and for the attainment of a lasting peace between our two countries within the framework of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). Israel sincerely hopes that this time its appeal will not fall on deaf ears and will not go unheeded.

97. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the Head of the Political Department of the Palestine Liberation Organization. I call on him in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX), dated 22 November 1974.

98. Mr. KADDOUMI (Palestine Liberation Organization) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, at the beginning of my statement at this ninth emergency special session, we wish to convey to you and to this international organization, to its Member States and its peoples, the greetings of our fighting people and, through you, we should also like to greet the fraternal Arab country of Iraq, its people and its Government.

99. We should also like to congratulate the new Secretary-General, Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar, who represents the aspirations and hopes of the peoples of the developing countries in the third world and the non-aligned countries. We wish him every success in his work in the United Nations to build a new world and safeguard the independence and prosperity of peoples and their development.

100. Similarly, we should like to assure him of the intention of the Palestine Liberation Organization to continue its uninterrupted and constructive co-operation with a view to establishing a just and comprehensive peace in our region through the implementation of the inalienable rights of our Palestinian people.

101. Once again, the General Assembly is meeting in an emergency special session to consider a dangerous Israeli act of aggression which jeopardizes international legitimacy, threatens international peace and security and constitutes an escalation of continued Israeli aggression along with its expansionist policy of settlements. Once again, this session is being held because the United States of America has paralyzed the work of the Security Council and has prevented it from adopting a resolution to impose sanctions against the aggressor. The Security Council had adopted resolution 497 (1981) unanimously, which stipulated that the law annexing the Golan Heights passed by Israel was null and void and constituted a violation of international law. It called on Israel to rescind that law within a specified period of time. When Israel defied that resolution with the utmost arrogance, the Security Council met again, and the United States of America used the veto to prevent the application of sanctions against Israel and presented unacceptable arguments, which were repeated by certain countries that abstained in the vote.

102. One of the arguments related to the uselessness of imposing sanctions against Israel as a punitive measure to deter it from pursuing its aggression, when there was obvious proof of the futility of the policy of attempting to persuade Israel to end its aggression and prevailing upon it to restore the rights which it had usurped. The result of that policy of persuasion was a whole series of wars and a continuation of tension in the region and continual oppression of our Palestinian people, because of the persistence of Israeli aggression, thanks to United States support to that State.

103. Surely we must reject those arguments and repeat what we already said here during the discussion of the Palestine question at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, two months ago. We said:

"One, and only one, State is responsible for this tragedy, namely the United States of America, which persists in using its hegemonist influence to impede the role of this Organization and to paralyse its ability to implement its resolutions . . . had it not been for the United States, there would not have been an Israel, and even had there been an Israel it would not have stayed

intact, notwithstanding the haughtiness of the Zionist extremists and their claims as to the ability to survive." [80th meeting, paras. 86 and 87]

104. The international community is capable of imposing sanctions against Israel in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. The United States of America and the States which abstained in the vote put forward arguments that the Israeli aggression did not create a threat to world peace. One must wonder where their commitment is to the principles of the Charter, and to what extent they are blinded in their failure to recognize those dangers which threaten international peace because of that act of aggression.

105. These dangers exist today at various levels. Firstly, at the level of the Syrian Arab Republic, a brother country: anyone who follows events in the region can see clearly that this decision is a new act of Israeli aggression against Syria which constitutes an end to the cease-fire, and such an observer can also see clearly how Israel prepared itself for a new war.

106. Mordecai Gur, former Israeli Chief of Staff, said in the Knesset in the course of the discussion on the law annexing the Golan Heights, as broadcast by the Hebrew Radio of Israel on 14 December 1981:

"Sharon is intent on launching a war against Syria and, by virtue of this law, is seeking to mobilize global support with this intent in mind."

107. Two members of the Knesset supported this view and, when the correspondent of the Israeli radio asked Mordecai Gur at noon on the next day whether that accusation was not too dangerous, the former Chief of Staff said:

"It is not a dangerous accusation; there is a basis for it. I heard Sharon speak on several occasions on the need to test Syria sooner or later, and I think that this is one of his main ideas connected with the strategy of the State of Israel and I believe that this constitutes a very serious danger."

108. Sharon is the Israeli Defence Minister who bears responsibility for the Israeli military arsenal, which, thanks to support from the United States of America, has become the most dangerous source of tension in the Middle East. Sharon is the author of the expansionist policies and theories which are beyond all imagination in terms of their aggressiveness—and he declares them openly. Ze'ev Schiff described Sharon's policy and his working methods in three articles published by the Israeli newspaper *Ha'aretz*, on 22, 23 and 24 November last year, 100 days after Sharon had become Defence Minister. Schiff said that the question preoccupying Sharon in the matter of security strategy was a pretext for war. He said:

"Sharon himself did not resort to the term 'pretext for war' when he spoke publicly about this matter. He preferred to use the expression 'red lines' or the expression 'safety valves'. But the meaning remains the same . . ."

109. Sharon spoke of three categories of "red lines". According to him, Israel will not be able to go beyond the "red lines", which are in the States adjacent to Palestine and also other countries very distant from Palestine.

110. In our occupied country Sharon is pursuing the policy of the iron fist, the aim being—according to Schiff—to prevent the creation of a Palestinian State. Its methods are the dynamiting of homes and the torturing of citizens of all categories in the most horrible ways. This can be proved by what happened on 2 November last,

on the occasion of the anniversary of the infamous Balfour Declaration,¹⁰ when schoolchildren demonstrated and Sharon used tear-gas against them, arrested hundreds, closed down the Bir Zeit University and dynamited dozens of homes in Beit Sahur because a bottle containing incendiary material had been hurled during the demonstration.

111. Sharon is the author of the theory according to which Israel must recognize the tremendous strength it possesses and must overcome its inhibition of self-denial in order to extend its influence and outstrip the neighbouring Arab countries and even the most remote Arab States. When he described his proposal concerning strategic co-operation to the Americans, the latter saw that Sharon's strategic barometer consisted of numerous African States and even access to the Indian Ocean.

112. Sharon is the one who is provoking the members of the Jewish community throughout the world against the respective lands to which they belong. At a meeting with Jewish representatives from the United States, held at Gush Etzion, according to Ze'ev Schiff, he made a statement clearly demonstrating his character traits. Speaking in English, he said:

"I believe that it is incumbent upon the Israeli people throughout the world to raise their voices and express their ideas—even to exert pressure on the States where they live, and it makes no difference whether these countries are big or small. We belong to a great nation, although it is a small nation in terms of the number of its inhabitants. We have the right to ask the whole world for everything and, as Jews, we are beholden to no one and, on the contrary, the world owes us much."

113. What do these theories, these policies and these practices bring to mind? Are they not reminiscent of the theories of racial superiority and the policies of *Lebensraum* and the quotations of other expansionist tyrants who launched wars and caused calamities to befall others and themselves before they met their terrible fates?

114. Sharon today is one of the symbols of the Zionist movement, one of Israel's leaders and, above all, he is the terrorist who prepared the massacre of Qibya which he carried out with the 101 brigade in 1953. He is not working in isolation within the Zionist movement, but is aided and abetted by Menachem Begin, the Head of the Likud, who presides over the Government of Israel. Begin made public his historic allegations when he presented the law on the Golan Heights to the Knesset. According to the Israeli radio, at 7.30 p.m. on 14 December last, he said:

"All those who have studied the heritage of the Land of Israel cannot deny that the Golan Plateau was for many generations an integral part of our territory. It is our right, therefore, that the frontiers of the territory of Israel in the north should go through the Golan Heights."

115. When he uttered those historic lies, Begin did not shrink in his insolence from levelling charges against two European States that had permitted imperialist Zionism to establish itself in Palestine. In his speech he said:

"Zionist efforts were made at the end of the First World War to trace out and adopt these frontiers. However, two imperialist States shared out a large portion of the world after the World War, now known as the First World War, and traced out the frontiers of the State of Israel about 10 metres to the east of Lake Tiberias. This fact demonstrates the intransigence of the imperialist leaders at a time of infamy. We are not committed by that intransigence. I am confident

that the approval of the overwhelming majority in the Knesset and in the nation will make it possible to establish that the Golan Heights are and will remain an integral part of the Land of Israel."

116. The frontiers mentioned by Begin are the frontiers of our country, Palestine. Their history within the context of the partition of our Arab homeland is a distressing story abounding in imperialist plots by the two imperialist nations, Britain and France, together with the imperialist Zionist movement, in accordance with the Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916.

117. It is paradoxical that the United Kingdom and France should have abstained in the vote on the draft resolution seeking sanctions against the Israeli aggressor. Surely it is also paradoxical that the Zionist colonialist should have hurled insults in front of the imperialists who implanted a diabolical germ in our country, Palestine.

118. In his speech Begin said:

"At the tenth Knesset the Government, obtaining a vote of confidence, laid down the outline of its policy in the eleventh paragraph. Israel will not give up the Golan Heights and will not eliminate any settlement in that territory, and it is the Government which will decide when it will apply the law and the administration of the State to the Golan Heights."

119. In the face of Israel's attitude we should realize the magnitude of the danger of the new Israeli aggression aimed at launching a new war against the Syrian Arab Republic and creating a further instability in the region. Danger also lies in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank in occupied Palestine. We should recall that the programme of the Begin Government very clearly explained the greed of Israel in regard to the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. It will also be recalled that that Government already pronounced the annexation of Jerusalem—somewhat less than two years ago—ignoring the rights of our people and defying international legitimacy and the will of the international community.

120. The head of the Israeli Foreign Office, Shamir, who is a well-known terrorist like his chief, Begin, commenting on the law annexing the Golan Heights, said, in the Security and Foreign Affairs Commission of the Knesset—again according to the Israeli radio, in a broadcast at 7 p.m. on 15 December last:

"He wanted to apply the Israeli law to other regions, but the resolution of yesterday concerns only the Golan Heights. This was a well-synchronized resolution."

Shamir also added:

"This resolution is one of the most important resolutions ever to be adopted by the Government. Its synchronization was ideal, and it was the best obtainable."

We can imagine the magnitude of the sufferings of our people on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip under the yoke of Israel, which is preparing its criminal operations, committing crimes every day. We have repeatedly explained here the dangers of Zionist settlement in the Palestinian territories that were occupied in 1967. The world was unanimous in condemning those Zionist settlements and their corollary, the persecution of our people. But the history of this period in our world will record that the international Organization was not in a position to halt the aggression. History will also record that the United States of America denied a small people that played an important part in human civilization its inalienable national rights. It encouraged Israel to violate the human rights of the Palestinian people. At the same time, the Israeli occupation authorities were pursuing a reign of terror against our people and trying to implement their

settlement policy, bringing in Jewish foreign settlers from their homelands to be established at the expense of the rights of the indigenous inhabitants.

121. In the Israeli daily newspaper *Davar* of 30 October 1981, Danny Rubinstein summed up his judgement of the Israeli settlement policy as follows:

“The Israelis, who have priority on the West Bank, are the symbol of social and moral discrimination and contribute there a policy of being masters; that is the exorbitant price for the settlement policy.”

122. How can the United States justify its silence in the face of these crimes, and its encouragement to Israel in committing those crimes? How is the Jewish community in our world going to justify its silence in the face of those crimes committed in the name of world Judaism?

123. The danger still remains for Lebanon. Sharon does not attempt to conceal his intention to launch a war against the south of Lebanon, a war which will follow the war launched by Israel against the south and against unarmed civilians in Beirut last July. The greed of Israel, its coveting of Lebanon, goes back a long way. Its dreams of dominating the River Litani are well known, as seen by its calling the war begun in March 1978 “Operation Litani”. Similarly, the declared objective of Israel is the extermination of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestine people. Its undeclared objective to exterminate as many Palestinians as possible is being pursued with the annexation of the Golan Heights. The Israeli authorities have expressed their intention to find pretexts for beginning their war, a war they have been preparing; they have mobilized three brigades stationed in the north of occupied Palestine, as the international Emergency Force knows full well.

124. Sharon is always talking about the instability of the military situation in southern Lebanon after the last cease-fire and refers to a “red line” which has been violated, but we all know that Israel was the one that failed to comply with Security Council resolution 425 (1978) and that it persists in dominating the frontier strip in southern Lebanon by force.

125. Do we have any need for further explanations of these dangers inherent in the Israeli aggression against the Golan Heights? If those dangers do not represent a threat to international peace and security, where does such a danger lie? It is obvious that Israel is bent on pursuing war and anxious to escalate tension in the region in order to prevent any attempt to bring about an equitable and comprehensive solution, and we should stop and think about the synchronization of this aggression. Israel committed this act of aggression after concluding the agreement on strategic co-operation with the United States and following another round conducted by the American envoy Philip Habib in the area. A commentary on Israeli radio, broadcast also at 7.30 p.m. on 15 December 1981, spoke of the synchronization of the passing of the law annexing the Golan Heights as “taking into account the probability of the absence of a very strong reaction, since the various capitals were preoccupied by events in Poland”.

126. It is interesting to examine the agreement on strategic co-operation between Israel and the United States, as that agreement constitutes a grave danger to international peace and security, since it was an essential factor in encouraging Israel to carry out a series of acts of aggression and threaten a new war. The conclusion of that agreement constituted an escalation of world tension at a time when what was needed was détente. It has been said that it was aimed against the Soviet Union, but

Sharon, on 2 December 1981, spoke in the Knesset of the importance of the agreement in the event of a war with the Arab States, and he described the opponents of the agreement in the following terms:

“... in times of distress and difficulty they held out their hands for charity from the United States, and they were disposed to make concessions in vital regions for our nation in Samaria and Judea and in the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights, to revive illusory hopes of security and peace”.

127. It would seem Sharon felt that the agreement would permit him to continue occupying the Arab territories, disregarding the rights of the people and international law. Perhaps the most dangerous aspect of that agreement is that it links the policy of a major Power—that is to say the United States of America—with the policies of a Zionist, racist movement which governs Israel. I do not describe the United States as a “great” Power because the attribute of greatness involves moral responsibilities and commitments which are not guaranteed by the simple magnitude of the power, and a great Power must carry out its responsibilities in accordance with the Charter and principles of the United Nations, which safeguard the rights and freedoms of peoples and also international peace and security.

128. This link threatens our world with destruction. To take just one example, let us recall what Begin said to the United States Ambassador in Israel on 20 December last. Begin was criticizing the United States for having levelled very slight reproaches at Israel in an attempt to save face in the eyes of the world. But he exaggerated that criticism of those reproaches, and viewed them as a sanction. Begin said:

“They won’t frighten us with sanctions. Anyone who threatens us will find us with our ears closed in the face of those threats. I consider your decision to suspend the debate on the memorandum of understanding as a cancellation of it. We will never allow the sword of Damocles to hover over our heads...”.

129. Unfortunately, such was the conclusion of the final scene of this American-Israeli comedy—wherein a big Power, the United States, gives in to the wishes of Israel.

130. We recall here the insults proffered by Begin to three European States—the Federal Republic of Germany, France and Great Britain—last year, in different circumstances, and how the Governments of those States reacted to stress the crisis through which the Organization is passing because of the impotence of its Member States in living up to their responsibilities for safeguarding international peace and security.

131. I should like to stress, with regard to the current situation, that world imperialism has done a great deal against the will, and to the detriment of the destinies, of the peoples by sowing war and conflict in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and even in Europe. Most unfortunately, it has been able to split the Arab front, isolating Egypt from the Arab nation through the Camp David agreements.⁴ And this served to encourage Israel to commit an act of aggression against Iraq, to threaten Syria and to violate the air space of Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

132. But this situation will not go on, whatever weapons Israel possesses and whatever agreements and alliances it concludes with the United States. The peoples of the world should understand these realities and unite against imperialism, zionism and colonialism and their greed.

133. Current experience and past experiences should have taught us lessons; they should have taught us that armed struggle is the language that those oppressive

forces understand, and that armed struggle is the means which will safeguard international peace and security and the independence of small peoples, as well as their right to self-determination, and will make this international Organization a useful instrument in the service of its noble objectives.

134. The fact that the General Assembly may adopt a resolution to deter the Israel aggressor and refuse to accept Zionist credentials in the Organization would have a moral impact in terms of international politics and would raise the morale of the fighting peoples and restore their confidence in the effectiveness of the international Organization, even if Israel and the United States of America, as well as some other European countries together with them, were to try to prevent the implementation of such a resolution. We are fully aware of the impact of the struggle of the peoples in terms of writing new pages of history and in eliminating aggressors, both States and individuals, and casting them onto the scrapheap of history. Ever since Israel passed the law annexing the Golan Heights, there have been daily reports of the resistance offered by the inhabitants of the Heights, who have rejected this law. Moreover, the march of resistance is proceeding in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank and among the Palestinian people wherever they must face occupation, annexation and aggression of whatever type.

135. The Palestinian revolution has begun its seventeenth year with determination and pride. Resistance is one of the noblest phenomena of human history when people resist aggression and injustice. Resistance is a right which is assured by international instruments. This is a very noble means of upholding the values of equity and justice and works for the establishment of a comprehensive and just peace. Resistance with those noble goals in mind will be strengthened and will not be harmed by the attempts of the Zionists or the representative of the United States, who are striving to have it labelled "terrorist". Quite the contrary: this will give us ever more strength, since the people are profoundly aware of the reality of terrorism and are well aware of Zionist terrorism and of imperialist terrorism. The people are still capable of drawing a distinction between noble resistance and terrorism.

136. Mr. VIERA LINARES (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): At the beginning of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, the head of the Cuban delegation expressed to you, Sir, and to the Assembly, our satisfaction at seeing you presiding over that Assembly. Today we reiterate that feeling and add an expression of our pleasure at the continuing forging of closer links between Iraq and Cuba.

137. On behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf, I express to the Soviet delegation our condolences on the death of comrade Mikhail Suslov, an outstanding fighter for revolution. All progressive mankind grieves today at his passing.

138. I avail myself of this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar on his election to the post of Secretary-General of the United Nations. These are difficult times for an organization entrusted with safeguarding peace and promoting the development of all peoples. With this goal before us, some rise up to obstruct international dialogue and to promote a policy of force and blackmail, of economic and domination exploitation. The Secretary-General has an arduous task before him. I am certain that, as the representative of a Latin American, developing and non-aligned country, he is in a position to understand and to draw inspiration from the needs and aspirations of the countries that make up the vast majority of the General Assembly. We shall be with

him in his efforts to achieve in present-day international relations the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

139. I wish to record on this occasion our gratitude and appreciation for the work accomplished by Mr. Kurt Waldheim at the head of the Organization. His visits to Cuba and the co-operation he always extended to us will remain in our memory.

140. On 25 January 1982, a plenary meeting of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held here at United Nations Headquarters, agreed to urge the Security Council to take the necessary actions in order to convene the emergency special session of the General Assembly which we are beginning today, on the subject of the annexation by Israel of the Syrian territory of the Golan Heights.

141. The immediate reasons for that request are clear. Following on the Israeli decision to extend its laws, jurisdiction and administration to the occupied Golan, the Security Council declared that decision to be null and void and totally without effect from the standpoint of international law, and, in its resolution 497 (1981) of 17 December 1981, it gave Israel two weeks in which to rescind its decision and to comply with that resolution.

142. Far from acting in accordance with the obligations undertaken as a Member of the United Nations, the Israeli authorities once more disregarded the Security Council and with cynical brazenness informed the Secretary-General, in a note dated 29 December 1981,¹¹ that it would not rescind the illegal annexation.

143. The situation thus created constitutes, in addition to a violation of the norms and principles of international law, a serious threat to the peace and security of the world at large and sets an ominous precedent with regard to guarantees of respect for the territorial integrity of all States.

144. The representatives of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries immediately requested the Security Council, in fulfilment of its primary responsibility, to take the appropriate measures against Israel under Chapter VII of the Charter.¹² The non-aligned members of the Council submitted a draft resolution¹ which constituted the Organization's minimal response to the Israeli decisions, accurately described as acts of aggression, which are now compounded by non-compliance with Security Council resolution 497 (1981). But that draft resolution, although it commanded the needed majority, could not be adopted because of the veto of a permanent member of the Council, the United States of America, which thus confirmed once again its strategic alliance with Israel and its support for the terrorist acts of Mr. Begin's régime.

145. The convening of this emergency special session thus became unavoidable, for it is imperative to impress upon Israel and those who support it the international community's utter rejection of Israel's illegal actions. It must be affirmed that the annexation of the Golan Heights forms part of a chain of events which, if not broken by our collective action in accordance with the Charter, will continue with large-scale military aggression against Palestinians in southern Lebanon, as well as against the Syrian Arab Republic, because of the worthy and valiant position of its Government against Israeli expansionism, which is an imperialist tool aimed against the Arab peoples.

146. It would be disregarding reality if we were to separate the illegal annexation of the occupied Syrian territory from all the aggressive actions of Israel which for three decades now have been of concern to the General Assembly. Beginning with the negation of the rights

of the Palestinian people and with its persecution, Israeli aggression has continued with the periodic occupation of territories by force and their subsequent annexation. It is clear that this expansionist policy will go on in accordance with the strategic needs of Israel's main ally and supporter and with the ambitions of the Zionists, who, as early as 1919, had delineated the territory that they coveted.

147. But in the ever mounting struggle of the Palestinians led by their sole authentic representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization, and in the firm position of Syria and of the Arab Governments which support it, the Israeli policy has met with an insuperable obstacle guaranteeing that in the end peace and justice will prevail in the Middle East.

148. That is why Israel is now annexing the Golan Heights, as it prepares public opinion in the United States and other countries for further military actions in Lebanon and Syria.

149. We must ask, as we have asked on many occasions, whether it would be possible for Israel to continue on its aggressive and expansionist course if it were not for the material and political support it receives from the United States. It is enough to look at Washington's most recent decisions on military assistance to the Israeli authorities, at the economic assistance they steadily receive, and at the campaign waged by the United States press and news agencies on their behalf to know the answer. Israel is acting in accordance with its strategic commitments with the United States and in return receives the assistance which those commitments entail.

150. Moreover, it would be impossible for Israel to act with impunity in the Middle East, as it does today, had not the present Administration of the United States promoted a climate of confrontation and tension in international relations. That climate encourages Israeli aggressiveness, which fits in with the United States policy for the Middle East.

151. Let us recall that in the recent past the Israeli authorities proclaimed their decision to annex the Arab city of Jerusalem. Now a similar measure is taken with respect to the Golan Heights. What Arab territory will be next to suffer the same fate? Will there not be another treacherous attack, such as the bombing of the Iraqi nuclear reactor? If these actions are tolerated, will the door not be open to other similar actions in other parts of the world?

152. Israel's alliance with the most reactionary régimes in Latin America and with racist South Africa is no coincidence. Israeli weapons and advisory services go hand in hand with the assassination of peasants, workers, intellectuals and students in El Salvador and Guatemala.

153. If the illegal action in the Golan does not meet with an adequate response, *inter alia* in the United Nations, we shall be inciting South Africa to aggressiveness and contributing by our passive stance to continued criminal actions by Israel and its friends and allies.

154. From its founding, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has offered its support to and solidarity with the Arab countries that have been the victims of Israeli occupation. Invariably, at each summit meeting of the Movement, that solidarity has been renewed and reformulated. On this occasion, we affirm that support once again as we inform the world that Syria and the Palestinians are not alone, that the overwhelming majority of the Members of this Organization are with them.

155. When he reported to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly on the results and decisions of

the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana in September 1979, President Fidel Castro stated the following:

"For the non-aligned countries, the Palestinian question is the very crux of the problem of the Middle East. Both questions form an integral whole and neither can be settled separately.

"The basis for a just peace in the region starts with the total and unconditional withdrawal by Israel from all the occupied Arab territories and provides for the return to the Palestinian people of all their occupied territories and the restoration of their inalienable national rights, including their right to return to their homeland, to self-determination and to the establishment of an independent State in Palestine, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX). This implies that all measures taken by Israel in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories, such as the establishment of colonies or settlements in Palestinian and other Arab territories—whose immediate dismantlement is a prerequisite for the solution of the problem—are all illegal, null and void." [31st meeting, paras. 22-23]

156. The following are the basic elements for peace in the Middle East included in the Political Declaration adopted by the Sixth Conference [see A/34/542, annex, sect. I, para. 102]: The Palestinian problem is the crux of the Middle East problem and the essential cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict; peace must be comprehensive, including all parties and eliminating all the causes of the conflict; there can be no just peace in the region unless it is based on Israel's complete and unconditional withdrawal from all the occupied territories and the recovery by the Palestinian people of all their inalienable national rights, including the right to return to their homeland, to self-determination and to the establishment of an independent State in Palestine; the city of Jerusalem is an integral part of occupied Palestine; the Palestine Liberation Organization is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people; there can be no general, just and acceptable solution to the problem unless the PLO participates on a footing of full equality with the other parties; and all measures taken by Israel in the Palestinian and Arab territories since their occupation are illegal and absolutely invalid.

157. These principles subsequently were reaffirmed at the Conference of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Non-Aligned Countries held at New Delhi in February 1981 [see A/36/116 and Corr.1], and more recently at the meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, which was held in New York in September 1981. These are widely shared principles, which are reflected in many of the most important resolutions of the General Assembly, including those adopted at the thirty-sixth session, and they are still entirely valid today.

158. It is in accordance with this approach to peace in the Middle East that Cuba condemns the illegal annexation of the Syrian territory of the Golan Heights by Israel, and from this rostrum we reiterate the solidarity of the Government and people of Cuba with the Arab peoples in their struggle against Israeli aggression and expansionism, and especially our solidarity with the valiant and worthy people of Syria.

159. We trust that this emergency special session of the General Assembly will fulfil its obligations and give the needed logical response to Israel's illegal action. This is the way to help prevent the enemies of peace and progress

from achieving their objectives in the Middle East and other regions of the world.

160. Mr. ABOU-KHATER (Lebanon) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, allow me to make a statement to our new Secretary-General in French. (*continued in French*)

161. Mr. Secretary-General, I should like to express to you the high esteem in which our country holds you. Between Peru and Lebanon there are relations which go back to time immemorial. We know that our large colony in Lima and elsewhere derives great benefit from the protection of the laws and kindness of your country. I should like to say also that Lebanon, like all States Members of the Organization, places high hopes in your wisdom and experience in the service of the cause of international justice and peace. (*continued in Arabic*)

162. The General Assembly is meeting today in special session and its keynote is the maintenance of international peace and security. The point of departure of this session is the international consensus reflected in Security Council resolution 497 (1981).

163. If Lebanon hopes for anything from the Assembly, it is that this session, given the wanton action of Israel, will succeed in upholding the legitimacy of the United Nations and establish peace and justice in the Middle East, which are our aspiration.

164. Lebanon condemns Israel's action. It does so out of solidarity with a fraternal country to which we are linked by age-old and innumerable ties. We do so also because it is our conviction that the seizure of the Syrian Golan will intensify the risks of an explosion of the Middle East situation and compound the complexity of the Lebanese problem and the tragedy of our own dear country.

165. Indeed, for seven years now my country's life-blood has been draining away. Its people are living in anxiety and torment, contemplating the monuments of its culture fallen in ruins, from the north to the south, and above all in its capital, Beirut, where many neighbourhoods and streets are today nothing but piles of debris, after the Lebanese had made it a city of prosperity and a source of intellectual light for the illumination of the whole Middle East.

166. I shall not dwell any longer on the Lebanese question, because I know that the General Assembly is holding this special session to deal with a just cause connected with the security of the whole Middle East, and its results will have repercussions on all the neighbouring countries, because they bear witness to a wanton expansionist spirit.

167. Today Lebanon will set aside its own suffering. We have come to the Assembly today to defend the inalienable right of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Golan Heights, to help a fraternal country to which we are bound by links, present and past, that go back to the remote past, a country whose rights are our own and whose feelings of dignity and need to defend that dignity are shared by Lebanon. What we want to see is Lebanon,

united and independent, recovering its full sovereignty over its entire territory, and enjoying once again peace and stability. That is also why our country remains a generous brother to our closest neighbour, which shares all our frontiers.

168. Israeli forces occupied the Golan in the 1967 war. They evacuated part of it after the 1973 war. Later, following certain well-known events, when the world was expecting Israel to evacuate the remainder, thus proving that it harbours sincere and peaceful intentions, we found it taking an intransigent stance, an intransigence tainted with arrogance and expansionism. It deliberately barred the road to a just peace in the Middle East. Its true intentions then clearly emerged for all to see. With a single gesture the Government of Tel Aviv annexed part of the territory that had always belonged to Syria for many generations and added it to many other Arab territories which it has been occupying in violation of the partition resolution [*General Assembly resolution 181 (II)*], as well as other territories which it has been occupying since 1967, in defiance of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and relevant General Assembly resolutions. And yet, with all that, Israel's leaders speak of peace and security. However, bent as they were on expansion and conquest, they are barring all the paths to peace; they provide constant proof of their greed and ambitions, thus unmasking their true intentions. They have no desire to make peace; it is as if they wanted, at all costs, to force the Arabs into a new war, which would not be confined to the Middle East region but would be likely to disrupt world peace.

169. With its sense of dignity, its desire to protect its rights and its desire to preserve peace, Syria turned to the Security Council. The result was the draft resolution¹ with which representatives are familiar and which was paralysed by the veto. Today it is turning to the General Assembly, and this is the very least that our Syrian brothers could do, for after all, they have an inalienable right to their territory.

170. I do not wish to dwell any further on this subject, because all representatives are aware of the essence of the Arab-Israeli question in all its aspects. It is the Arabs' right to receive reassurance as to their destiny and future in that land which has been the home of successive generations of their ancestors. They are also entitled to hope that an international organization which brings together countries of the whole world will reject the expansionism of the greedy and the greed which pervades any given State and induces it to act in defiance of all rights.

171. On behalf of Lebanon, I ask the Assembly to adopt the draft resolution that has been submitted and thus reaffirm its desire to uphold the prestige of the international Organization and its duties for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.