

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

NINTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records

3rd
PLENARY MEETINGMonday, 1 February 1982,
at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Ismat T. KITTANI (Iraq)

AGENDA ITEM 5

The situation in the occupied Arab
territories (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with General Assembly resolution 3369 (XXX) of 10 October 1975, I call on the Secretary-General of the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

2. Mr. CHATTY (Secretary-General of the Organization of the Islamic Conference) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, on the occasion of this historic session of the General Assembly, I should like first of all to pay a tribute to the intelligence, lucidity, tact and wisdom with which you are guiding these very serious debates on so important a problem as that of Israel's annexation of the Syrian Golan.

3. Further, I should like to take this exceptional opportunity at the commencement of his term of office, to convey to Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, Secretary-General of the Organization, my sincerest congratulations and to express the great hopes placed in him by the Organization of the Islamic Conference. The great qualities that fit him for his new and delicate tasks are well-known, and we are convinced that he will do honour not only to the third world, but also to all the ideals of the international community.

4. I should like also to pay a heartfelt tribute to his predecessor, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, for the competence he demonstrated in the service of the United Nations. During a term of office that took place at a time when the Organization faced the gravest problems, his tireless activity and his devotion to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations—while they might not have enabled him to resolve all pending problems—still safeguarded the peace which was threatened on many occasions, and furthered the solution of other problems, the sources of tension throughout the world. I wish to express our deep gratitude and consideration for his service to mankind.

5. On the occasion of this emergency special session of the General Assembly, I should like to tell the members of the Assembly that, at this time of reflection and action to bring about the triumph of law, justice and peace, they can count on the determination and solidarity of our organization. Our hearts—saddened by so many years of suffering, humiliation and frustration, but more than ever filled with hope—beat in harmony with yours and with the hearts of the valiant soldiers of the Palestinian people and of the Arab territories occupied by Israel.

6. The Arab-Palestinian cause is indeed one of the fundamental pillars of our organization. May we recall the first Islamic Summit Conference held in Rabat in 1969, a conference at which our heads of State, profoundly concerned by the situation in the Middle East, had energetically denounced Israel's occupation of the

Arab territories invaded in 1967 and its direct consequence—the tragic and criminal burning of al-Aqsa Mosque, which shocked 600 million Moslems and was condemned by all the peoples of the world.¹³

7. Since that date, our organization, inspired by the principles of its charter and the numerous resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly, has constantly drawn the attention of the world to the situation in the Middle East and to the urgent need for a settlement, but since then no progress has been achieved.

8. On the contrary, numerous violations of human rights and international law, in particular the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,¹⁴ and the Hague Convention of 1907,¹⁵ are continuing with impunity in the occupied Arab territories, the escalation attaining its zenith after the bombing of the nuclear power plant at Tamuz and the periodic bombings of Beirut, in the annexation of the Golan Heights which we are witnessing today.

9. At this time one might question the value of the numerous resolutions of the United Nations which have for so many years been denouncing the illegality of the Israeli occupation, since we note that every day Israel, in an unholy alliance with the devil, is defying the international community by further accentuating its policy of *fait accompli*.

10. To be sure, the annexation of the Golan Heights—which is a logical part of that policy—should come as no surprise, since in August 1981 the Israeli Prime Minister stated before the Knesset that Israel would claim sovereignty over the West Bank following the period of autonomy, in accordance with the Israeli tenet that the “occupied Arab territories belong to Israel”.

11. Indeed, by modifying the status of the Syrian Golan Heights, which has been changed from that of an occupied to that of an annexed territory, Israel is threatening the very foundation of the international system. If this dual act of aggression remains unpunished, history will take us all back to the system that prevailed prior to the Second World War when, despite the existence of the League of Nations, some States engaged in acts of aggression such as those committed by Nazis and Fascists.

12. The *Anschluss* of Austria, the invasion of Czechoslovakia and the occupation of Ethiopia are indeed examples of a lawless world where the strong felt free to destroy the weak. However, we know what that situation led to: a general conflagration in Europe and throughout the world.

13. The annexation of the Golan Heights constitutes not only a serious violation of international law but also a grave breach of Security Council resolution 338 (1973), as well as a unilateral revocation of the cease-fire, since the annexation in and of itself represents a *casus belli*.

14. This is why the Security Council in its resolution 497 (1981) of 17 December 1981 then condemned Israel for that annexation, which it declared to be null and void, and warned in operative paragraph 4 that appropriate

measures could be adopted against the perpetrator in the case of non-compliance with the resolution.

15. However, unfortunately, the events of recent weeks have demonstrated that one of the great Powers in the Security Council refuses to accept the sanctions that are called for in the case of Israel, owing no doubt to the diplomatic, political and intellectual terrorism perpetrated by the Zionist entity in contradiction of its statements and acts.

16. It is a matter of urgent necessity, therefore, for the international community to consider that Israel's behaviour represents a serious threat to peace in the Middle East. It is a fact that no alibi and no lie can conceal. The only recourse we have is to impose sanctions unhesitatingly, and to implement that decision.

17. We should be irresponsible and should be obstructing the cause of peace and justice in the Middle East and the vital interests of mankind as a whole were we not to oppose the annexation of the Golan Heights with all our strength, an annexation that is obviously incompatible with the concept of occupation in wartime, as expressed in article 43 of the Hague Convention of 1907,¹⁵ according to which the occupier should be considered only as an administrator.

18. Recently, at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held in Fez in November 1981, I stated that:

"There can no longer be any doubt in the minds of right-thinking people that the Camp David accords⁴ have dangerously blocked any attempt to find a peace in the region and may indeed eclipse the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people."

In any event, I added, with some bitterness but with firm conviction and much hope, that the growing support of a billion Moslems—and how many people of the third world and the group of non-aligned States—for the Arab and Palestinian cause were proof enough that the United States of America would find itself isolated, and indeed, obliged to change its position in accordance with its own interests, for it is true that States do not have permanent friends but interests.

19. Unfortunately, the United States has not changed its position one iota. On the contrary, it has consolidated and accentuated its stand by entering into a military alliance with Israel and by vetoing the application to Israel of the sanctions laid down in the United Nations Charter and envisaged by the Security Council in its resolution 497 (1981).

20. The Assembly's responsibility is fraught with many consequences. As you know, the maintenance of a real and lasting peace is essentially dependent upon respect for all the purposes and principles set forth in the United Nations Charter, the implementation of the resolutions adopted to assure the maintenance of international peace and security and, in particular, implementation of the resolution declaring the annexation of the Golan Heights to be null and void.

21. The recommendations of the Assembly should be addressed to Member States and also to the Security Council, which should meet once again to consider collectively and otherwise—possibly with other concerned States—this problem of the annexation of the Golan Heights which is threatening international peace.

22. We remain convinced that the strength of this Assembly's decision will affect the credibility of the United Nations. We consider that an agreement arrived at in accordance with the spirit and the letter of the Charter will be adopted, in the interests of the Security Council and of the international community.

23. I welcome the fortunate initiative taken by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries,¹⁶ which is a clear demonstration of the active solidarity now more than ever necessary to ensure the establishment of a real and lasting peace in the Middle East.

24. I should like to conclude by appealing to the United States—without which the settlement of this problem will be impossible—to become aware of the fact that because of its responsibility at the world level it cannot be a party to a regional conflict.

25. Indeed, the role of the United States in the Middle East should not be that of Israel's ally but rather that of an arbitrator to settle conflicts on the basis of its own principles and those of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law and the requirements inherent in safeguarding peace. If its behaviour in the near future does not follow that course, I fear that the Arab-Israeli conflict will be turned into an Arab-American conflict. Whenever the international community in its virtual entirety expresses its desire to impose sanctions against Israel so as to ensure that it put an end to its policy of aggression and expansion, it is America which thwarts that desire.

26. The Arab peoples whose dignity and honour have been slighted by the occupation of their territories, the establishment of Israeli settlements on their lands, the annexation of Jerusalem, the bombing of Tamuz and Beirut, and today the annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights, cannot understand why these acts which have been criticized and sometimes condemned by the United States, in so far as statements are concerned, can be carried out only because Israel is protected by Washington. If this concept were to become more widespread in the Arab countries, that would not be in the interest of the Arab countries, of the United States, or of peace. The United States must play its role as a great Power with international responsibilities, not that of a country allied to another for untenable reasons.

27. The Organization of the Islamic Conference, which I have the honour of representing here, is composed of 42 States with a billion inhabitants. All those peoples are anxiously awaiting the results of the present proceedings to see whether the United Nations can indeed still be useful or if a racist and terrorist lunatic which it itself created, can continue flouting its decisions with impunity under the protection of a Power, one of whose primary responsibilities as set forth in the United Nations Charter is to ensure that the United Nations serves as an instrument to guarantee respect for international law and to safeguard peace throughout the world.

28. Mr. KOH (Singapore): The Golan Heights belong to the Syrian Arab Republic. They came under the occupation of Israel as a result of the 1967 Arab-Israeli war. On 14 December 1981, the Parliament of Israel enacted a law extending its laws, jurisdiction and administration to the Golan Heights. These facts are not in dispute; what is disputed is whether the Parliament of Israel has the right to do what it did.

29. The action of the Israeli Parliament is tantamount to the annexation of the Golan Heights by Israel. But the Israeli law is without international legal effect for the following reasons. First, the Charter of the United Nations prohibits the acquisition of territory by the use of force. Secondly, the Israeli action is contrary to the fourth Geneva Convention.¹⁴ Article 47 of that Convention forbids an occupying Power to deprive protected persons of the benefits of the Convention through the mechanism of annexation of part or the whole of an occupied territory. Thirdly, the Hague Convention of 1907,¹⁷ which the fourth Geneva Convention

supplements, makes clear that a belligerent occupant is only a temporary administrator of the territory that it occupies. It is prohibited from annexing, dividing or pursuing any act that may permanently affect the legal status of the occupied territory. Fourthly, Israel's action violates the letter and the spirit of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) which, *inter alia*, reaffirms the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and, consequently, calls for the withdrawal of Israel from occupied Arab territories. Fifthly, it is an infringement of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Syria.

30. In defence of his Government's action, the representative of Israel, Ambassador Blum, has adduced three arguments. His first argument was that Syria has regarded itself as being in a state of war with Israel since 1948. His second argument was that the annexation was necessary in order to put an end to what he called an anomalous situation in the Golan Heights and to normalize the situation there. His third argument was that Israel remains ready to negotiate unconditionally with Syria, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). None of those three arguments can justify the action of the Israeli Parliament.

31. The fact that Syria regards itself as in a state of war with Israel does not confer on Israel any right under international law to annex occupied Syrian territory. If the occupation of the Golan Heights by Israel for 14 years creates an anomalous situation, the remedy for that anomaly is for Israel to restore the territory to Syria rather than to annex it. As for the third argument, while my Government welcomes Israel's offer to negotiate unconditionally a peace settlement with Syria, we regard Israel's action as having weakened, rather than strengthened, the prospects of negotiations with Syria.

32. Has Israel's action advanced or set back the cause of peace in the Middle East? In my delegation's view Israel's action has set it back. First, as we have already said, it weakens, rather than strengthens, the prospects of negotiations between Israel and Syria; secondly, it encourages extremism in the Arab world; and, thirdly, it compromises the Camp David peace process.

33. My Government enjoys diplomatic relations with the State of Israel. We recognize the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the State of Israel. We believe that Israel has a right to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized borders.

34. It is therefore as a friend that we address an appeal to the Government of Israel to rescind the law which its Parliament enacted on 14 December 1981. If Israel is sincere in seeking peace with its Arab neighbours, then Israel must refrain from taking such actions as the annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights, the annexation of East Jerusalem and the implantation of Israeli settlements in occupied Arab territories.

35. Finally, there can be no just and lasting peace in the Middle East until Israel is prepared to recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination, and until the Arab nation is prepared to accept the legitimacy of the State of Israel.

36. Mr. KUEN (Austria): The decision of the Government of Israel to extend its jurisdiction, laws and administration to the Golan Heights has been discussed extensively in the Security Council and during the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly. Security Council resolution 497 (1981), which was unanimously adopted, presents, in our opinion, a correct and firm position on that act, taking into account all its facets. It corresponds to the unequivocal position the Austrian Government has taken on that event and we fully subscribe to it.

37. The unilateral action of Israel has to be regarded from different angles. First, it constitutes a clear violation of established and generally accepted norms of international law, foremost, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by the use of force. There can be no doubt that the Golan Heights belong to the Syrian Arab Republic and are part of the territories occupied by Israel in the war of 1967. That being so, all the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention are fully applicable to them and have to be respected. On that basis, any unilateral action of an occupying Power which changes the legal, physical or demographic character of an occupied territory is illegal and no validity or recognition can be expected for it. I wish to refer in particular to article 47 of that Convention, which underlines the fact that protected persons cannot be deprived of the benefits of the Convention by a purported annexation of occupied territories. Thus, Austria finds itself in complete agreement with the stipulation of resolution 497 (1981) that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken in implementation of the decision of the Israeli Government have no legal validity and are to be considered null and void. We see that as a clear confirmation of the principle *ex injuria jus non oritur*.

38. Furthermore, we regard *de facto* annexation of the Golan Heights as a serious violation of the letter and the spirit of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which demand the withdrawal of Israel from the territories occupied in 1967 and respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all States in the region, and establish their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

39. With respect to the second aspect, that decision has added yet another dimension to the already complex situation in the Middle East as a whole. The Government of Israel has embarked on that unilateral course of action at a moment when, on the one hand, the tensions in the area were markedly increased and when, on the other, efforts were intensified to keep the frail structure of the peace process from collapsing.

40. The long preoccupation of the United Nations with the Middle East conflict has resulted in defining the approximate terms of a viable and comprehensive settlement. Foremost among those terms, we are convinced, is that it will have to be a peaceful and negotiated solution. The resort to violence, the use of force and unilateral measures such as the one at present under consideration can only aggravate the situation and lead to further obstacles on the road to peace. At this moment, when so much attention is focused on promoting negotiation, it seems to us imperative that all parties to the conflict refrain from actions which can only endanger the prospects of a negotiated settlement.

41. We are here considering an issue on which the international community has pronounced itself unequivocally and indeed with one voice. In view of the gravity and the serious implications of the problem, it is essential that this spirit of unanimity be maintained. Security Council resolution 497 (1981) deals with all the various aspects of the problem, and we feel that the significance of that unanimous decision should not be minimized by introducing issues which are legally or politically controversial and thus could complicate even further our search for peace and security in the region as a whole. We trust that the General Assembly at this ninth emergency special session will bear this in mind when it adopts its own decisions on this matter.

42. Mr. AL-AWADI (Kuwait) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, I should like to express to you once again my country's pleasure at seeing you preside

over this emergency special session, following the unanimously acknowledged success that you achieved while conducting the affairs of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly. Your experience, wisdom and sincerity will surely lead this session to its desired success.

43. My country is also pleased to see the new Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, conducting the affairs of the Organization, in which mankind places increasingly great hopes. Mr. de Cuéllar's special attributes will not only be a great help to the Organization but also enhance its role and provide a safeguard by dealing with matters with objectivity, wisdom and honesty. We offer him complete and faithful co-operation in the service of world peace and security.

44. I should be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the effective role played by the former Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, while serving the Organization, as well as to his honest efforts to promote its high objectives. In recalling those efforts, my country's delegation would like to wish him all success in his future life and endeavours.

45. The General Assembly has had to convene quickly in an emergency special session in order to consider the aggressive step taken by Israel recently when it decided to annex the occupied Arab land of the Syrian Golan Heights to the Israeli entity.

46. The Security Council has had the opportunity to consider this aggression. Unfortunately, however, the Council—the very instrument created to safeguard world peace and security—failed to shoulder its responsibilities, as defined by the provisions of the Charter, because of the veto power exercised by the United States of America in an effort to stand in the way of what is right and perpetuate what is wrong. Consequently, we believe that, since the international community has already expressed its condemnation of this aggression in the course of numerous meetings held by the Security Council in December 1981 and January 1982 and demanded that Israel rescind its illegal decision, the subject-matter for this session should not be restricted to the consideration of the new aggression committed by Israel but should include the discussion of the continued efforts on the part of the United States to protect and support Israeli expansionist and aggressive actions, not only through its unlimited financial and military support but also through its manipulation of the veto power against any decision dictated by the international will against the continued aggression by Israel.

47. My country's delegation is convinced that the veto power which the United States has acquired in its capacity as a great Power should not be abused in a way that grants the aggressor immunity against punishment.

48. As is known, the Security Council adopted resolution 497 (1981) of 17 December 1981, which declared that the Israeli decision to apply Israeli law, jurisdiction and administration to the Golan Heights was null and void and, therefore, should have no international legal effect, and which demanded that Israel rescind that decision, failing which the Council would meet again to consider appropriate measures, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, in order to compel Israel to comply with this Security Council resolution.

49. As expected, Israel rejected the unanimous resolution of the Security Council and expressed its disdain of the unanimous will of the international community by declaring, on the same day the resolution was adopted, that it would not abide by it. It also expressed its lack of interest in the prestige of the world Organization and its Members by insisting on challenging its resolutions

by proceeding to allow the establishment of still more settlements in the Golan Heights during the same period of time.

50. Hence the Council had to convene once again to consider the manner in which Israel could be forced to respect the international will, thereby avoiding a major setback to world peace and security. The Council met, and for 10 days the international community expressed the view that the only remedy for the situation was to apply the clear unequivocal provisions of the United Nations Charter. However, the United States of America and other States permanent members of the Council did not only remain totally silent throughout the debate on the Israeli aggressor—which threatens the peace and security not only of the explosive region of the Middle East but also that of the entire world—but even went so far as to make an effort to obstruct any attempt by the international community to impose sanctions on this outlaw State.

51. It was distressing to see those Powers relinquishing their international responsibilities at a time when they were expected to take the initiative with regard to the concern over peace, since these particular countries had played a major role in the creation of Israel—which has become a monster highly disrespectful of human values, as a result of the connivance of those countries and their encouragement in protecting its aggressive actions from the world's anger.

52. We believe that the time has come for us thoroughly to discuss this deep-rooted phenomenon and make a concerted effort to deal with it in a way which will make right prevail. We have repeatedly pointed out that the United States, with all its might and responsibilities, can play a balanced role in the Middle East crisis which will not ignore legitimate Arab rights and which will not be influenced by pressures—which are mostly illusory—constantly exerted in order to mislead the nations of our region into believing that an outside threat to their security and stability is imminent. The States of our region are convinced that the real threat in the Middle East area comes from the Israeli expansionist policies of aggression—those very policies which disregard the existence, interests and future of the Arab nation. The latest Israeli decision, that of annexing the occupied Syrian Arab territories, is but one episode in a long series of expansionist and aggressive actions which expose the reality of this racist aggressive entity.

53. The United States claims that it will not approve the imposition of any sanctions on any country not violating its strategic interests. We believe that peace and security in the Middle East are of major strategic interest to the whole world. Peace in the Middle East is closely linked to world peace and security, and by its aggressive actions Israel constitutes a major threat to peace.

54. On the other hand, the United States should realize that the continued Israeli aggression will only make it more difficult for the Arab nations of the region to control the situation in such a way as to guarantee that American and Western interests remain secure. History has taught us that violence begets violence and that continued aggression will only lead to undermining the basis and requirements of peace and stability.

55. From this rostrum we should like to call upon the United States to recall the ideals inherent in its war against injustice and colonialism—the very ideals that have been looked upon with great admiration by the world at large—instead of continuing to support the forces of injustice and aggression in our region.

56. My country's delegation believes that the entire international community should deal with this dangerous

state of affairs created by Israel in the Middle East—a reality that not only threatens the States of the region but may also in the future threaten other neighbouring countries, particularly in view of the fact that Israel's ultimate goal has been and still is the creation of so-called Greater Israel. Sharon's concept of the borders of that Greater Israel is well known by now. Such borders go beyond the old dream of a Zionist State extending from the Nile to the Euphrates; they continue eastward to Afghanistan and westward to the African reaches.

57. Since the planting of Israel in our midst on usurped Arab Palestinian lands, we have been warning the world about its expansionist ambitions. The time has now come when Israel has confirmed our misgivings, which are growing bigger and bigger.

58. We therefore call upon the international community to adopt at this emergency special session the necessary measures to deter the aggressors and to keep from them the tools that will help them achieve their territorial ambitions, whatever their source.

59. My country's delegation believes that we should determine what deterrent sanctions against Israel can be agreed upon in order to safeguard world peace and the future and aspirations of mankind. This requires that we meet our responsibilities and take appropriate decisions to deter the aggressor, to prevent it from benefiting from its aggression and to establish justice and peace in the region.

60. Mr. THUNBORG (Sweden): The Middle East conflict is primarily a conflict of fundamental national rights. For decades the rights of a people to national identity have been denied by a State which itself has found its rights of recognition, security and even survival called into question by its neighbours. No one party bears the full blame for the wars, atrocities and tension that have ensued over the years. Nor is any one party wholly without blame. We must focus our attention and react strongly each time a party to the conflict wilfully proceeds to aggravate an already intolerable and dangerous situation.

61. This emergency special session has been called to deal with Israel's decision to apply Israeli law, jurisdiction and administration to the occupied Syrian area of the Golan Heights. My Government condemns that decision.

62. In this context, it is appropriate to recall the principles established by Security Council resolution 242 (1967). That resolution confirms the inadmissibility of acquiring territory by war and calls for full respect for the territorial integrity of all States and for their right to live in peace within secure and recognized borders. Obviously, the obligation to respect the territorial integrity of other States applies to Israel as well as to its neighbours. The extension of Israeli jurisdiction to the Golan Heights is a clear violation of international law and resolution 242 (1967). It aggravates the tension in the area and further reduces the possibilities of achieving a peaceful solution of the conflict.

63. The Israeli action is of such a nature that the international community cannot leave it uncontested. That would indeed be a dangerous precedent. Sweden therefore fully supports Security Council resolution 497 (1981) of 17 December 1981, in which the Council, in accordance with its responsibilities, decided that the Israeli decision was null and void and demanded that Israel rescind it forthwith.

64. Israel has not complied. In its reply to the Secretary-General¹¹ concerning the Security Council resolution, Israel, by way of justification, refers to the long-standing hostile attitude of Syria and the need to bring to an end

what is called the anomalous situation regarding the Golan Heights. No satisfactory explanation is given, however, as to why, after nearly 15 years of military occupation, a change in the legal status of the area was suddenly considered necessary. On the contrary, it is this violation of international law that creates an anomalous situation.

65. Unfortunately this is not an isolated event. There are many aspects of the Israeli policy with regard to the occupied territories which cause grave concern and raise serious doubts about the ultimate intentions of Israel. I need only mention the unilateral Israeli decision to incorporate East Jerusalem, the increasing number of Jewish settlements, the treatment of local inhabitants and now, the virtual annexation of the Golan Heights. All these measures have one thing in common: their aim seems to be perpetuation of Israeli control of the occupied areas.

66. Sooner or later Israel must recognize that it cannot base its existence as a State on the denial of another people's right to self-determination. The quest for secure borders will prove futile as long as it relies on force and unilateral actions only. Secure borders, in the true sense of the word, require confidence and co-operation across those borders.

67. In its reply to the Secretary-General,¹¹ Israel reiterates its willingness to negotiate with Syria and its other neighbours for a lasting peace, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). We note this with satisfaction. Our satisfaction would be greater, however, if Israel would show its respect for those resolutions not only in word but also in deed—that is, removing the obstacle it recently placed in the way of negotiations by extending its jurisdiction to the Golan Heights.

68. A comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict must recognize Israel's right to exist within secure and recognized borders. It must also recognize the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, including, should they so wish, the right to form a State of their own. Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) remain the basis, although incomplete, for a peaceful settlement.

69. It cannot be repeated too often that a peaceful comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict can only be achieved through negotiations between all parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO]. Israel and the PLO must negotiate directly with each other. In our view it is false and misleading to believe that time is on the side of any single party in this conflict. The truth is that everybody stands to lose by allowing the present tense situation to continue. It is certainly no easy task to surmount the difficulties caused by decades of hostility and distrust, but the process of normalization between Israel and Egypt shows that it can be done. There is no alternative to negotiations but violence and war. In order to create an atmosphere conducive to negotiations, it is imperative that the parties show restraint and avoid taking provocative measures of the kind we are discussing here today.

70. The General Assembly and the world community have a duty to discuss and formulate their reaction to events. It is the responsibility of the Security Council to take action when international peace and security are endangered and to take a lead in bringing the parties to a comprehensive settlement and peace.

71. Mr. KOMATINA (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, we should like to extend to you our warm welcome to New York and to wish you a Happy New Year under more favourable conditions and circumstances—namely, we should prefer you to be presiding over the special session in better conditions, instead of dealing with the violation

of the territorial integrity of a sovereign country. It is evident that the year 1982, like the previous year, has not begun under a lucky star. Therefore, the General Assembly is facing a very responsible task, and I am convinced that under your experienced guidance it will open the way to firm opposition to the annexation of Syrian national territory.

72. The Yugoslav delegation already had the opportunity to express its views on this acute issue at the meetings of the Security Council held on 17 December 1981¹⁸ and 8 January 1982.¹⁹ The decision by the Israel Government to annex the Syrian Golan Heights was qualified as an extremely dangerous act threatening peace in the region and beyond, and as a violation of the basic norms on which international relations are founded and mutual international life is organized. In our intervention of 8 January 1982, we expressed the view that the application of Chapter VII of the Charter by the Security Council would be the adequate response to the threat to peace which emerges from the annexation and from the disregard of the Security Council decision to annul that annexation.

73. The Yugoslav Government has expressed, through a representative of the Federal Secretariat for Foreign Affairs, grave concern over the act of overt aggression against the Syrian Arab Republic and the flagrant violation of the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations and provisions of international law, and has also underlined the need to take indispensable and effective measures in order to protect the sovereign rights of Syria and other Arab States and of peoples in the occupied territories.

74. Unfortunately, the General Assembly has recently had to deal with an ever larger number of cases of encroachment on the national independence and territorial integrity of sovereign countries and the self-determination of peoples, instead of solving global issues. The ever more diverse forms of aggression are carried out through a sophisticated use of force—from more or less hidden forms of interference in the internal affairs and the undermining of the national and social stability of sovereign States, to armed interventions, prolonged occupation and acquisition of foreign territory by force as one of the most blatant forms of aggression. The annexation of the Golan Heights has confronted the international community with such an example of naked violence and is, after Jerusalem, the second Israeli annexation of occupied Arab territory in the last 18 months. It is obvious that this is nothing more nor less than the execution of a premeditated plan of expansion and domination.

75. This illegal and overwhelmingly condemned decision by the Israeli Government has turned the already complex situation in the Middle East into an even more dangerous and acute one, directly threatening international peace and security. It is beyond any doubt that the Middle East crisis constitutes a hotbed of universal dimensions which directly concerns the whole international community and each of its members. All the fundamental principles of contemporary international relations are involved in its substance, such as the non-acquisition of foreign territories by force, the condemnation of aggression, the non-recognition of *faits accomplis* perpetrated by force and the realization of the right to self-determination of, and support for, countries victims of aggression. Consistent respect for those principles has always been the precondition for any realistic way to a lasting, just and comprehensive solution of the crisis, which would enable all countries of the region to embark upon the road of independence, free from all kinds of foreign influence.

76. Furthermore, all conflicts and antagonisms in the world—wherever they occur—are reflected in the Middle East crisis since any deterioration in relations among the big Powers and blocs, any economic disturbance, or any exacerbation anywhere in the world directly influences the course of events in this region more than anywhere else. Various military, economic, political and other concerns are involved in the subtle game played around the Middle East. This is the reason why the Palestinian national revolution is faced with the intricacies of extra-regional foreign interests, and it is the reason why the war imposed on the Arab States and peoples by the Israeli aggression is a kind of total war waged through continual armed attacks against neighbouring States, reprisals, State terrorism, the usurpation of land, the expatriation of population, the colonization of occupied territories and their gradual annexation, as is the case with the Golan Heights and Jerusalem.

77. The General Assembly is therefore facing two urgent tasks: first, to prevent, by all means at its disposal, the acquisition of foreign territory by force, that is, to rescind the annexation of the Golan Heights, which is null and void; and secondly, to contribute by its decisions, clear messages and firm stands to the solution of the Middle East problem as a whole.

78. We are seriously concerned over the fact that the Security Council, having considered this acute question on two occasions, failed to respond to its essential obligation. The reasons for that are well known. The use of the veto, even in unquestionable cases of acts of annexation and aggression, reflects a wider negative phenomenon: that collective security, built on implied agreement—above all, of the permanent members of the Security Council—on the need to maintain world peace and security, could not be achieved in the existing division of the world into blocs. Instead, within the context of increased international tension, the intensified struggle for spheres of influence and the unrestrained arms race, there are ever more frequent manifestations of encroachment on the freedom and independence of sovereign countries and peoples. Such a situation has stressed the urgency of efforts effectively to strengthen the role of the Security Council and that of the General Assembly as the most democratic organs for the maintenance of peace and the protection of the security and territorial integrity of all countries, first and foremost of all small and militarily weak ones.

79. It is obvious that we are entering the 1980s without any immediate hope of a speedy solution of the Middle East problem. That is why intensified efforts by all to halt the use of force, to annul the annexation and to open the way to the establishment of lasting peace in the Middle East through a comprehensive and just solution have become indispensable. Such a solution must include the elimination of all the consequences of aggression and expansion: that is, the withdrawal of Israel from all Arab and Palestinian territories occupied during the 1967 war; the exercise of its inalienable national rights by the Palestinian people under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, which implies the recognition of their right to self-determination, a return to their homeland and the creation of their own national State; and the recognition of the right of every people and every country in the region to a secure development and a secure life.

80. The non-aligned countries have continuously striven to eliminate all the factors obstructing such a solution and have rejected every attempt to legitimize the *faits accomplis* of annexation and occupation.

81. The gravity of the situation calls for stronger joint efforts in order to overcome the impasse created by the

Israeli policy of expansion and annexation and by the negation of the rights of the Palestinian people. No one—least of all the international community—can remain indifferent to this crisis or regard it only from the narrow viewpoint of individual interest. In fact, there are fewer and fewer who can think and act in this manner. The positive elements of such an evolution are to be seen in the recognition of the urgency and the acute and universal character of the Middle East crisis and in the general condemnation of the annexation of the Golan Heights. This was also reflected in the recent debate in the Security Council on this issue. The international community has in fact reached a consensus on the need to put an end to the occupation, to annul the annexation and to create a Palestinian national State, as well as on the fact that this crisis has become harder to control and that as a result of the failure to resolve the crisis, it has become more difficult to guide international relations in a positive direction.

82. We therefore consider it imperative at this moment to prevent the annexation of the Golan Heights. It is in a sense a test for the United Nations to prevent the legitimization of the practice of changing the map of the Middle East by force. That can be done only by energetic and speedy action in applying all measures provided for in the Charter of the United Nations.

83. We expect the General Assembly to react in a manner that corresponds to the gravity of the situation and to its responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security.

84. As we have already pointed out, the situation facing us involves not only the need to defend the inalienable right of Syria to its territorial integrity; it also involves the defence of an essential principle for the maintenance of peace and security, which is in the interest of every one of us. Yielding or any kind of complaisance in this case would provide encouragement to any potential aggressor to use force with a view to acquiring foreign territory. Peace and security cannot be preserved here or elsewhere without the guarantee of independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity for every country, large or small, irrespective of social system and geographical position.

85. Yugoslavia has always stood by the victims of aggression—everywhere and in every case—as it has always supported peaceful political solutions of all conflicts, based on the recognition of the right of every country and people freely to decide its own destiny. Hence, we resolutely demand the protection of the sovereign right of Syria to the Golan Heights. Consistently with its non-aligned policy, Yugoslavia will support every constructive effort leading to the creation of conditions under which the world Organization can perform its duty in seeking a just, lasting and comprehensive solution on the basis of the annulment of all acts based on force.

86. Mr. FRANCIS (New Zealand): When I spoke on 23 July 1980 in the seventh emergency special session, on Palestine [4th meeting], I expressed New Zealand's view that the principles for a just and lasting peace set out in Security Council resolution 242 (1967) remained as valid as they were when agreed by the Council nearly 13 years earlier. It is saddening to us—as it must be to every Member of the United Nations that continues to place faith in this Organization as an instrument of peace—that 18 months further on, the achievement of a durable settlement in the Middle East seems as far away as ever.

87. As well as wanting to see the rights and aspirations of the Palestinian people realized, the New Zealand Government continues to support the just implementation

of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). In that resolution, the Council set forth the basis on which a comprehensive and peaceful settlement in the region might be achieved. It called for a termination of all states of belligerency and affirmed the right of every State in the area to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries. It further emphasized the inadmissibility of acquiring territory by war.

88. Yet it is this very action—the acquisition of territory by force—which Israel is seeking to legitimize through its decision of 14 December 1981 to impose its law, jurisdiction and administration on the Golan Heights area. The step which Israel took on 14 December has been denounced by almost every Member State of this Organization. Like Israel's policies on East Jerusalem, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, the step of annexation is a clear and direct contravention of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and of international law. It is a violation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and of the precepts by which the Organization seeks to bring about international peace and security.

89. New Zealand supports the decision of the Security Council in its resolution 497 (1981) of 17 December 1981 that Israel's imposition of its laws and administration on the Golan Heights is null and void and without international legal effect. Regrettably, for all the unanimity of that decision, the practical and political effects of Israel's annexation cannot so easily or readily be undone.

90. Israel's attitude towards and actions in the territories occupied since 1967, other than the Sinai Peninsula, give cause for concern. New Zealand sees these attitudes and actions, and the provocative policies Israel has pursued in recent months, as major obstacles to the achievement of peace in the Middle East. We see little chance of real progress towards a settlement until Israel is prepared to respect the rights and interests of the other States and people in the region and to live up to its responsibility to act as an acceptable neighbour. At the same time, there is little prospect of worth-while negotiations unless all parties are prepared formally to recognize Israel's right to exist. Only then can we realistically expect Israel to cease claiming that its survival is at stake and that it must take extreme measures to secure its boundaries.

91. The calling of this emergency special session is a measure of the frustration and rising tension caused not just by circumstances in the Golan Heights but by the whole situation in the Middle East. Unless intransigence is replaced by those negotiations that have repeatedly been called for by the Security Council, the region and its people will have little to look forward to but continuing violence and conflict. That will be the case, too, unless all States in the area refrain from actions that increase tension and threaten peace. For Israel to rescind its decision of 14 December would be a good start.

92. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States. I call on him in accordance with resolution 477 (V) of 1 November 1950.

93. Mr. KLIBI (League of Arab States) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, this is the first time since your election to the presidency of the General Assembly that I have had the honour to attend the deliberations of this body. Therefore, I extend to you my congratulations on the confidence the international community has expressed in you, and I also applaud your high qualifications, which amply merit that confidence and which ensure your complete success in carrying out your duties.

94. I should also like to renew my congratulations to Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, the new Secretary-General of the United Nations. I am confident that his

outstanding qualities and wide experience will help him to continue, with the same integrity and dedication, the great work of his predecessor, our friend Mr. Kurt Waldheim, for the interests of world peace, for greater understanding among nations, and in support of just causes.

95. Israel's decision to annex the Golan Heights, indisputably a part of Syrian territory, is contrary to both international law and the Charter of the United Nations. That fact formed the basis for the clear-cut Security Council resolution 497 (1981) of 17 December 1981. In the face of Israel's refusal to comply with the orders of the Security Council to rescind the annexation decision, the required majority of the members of the Council voted to adopt a draft resolution¹ calling on the international community to take a series of deterrent measures. But that draft resolution is now void, having been vetoed by one of the permanent members of the Security Council.²

96. The drafters of the Charter intended the right of veto to be exercised in relation to efforts for the preservation of peace and prevention of war. But now we see that same right being used in support of aggression, thus escalating tensions in a region considered to be one of the most dangerous, sensitive and explosive in the world. We are certain that the aggressor, Israel, which remains a major threat to peace and security, will persist in its policy of expansion at the expense of its neighbours and through the use of force and oppression so long as it is confident that its aggression will be supported by a super-Power which uses the veto to shield Israel from deterrent sanctions. It is that continuous, unconditional protection that encourages Israel to prepare for new aggression, which could be a military strike against southern Lebanon or another law annexing the West Bank to the Zionist entity, which already calls that territory Judaea and Samaria, or both those actions.

97. The basic problem facing the United Nations lies in the differences among proclaimed positions towards international issues, differences based not only on the relative importance of those issues, but also on the parties involved. Legitimate sanctions, which are provided for in the United Nations Charter, could be blocked by a country which has the right of veto, thus effectively voiding Security Council resolutions condemning an aggressor. The result undermines international morality, reducing it to an empty shell in which no one can believe. That contradiction between adherence to legal and moral principles and actions that deprive those principles of any effectiveness not only creates instability in the course of international law, but also denigrates the moral code and jeopardizes the prestige of the United Nations as a result of the contempt shown for its Charter, both in spirit and in substance. It also undermines the hope that international relations might reach a level of justice and equality consonant with human aspirations.

98. We wonder at a State founded upon the loftiest of human ideals, whose founders enshrined as sacrosanct respect for the freedom of the individual, for the rights of every nation and the sovereignty of every country, a State which possesses the material power to bolster its high ideals and to protect the rights of nations to dignity and self-determination—we wonder that such a great Power should support Israel, whose system is based on the ugliest forms of fanaticism, racism and expansion, and that it should provide Israel with unlimited military, economic and political assistance, which encourages it to greater tyranny and oppression. The nations that for so long were subject to European colonialism had high expectations of the role of the United States within the

framework of the United Nations because of the United States' support for the cause of liberation and independence. We in the Arab world were among those nations.

99. The matter of Israel's security produces an effect which is the opposite of what that term usually means. If that were not the case, how would it be possible for some to continue to be concerned about the security of Israel, with its proven power and the protection it enjoys from the United States, when it commits acts of aggression against its neighbours and undermines the peace of the region and of the world for no other reason than the insistence of its founders on translating into reality dreams and myths stemming from what they consider to be historical facts and sacred rights? It is not Israel that is threatened. It is the Arab States that have lost their security and whose skies and lands are under constant threat because the Zionist entity neither respects the law nor fears deterrent action. Could the United States agree with such reasoning, which places peace at the mercy of whims, megalomania and a fanatical desire for domination?

100. History primarily notes a country's achievements in the field of high human concepts. Similarly, an international system is remembered in any stage of its development for the degree of stability it establishes in relations among nations, the confidence it promotes among the weak, in the just behaviour of the strong, and for its success in ensuring peace and security. That is why security and peace occupy such an important place in the Charter of the United Nations. That is why the nations flocked to join the Organization; they hoped for the establishment of an international system that would ensure justice, peace and security and define the framework of civilized interaction.

101. We came to the General Assembly after it had become clear to us that the justice we seek would not be available in the Security Council because of the abusive use of the veto. We hope that the General Assembly will adopt adequate measures to end aggression and deter the aggressor.

102. The General Assembly has been witness for 35 years to the developments of one of the cruelest international tragedies in contemporary history, a tragedy that began when the Assembly decided to establish on Arab land inhabited by Arabs for centuries a political entity whose leaders from the very beginning rejected the principles of the United Nations, the very organization that created Israel. They launched a campaign of terror, violence and murder aimed at expelling the legitimate inhabitants of the land. They transformed an entire people with an ancient tradition, history and civilization into refugees, and lit the fires of successive wars against neighbouring Arab States with the aim of thwarting the struggle of generations for growth and progress. In every conflict, and because of Israel's aggression, the international community stood on the brink of a world war.

103. Yet the Arab nation did not lose confidence in the Organization, renewing its hope with every session of the General Assembly that the impact of the establishment of Israel on the Palestinian people would be rectified.

104. The international community cannot countenance the idea of imposing the will of any country by force of arms. It cannot, after successive centuries of civilized progress, permit a return to the law of the jungle. The Charter of the United Nations outlined for all of us—the strong and the weak, the rich and the poor—a code that gives no precedence to any particular ideology or dominance to any one country or power to one human being over another. Thus the international community

today cannot be permissive towards behaviour characterized by terrorism, violence and oppression. Neither can it go along with racial supremacy and a policy of invasions, based on myths that cannot possibly serve as a foundation for political interaction among nations.

105. The Arab nation believes in the values of human civilizations which it has helped enrich, and the similarities between the objectives of the League of Arab States and those of the United Nations bolster the faith of our Arab nation in this great human tradition, which calls for an international morality based on justice, equality, peaceful coexistence and prevalence of what is right.

106. We see only the United Nations as a symbol of this human tradition, as the repository for the hopes and aspirations of the peoples of the world and as the instrument for allowing the weak to attain the right to self-determination. And we recognize only this Organization as the means of punishing the aggressor and deterring those who would tamper with the law.

107. Therefore, when a Member State comes to the Organization with a complaint and when no doubt is left about the injustice and aggression committed against that State, it has every right to expect that the Organization will deter the culprit and mete out justice. We have waited for the Security Council to play the role assigned to it by the Charter, especially after the Secretary-General carried out to the fullest the mission entrusted to him by the Security Council. We do not say that the Council's position on Syria's complaint has thwarted our hopes in the Security Council or the United Nations, but we are concerned about the international Organization coming under influences that would prevent it from carrying out the aims of the Charter and the responsibilities for which it was established and which have gained the confidence of the nations.

108. If the policies of aggression persist, our peoples, trying to ensure their safety and security, would be forced to choose between two options: either to seek the protection of a powerful party, thus escalating the arms race, increasing international tensions and posing the threat of a destructive world war, or to resort to desperate, direct measures, with violent and destructive results.

109. We do not wish to follow either option, since both would ultimately lead to catastrophes and calamities. We are exerting every effort to avoid such a destination. That is why we resort to the General Assembly to reaffirm our commitment to international legitimacy.

110. The question before the Assembly represents, in fact, a call to the conscience of the international community to awaken before it is too late and before it becomes more dangerous, and before defiance of the United Nations Charter, instead of respect for it, becomes the new norm for political action in our region and other parts of the world.

111. We, the small States, have enough problems involved in the development and the construction of our countries, sufficient to absorb all our energies and efforts. We have no desire to add to the burdens of development the burdens of being drawn into alliances, of the construction of military bases and of the war machines of the super-Powers. We realize that thwarting the legitimate rights of the Arab nation—for example, by the position in the Security Council concerning the problem of the Golan Heights—could have dangerous repercussions for the entire region at a time when the Arab nation looks forward to development, stability and the removal of the causes of friction and all its consequences, that affect world peace.

112. For us the Palestinian cause takes precedence over other issues, because it is a question of halting the

constant depredation inflicted by Zionist aggression on our lands, our peoples and our resources, as well as on Arab industrial installations, such as the bombed Iraqi nuclear reactor. Our primary concern is the development and progress of the Arabs. Unfortunately, this is directly related to the issue of Israeli aggression, because as soon as we direct our energies towards construction and development, the Zionist entity strikes at the heart of that effort. We even expect that Israeli aggression, sustained by the most modern, long-range weapons available, will strike at the bases of development in all the Arab countries in order to satisfy a reactionary ideology and leaders who follow their terroristic course even while they occupy the seats of power and claim to carry out their international responsibilities.

113. The time has come for the international community to realize that to permit Israel's aggression and threats against its neighbours to continue undeterred is to raise the spectre of the United Nations losing the respect and importance it deserves and of dashing all those hopes which were raised when the Charter of the United Nations was proclaimed 37 years ago.

114. The General Assembly must also realize the extent of its historic responsibility in this particular case. Membership in the United Nations imposes on every Member State the obligation to comply with its Charter and its orders and warnings, as well as to respect international law. If the General Assembly permits a Member State to evade those obligations, to commit aggression against others and to defy the Charter, while at the same time enjoying the benefits of membership, then that would be tantamount to encouraging continued defiance and aggression, and would prompt others to follow in the same path.

115. It is also time for the international community to enhance the influence and position of the Organization and the credibility of the Charter by enforcing its provisions. The Arab States ask for no more than that. It is, at the same time, the will of the overwhelming majority of the Member States.

116. Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): Sometimes one ponders how many times the Zionist régimes have violated the rules of international law and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations; how many times they have unleashed aggression against Arab territories; how many times they have barbarously attacked and bombed civilian and peaceful targets; how many times they have attempted through military and "legal" means to suppress the Palestinian and other Arab populations of the occupied territories; and, finally, how many times the General Assembly and the Security Council have been obliged to meet to consider those outright breaches of international law and defiance of their own resolutions by the Israeli authorities.

117. The Organization alone has spent hundreds of hours of its precious time, accumulated tens of thousands of pages of documents and allocated millions of dollars of its scarce resources to cope with the consequences of these aggressive inhuman actions and to bring the wild aggressor to order. Yet, all to no avail.

118. The Israeli Zionist clique has not only refused to accept responsibility for its actions but has also, ironically, accused its neighbours of provocations or use of force against Israel. How could all this be possible while almost all nations have condemned every and each one of those actions and called for appropriate and prompt measures to be taken with regard to the situations created thereby?

119. A new low in international conduct has been reached by the Zionist bandits. Breaking even their own

past records, they have laid an open claim to world recognition of their alleged right to annex other sovereign States' territories.

120. Tel Aviv's decision to annex the Golan Heights, a territory of the Syrian Arab Republic seized by Israel in the 1967 war and occupied ever since, is a violation of international law and norms that is reminiscent in its outrageousness of the methods of Hitlerite fascism and militarism. It is an added irony that the solemn legalization of such utter lawlessness should have to be sought through the approval of that country's Parliament.

121. This is the unabashed, arrogant Zionist answer to all those resolutions on its aggressive and occupationist activities and attitude and for peace in the Middle East, and to this world Organization's repeated calls, in particular for Israeli withdrawal from the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories. The Zionist answer to world disapproval of indefinite occupation of independent nations' territories is overt annexation of the same territories.

122. This is Menachem Begin's reply, preceded by unprecedented repression of freedom fighters in the occupied territories, to their mounting mass campaign against the "autonomy" conspiracy designed to complete Israeli colonization of their homeland. This, too, is his and his régime's response to the increasingly vigorous denunciation by world public opinion of the stepped-up Zionist defiance of all accepted ground rules of international behaviour.

123. The Israeli bombing of the Iraqi nuclear reactor was evidently not to be the last illustration in that regard, universal as the condemnation of that act of piracy might have been. No more availing has been the voice of the United Nations against the Zionists' bid to redraw the map of the region, or its resolution against an over-ambitious Israeli canal project.

124. If the imperialist allies' support was always discernible behind the Israelis' aggressiveness, the stepped-up Zionist banditry, too, has not concealed the escalated support of the United States warlords behind it. Elevated to the status of "strategic co-operation", the new level of the United States-Israeli military alliance has clearly been the main inspiration behind that fresh series of outrages.

125. If the formal United States condemnation of the assault on the Iraqi nuclear installation did not prevent the concluding of "strategic co-operation", neither will the present publicity given to Washington's disapproval of the annexation decision be an obstacle to the further promotion of the alliance. It has, after all, been made very clear that the White House "disappointment" is only over the "timing" of the decision and the fact that it had not been extended the courtesy of prior consultations.

126. Faced with a strong world-wide condemnation of that Israeli action, the United States announced the suspension of planned negotiations on implementing the "strategic co-operation" agreement signed by the United States and Israel in November 1981. On 20 December 1981, the Israeli Prime Minister, showing his anger over the United States decision, informed Samuel Lewis, the United States Ambassador to Israel, that no power on earth could force his country to go back on its decision to annex the Syrian Golan Heights.

127. Begin's statement on that day regarding the unilateral annulment of the agreement on "strategic co-operation" was immediately revealed as a cloak for the close military co-operation between the United States and Israel and an attempt to mislead world public opinion. That agreement enables the United States to stockpile

in Israel ammunition for its Rapid Deployment Force, to conduct joint military exercises and to exchange intelligence information.

128. The Israeli Minister of Defence Ariel Sharon, however, told the Israeli newspaper *Yedioth Aharonoth* that the agreement on strategic co-operation between the United States and Israel remained in force and would be given effect as soon as required by circumstances. He made it clear that his Prime Minister's statement on the breaking off of the negotiations on the agreement was nothing but a means to get additional benefits for Israel in United States-Israeli bilateral relations.

129. The mild pronouncements made by the high-ranking officials of the United States administration served as Washington's official reaction to Begin's impudently sharp criticism and attacks. The United States Secretary of State, General Alexander Haig, appearing on American television, described the family scandal that had broken out in United States-Israeli relations as differences between very good friends. He said "Israel has been, is, and will be a close friend of the United States".

130. Sharon had previously stated his "confidence" that the United States knew of the annexation which was being prepared and which the Israeli Government had planned in principle long ago. That Washington knew about it is admitted by the American press as well. As reported by the *Washington Post* on 17 December 1981, high-ranking representatives of the United States administration were warned quietly about the prepared annexation. Specifically, the newspaper said, that was "hinted" to several officials by Shimon Peres, leader of the Israeli Labour Party, while he was staying in Washington on a visit a week before the official declaration by Begin of the decision on annexation. But, the newspaper said, the administration ignored that warning. Such a position, the *Post* continued, puts on the United States a share of responsibility for the Israeli action.

131. The diplomatic manoeuvres, however, are indicative of Washington's hypocrisy and duplicity. Demonstrations aside, it was far from the intention of the United States administration to suspend or even reduce the massive deliveries of up-to-date weaponry to the aggressor, although it is that weaponry that enables Israel to pursue its policy of aggression, expansion and piracy.

132. The world community had been rightly warned that the well-orchestrated quarrel between the United States and Israel should breed no illusions about the real role being played by United States imperialism in the Middle East and its criminal involvement in all Israeli aggressive actions.

133. The recent United States veto of the Security Council draft resolution condemning Israel and providing for sanctions against the aggressor has touched off another wave of anti-Zionist and anti-imperialist sentiment in the world. The storm of protest against the new Israeli outrage has had to be joined even by forces having pro-imperialist credentials, including those which, after Israel, are the major recipients of United States military aid or those which share a military alliance with it. Such reaction, however, is quite logical indeed. Washington has, in fact, not only given a mandate to Tel-Aviv to appropriate lands belonging to Syria, but has also encouraged Israeli extremist circles to go ahead with new acquisitions of territory by force.

134. Relying on those encouragements, Israeli Minister of Defence Sharon, in a comment to *Yedioth Aharonoth* on the annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights, stressed that Israel "will possibly have to think of other actions of this kind". That announcement may be explained in the context of the Zionist claim over a territory extending

from the Nile to the Euphrates. That could also be explained in the context of the need to ensure "vital interests" of the United States and "living space" for Israel.

135. Having taken the Israeli expansionists under its wing, United States imperialism has demonstrated again that it is an enemy of the Arabs and of peace in the Middle East. The United States veto of the Security Council draft resolution is likely to create conditions for the unleashing of another Israeli-Arab war.

136. The actions of Israeli aggressive circles are in full conformity with United States policy in the Middle East. The United States places its stakes on a strong Israel playing the role of a policeman in the region and, at the same time, being a jumping-off place for the United States armed forces.

137. Those are the only correct conclusions one can draw from the United States stand on this issue. Therefore, to ensure the complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from all occupied territories, to ensure the full exercise by the Palestinian people of their national inalienable rights, and finally to ensure a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, the world community must act with a united front to defeat totally the Zionist-imperialist designs.

138. The Afghan Government, in a statement issued shortly after the announcement by Israel of the annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights, stated in part as follows:

"While resolutely denouncing and condemning this new act of Israeli aggression, the Government and the people of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan express their solidarity with the Government and people of the Syrian Arab Republic in their heroic struggle against the Zionist aggression and expansion and for the restoration of the sovereignty of Syria over the Golan Heights. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is ready to support any effective measure against the Zionist aggressor, including the application of severe sanctions provided for under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter."

139. We reiterate once again our firm support of and solidarity with fraternal Syria and fully associate ourselves with the proposal made at the previous meeting by Mr. Abdul Halim Khaddam, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic, to suspend the membership of Israel in the Organization and to adopt complete and strict sanctions against it.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.