



## General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/40/PV.107  
9 December 1985

ENGLISH

Fortieth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Friday, 6 December 1985, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. DE PINIÉS (Spain)

later: Mr. OYQUE (Vice-President) (Romania)

later: Mr. MORENO-SALCEDO (Vice-President) (Philippines)

- The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General [38]  
(continued)

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 38 (continued)

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/40/168; A/40/668 and Add.1; A/40/779 and Corr.1)

Mr. VELAZCO SAN JOSE (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): It is a secret to no one that the situation in the Middle East continues to constitute a serious threat to world peace and security because of the persistent policy of aggression and expansionism being pursued by Israel with the military, economic, political and diplomatic support of the United States.

Israel's persistent refusal to recognize the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people and to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories is part of that policy. It is worth repeating that it is impossible not only to find a just, comprehensive and lasting solution to the Middle East crisis but also to restore peace to that region if we fail to take into account that the Palestinian question is the core of the Middle East problem and is the fundamental cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Consequently there is no room to harbour illusions that it is possible to resolve one problem without finding a solution to the other; the two are intimately linked.

Similarly, a prerequisite for the achievement of peace in the region is the total and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all the Palestinian territories and other occupied Arab territories and recovery by the Palestinian people of all its inalienable national rights, including its right to return to its homeland, its right to self-determination without external interference and to establish an independent and sovereign State in Palestine.

Partial or isolated solutions are inconceivable because they are doomed to failure. There can be no peace in the Middle East so long as Israel continues its policy of establishing colonial settlements in the Palestinian territories and in other occupied Arab territories, and while it persists in expelling Arab

(Mr. Velasco San Jose, Cuba)

populations from their territories and making demographic changes in the physical, cultural, religious and other characteristics of those territories.

It is unimaginable that peace can come to the Middle East so long as Israel continues to be protégé of the United States and to have the support of the Washington Government in continuing its international villainy. Yesterday it was the violation of Tunisia's sovereignty; today it is Lebanon's. Who will be next? For what destination in the Arab world will Israel's war machines head tomorrow to sow grief and death on Arab lands?

Israel's policy of State terrorism can be compared only with the acts of aggression to which Angola, the front-line countries and Nicaragua have fallen victim today at the hands of the South African racists and the United States imperialists.

This is terrorism raised to the level of State policy applied with all the force and power of those who consider themselves to be legally entitled to operate with impunity outside international law.

It is for that reason that the aerial attacks against Tunisia and the land incursions against Lebanon carried out by the Israeli Zionists go hand in hand with the mining of Nicaraguan ports by the Central Intelligence Agency and the bombing by the South African racists in Angola.

Cuba reiterates its solidarity with the cause of the Palestinian people. It calls for the unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories; it condemns the strategic alliance of the United States with South Africa and Israel; and it calls for the prompt convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East under the auspices of the United Nations in which all of the parties concerned may participate, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole and legitimate representative of that people.

Mr. ALAQUI (Morocco) (interpretation from Arabic): The Middle East question continues to occupy a prominent position in the list of problems accorded great attention by the General Assembly. The prevailing situation as our Assembly discusses this question, in this the year of the fortieth anniversary of our Organization, obliges us more than ever before to make relentless efforts to find the necessary ways and means to put an end to the crisis afflicting that region.

It is no secret that the question of Palestine is the core of the tragedy besetting the Middle East region, the history of which dates back to 1947, when the United Nations partitioned Arab Palestinian land into two States, one Palestinian and one Israeli.

Such injustice could have stopped there. However, Israel considered that the partition resolution was not an end in itself; it did not fit in with its expansionist designs. It therefore resorted to the most heinous arbitrary measures and oppression to deny the Palestinian people their most fundamental rights as spelled out by the partition resolution, which itself established Israel.

Israel has, as is well known, continued its expansionist policy at the expense of neighbouring Arab countries. It annexed Arab Jerusalem, the Syrian Golan Heights, Gaza and the remaining part of the West Bank. It attempted to draw other Arab parties into the conflict in the hope of diluting the character of the Palestinian question, with which the world was familiar.

Israel's invasion of Lebanon three years ago provided clear proof of Israel's ambitions in the region. Its army not only occupied that country; it perpetrated the most brutal crimes against innocent Lebanese civilians and Palestinian refugee camps. That is borne out by the painful events in the Sabra and Shatila camps.

(Mr. Alaoui, Morocco)

Today, as the people of that country are scoring decisive victories against Zionist colonialism, we can only hail the struggle of the Lebanese people and reaffirm our full support for and solidarity with them, our support for their unity and stability, and our readiness to pursue efforts in all forums until they regain their stability and security, and Lebanon can once again become a symbol of the coexistence of different factions in a framework of democracy and pluralism.

(Mr. Alaoui, Morocco)

Israel is pursuing in the region a consistent policy with clear-cut objectives. Ultimately, it aims at subjugating the Arab Palestinian people and at extinguishing the flames of its struggle. Evidence of this is that Israel, at every phase of expansion, did not hesitate to resort to desecration and oppression in all its forms. It has imposed its legal and administrative laws on Holy Jerusalem with a view to altering the religious and historical characteristics of the city. It has armed terrorist elements, and fomented bitterness among them so as to lead them to perpetrate liquidation activities and mass reprisals. It has continued setting up and expanding Jewish settlements. It has arrested tens of thousands of innocent Arab citizens and thrown them in gaol without trial, as well as engaged in other arbitrary practices, such as armed attacks against schools and universities, demolition of houses, dissolution of elected councils, burning down farms and forcing Arab citizens to emigrate.

A cursory glance at the latest report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories suffices for one to become acquainted with the events unfolding in the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories. It also sheds light on the scope of Israeli violations of the most basic human rights and pertinent United Nations decisions.

As if this did not suffice, Israel continues to export its terrorist policy outside the region. It has sent jet warplanes to bombard the Iraqi nuclear installations and, more recently, to undermine Tunisia's territorial integrity by a raid on the headquarters of the PLO. Everyone is aware of the waves of indignation and outrage that swept the international community in the wake of such events and the flood of condemnation that followed this terrorist operation, foremost among which was the condemnation of the Security Council.

(Mr. Alaoui, Morocco)

Worse still is the fact that officers and officials in Israel do not even deny their terrorist practices. They are even proud of them. They openly declare that they are ready to continue such practices, justifying their deeds by stating that they should inflict collective punishment on the Arabs, especially those they call "PLO terrorists".

The Arab countries do not have a tradition of practising terrorism or of encouraging terrorism. On the contrary, their leaders, both separately and collectively, have repeatedly denounced terrorism and called for resisting it. This is clearly borne out by the Final Communiqué of the Extraordinary Summit Conference of Arab States, held recently at Casablanca, which, in part, reads as follows:

"Out of commitment to the principles in which the Arab nation believes and drawing its inspiration from its civilization, its noble origin and its deep-rooted traditions, the Conference strongly disapproves of terrorism in all its forms and regardless of its source and, in the first instance, of Israeli terrorism both inside and outside the occupied Arab territories. It considers that recourse to terrorism is not in keeping with the ideals of mankind, and it calls for adherence to the principles of truth and justice in order to achieve the desired objectives and for the defence of national interests through the use of the legal means established by the international conventions." (A/40/564, annex, p. 5)

Everyone knows that this latest Extraordinary Arab Summit took place with the participation of the PLO in the person of its leader, Mr. Arafat, who played a prominent role in securing the success of this meeting and who strongly defended the proposals and recommendations spelled out in the Final Communiqué.

(Mr. Alaoui, Morocco)

Based on this public and explicit position expressed by the Arab leaders at that Conference, with the attendance and the participation of the PLO, we conclude, as mentioned recently by His Majesty King Hassan II, the following two points: first, the PLO is a liberation movement struggling to restore the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and is not a terrorist organization, as claimed by some; and, secondly, the legitimacy of the PLO representation has been recognized and reaffirmed on numerous occasions by the overwhelming majority of the international community, following its endorsement by the Arab Summit Conference held in Rabat in 1974.

To continue challenging such legitimacy represents an attempt to undermine all the efforts made thus far by the forces in the world that cherish peace and justice.

There is no doubt that the basic factor in the perpetuation of the tragedy afflicting the Middle East region lies particularly in Israel's intransigent disregard of the principles and measures formulated by the international community as an appropriate basis for peace and justice in this region. As we all know, the list of recommendations and resolutions adopted by various bodies of the United Nations in this regard is indeed lengthy and varied. The Programme of Action adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine represented an important step towards the resolution of this crisis. The Geneva Declaration on Palestine calls for the convening of an international peace conference in which all parties concerned would participate on an equal footing, including the United States, the Soviet Union and the PLO.

Members are aware of the tremendous support accorded to that Conference by numerous parties and regional and international organizations, more specifically the Non-Aligned Movement, the Organization of the Islamic Conference, and, recently, the Extraordinary Arab Summit Conference held in Casablanca.



(Mr. Alaoui, Morocco)

Participating in these efforts and fully upholding their national and historic responsibility with regard to the question, the Arab leaders took the initiative of adopting a courageous Arab plan, known as the "Fez Peace Plan", which was welcomed by many regional and international organizations, including the United Nations. Arab commitment to that plan was reaffirmed once again at the most recent Extraordinary Arab Summit.

The crisis prevailing in the Middle East, which is basically related to the fate of the Palestinian people, is giving rise to serious alarm, for it has now acquired even more dangerous dimensions inasmuch as it directly threatens international peace and security. Everyone knows that the reasons for this crisis can be attributed, not to particular characteristics or diverse elements, but basically to Israel's obduracy and resistance to the international will, as well as its disregard for law and international legitimacy in a bid to pursue its expansionist policy and its terrorist practices against Palestinian citizens and other Arab inhabitants under the yoke of occupation.

Hence it becomes necessary for our Organization to take the most effective measures and to redouble its efforts so as to force Israel to live up to its responsibility and to revert to legitimacy and law by respecting and applying the pertinent resolutions of our Organization.

As the General Assembly considers this item today, the Moroccan delegation wishes once again to express the commitment of the Kingdom of Morocco to the justice and legitimacy of the rights of the Arab people under occupation, and particularly the rights of the Palestinian people, and to their heroic struggle to regain their land and their homeland and to set up their own independent State on their soil. Morocco's solidarity with the Palestinian people and the other Arab peoples is not merely the instinctive solidarity of one Arab people with other Arab peoples but, as King Hassan II has said on many occasions, is an authentic solidarity based on our culture and our traditions as well as our firm adherence to the principles of law, justice, right and equality.

It has now been accepted everywhere that no just, comprehensive and lasting peace can be achieved in the region unless the following conditions are met: total and unconditional withdrawal from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including the Arab part of the Holy City of Jerusalem; removal of all the settlements established by Israel since 1967 in the occupied Arab territories; reaffirmation of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to the enjoyment of their inalienable national rights under the leadership of their sole and legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO); establishment of an independent Palestinian State with Jerusalem as its capital; and reaffirmation of the right of every country in the region to live within secure and recognized boundaries.

Finally, I express my delegation's gratitude to the Secretary-General for the valuable, comprehensive reports he has submitted on this subject. I wish also to thank the Chairman and members of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, as well as the Chairman and members of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, for the reports they have submitted on matters related to the issue of Palestine.

Mr. AZZAROUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): This week the Assembly is once again discussing the problem of the Middle East, just as it discusses the question of Palestine at every session. The connection between these two problems is that the question of Palestine is the core of the struggle in the Middle East. With the passage of every day and every year, that struggle makes the following truth ever clearer: that the Zionist enemy has genuinely aggressive, expansionist aims. Those aims are no longer limited to Palestine; they extend beyond that, to the neighbouring Arab territories.

At the beginning, Zionist expansionism took the form of agricultural settlements. It then entered the stage of the so-called Jewish National Home. It was claimed that this was a limited cultural and religious grouping. But in 1948 that grouping took on the form of a fighting entity. That entity managed to wrest resolution 181 (II) from the United Nations in November 1947. The resolution provided for the establishment of two States in Palestine, one Arab and the other Jewish, with an economic union and on the condition that Jerusalem would have a special status.

That resolution is absolutely null and void, because the United Nations had no jurisdiction to adopt it. The Mandate over Palestine was not transferred, either constitutionally or legally, from the League of Nations to the United Nations when the former was disbanded and the latter was created. Moreover, the United Nations partition resolution is conditioned upon the implementation by the Zionist entity of United Nations resolution 194 (III), adopted on 11 March 1949, but the Zionist entity has refused up to the present day to implement the latter resolution.

The Zionist entity was not concerned with these constitutional and legal questions. Its plans for expansion and settlement had a much wider framework than resolution 181 (II), adopted in November 1947. David Ben-Gurion was very frank about this in a letter that he sent to his wife from London on 16 March 1939. In that letter he said:

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

"The British could not believe their ears when we informed their Government, with determination and great self-confidence, that we would not let them create an Arab State in Palestine and that the Arabs could not rule Palestine against our will".

By pretending to accept the partition resolution, the leaders of the Zionist entity had in mind only obtaining a foothold in Palestine to which the international community would give international legitimacy - a foothold that would enable the Zionist entity to occupy and annex more of the territory of Palestine and neighbouring Arab States. David Ben-Gurion was frank about this issue also. In a letter that he wrote to his son, Amos, on 5 October 1937, he said this:

"I am a strong, enthusiastic advocate of a Jewish State, even if that means the partitioning of Palestine. I base myself on the premise that a limited Jewish State will not be the end but the beginning. If we obtain 1,000 or 10,000 hectares, we will be happy. Obtaining land is important not as an end in itself but because, through this, we can become stronger, and each increase in our strength will help us eventually to appropriate the whole country. The creation of a State, even a limited one, will make us stronger today, and that will give a solid pillar to and be an axis for our historical struggle to regain the whole country. We shall attract to this State all the Jews we can absorb. We are confident that we will be able to attract more than 2 million persons. We shall create a diversified Jewish economy, in the agricultural, naval and industrial fields. We shall create an efficient defence force, a first-class army. I have no doubt whatsoever that our army will be one of the best in the world, which will enable us to settle all the other parts of the country, either through agreements and understandings with our Arab neighbours or by any other means".

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

And it is these "other means" that the Zionist entity is using against the neighbouring Arab lands. It has occupied all of Palestine, southern Lebanon and the Golan Heights. It continues to occupy Taba in Sinai, through the use of those "other means" referred to by Ben-Gurion more than 48 years ago.

The Zionist ideology is based on the absolute certainty that all the Jews in the world must have a national presence in the historical land of the 12 Jewish tribes. That idea is the core of Zionism. Zionism cannot rid itself of the temptation to expand. The Zionist entity was created in well-known circumstances of illegality and terrorism. Hence, even if it wished to do so, it cannot abandon its feverish search for Lebensraum.

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

Having secured legitimacy in 1947, it then turned to expansionism. In the first phase it occupied Om Alrashrash and ensured an access to the Gulf of Aqaba. It followed with its invasion of Egyptian lands in 1956 to obtain privileges on the Red Sea. Then it waged its well known aggression in 1967 to achieve the first phase of the creation of Eretz Israel. In 1967 it managed to wipe Palestine off the map of the world and it gave Palestinian lands Hebrew names such as Judea and Samaria.

In addition to Palestine, its expansion spread to include the Syrian Golan Heights, southern Lebanon and Egyptian Taba, which is still being occupied by the other means mentioned by David Ben-Gurion.

Those stages in the life of the Zionist entity have underlined its chronic will to expand. The Zionist entity, after annexing all the Palestinian territories, moved to a new stage and to the implementation of a new plan which threatens the independence of many Arab States as independent States.

In the four major armed confrontations, in 1948, 1956, 1967 and 1973, the Zionist entity was the aggressor on every one of those four occasions. Those acts of aggression obtained a regional expansion for the Zionist entity at the expense of Arab land, and neighbouring Arab territories.

In their expansionism, the leaders of the Zionist entity based themselves on a bizarre theory which is that the aggressed will remember only the latest act of aggression, that the aggressed will demand only those rights which have just been transgressed, and that any new demands will cover all former demands, and that the aggressed will forget all demands because he has despaired of obtaining them.

Abba Eban, the former Foreign Minister of the Zionist entity, and the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the so-called Israeli Knesset, was very frank in this when he said in an interview with Foreign Affairs magazine in July 1965:

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

"Those Arabs who demanded first of all the return of Israel to the 1948 borders will be forced with time to demand only what Israel will have gained in 1966 or 1967.

Now, that declaration clearly shows the expansionist ambitions of the Zionist entity, and it clearly shows the pre-arranged invasion of 1967. It is an irony, both strange and sad, that the Arabs in fact call only for the territories the Zionist entity occupied on 5 June 1967. The Zionist entity refuses to return those lands occupied at that time as if that entity, according to its traditional policy, wants to force the Arabs in the future to be more moderate in demanding their rights.

In 1950, Ben-Gurion stood before the students of the Hebrew University and he expressed the following:

"The Israeli empire must annex all territories between the Nile and the Euphrates. By invasion and diplomacy, that empire shall be built."

When David Ben-Gurion was entrusted with forming the Government in 1952, he said:

"I accept to form the Government on condition that I be able to use all possible means to achieve our expansion towards the south."

None of the Arabs heeded those words, which clearly led the way to the Suez adventure and which ended in 1956. Le Monde, the French newspaper well known for its quality and objectivity, published on 1 December 1968, on page 3, quoted a letter sent by David Ben Gurion to the late President Charles de Gaulle, requesting support for the demands of the Zionist entity on territories west and east of the Jordan river because that was the land of Elijah, according to David Ben Gurion.

The map of Eretz Israel, sculpted on the highest entrance of the Israel Knesset building, reminds every Israeli of the continuing expansionist inventions which, after Palestine, are now aimed at other Arab States.

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

For that reason, the Zionist entity, after it wrested legitimacy from the United Nations on the basis of a United Nations resolution, has not accepted the borders laid down therein. Ariel Sharon, the current Minister of Trade of the Zionist entity, said: "The borders of Israel are where the furthestmost Israeli tank is." This is the other means mentioned by David Ben Gurion 48 years ago: occupation and expansion in all directions by using armed force.

The documents presented to the Peace Conference at Versailles on 3 February 1919, confirmed that Zionism wished to annex southern Lebanon, Sinai, the northern Hejaz and both banks of the Jordan River, West and East.

The most moderate Zionist thinker, Marcel Blaumfeld, who was very modest in setting out the borders of Eretz Israel, believed:

"They must include Judea, Samaria, Hebron and all the lands of Trans-Jordan."

He added:

"Palestine goes from the Mediterranean to a particular predetermined distance from the Hejaz railroad, and from the Litani River to an area south of Gaza and the Dead Sea, including the Dead Sea in a way which would cover the needs of the Jewish people."

That chain of aggressive wars, those ambitions of expansion and settlement, characterize the Zionist entity. The course of events since that entity was planted in the body of the Arab nation are a source of great concern. Bit by bit we have witnessed the annexation of many Arab territories in Syria, Lebanon, Egypt and Jordan, after all the Palestinian territories were swallowed up. In the future we shall witness the occupation of more lands, of more States Members of the United Nations by an entity which came to creation through a United Nations resolution which, as I said, from the beginning is null and void.



(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

Zionist aggression, Zionist occupation of the Arab territories was not condemned. It was not condemned for changing the demographic character of those territories, despite the fact that the principles of international law, as well as the Fifth Geneva Convention and the Hague Conventions all provide that military occupation as a result of war is essentially temporary and does not give the occupying Power extensive jurisdiction. In other words, occupation does not jeopardize the sovereignty of the State on that part of its territory occupied by a foreign Power.

Articles 42, 43 and 48 of the Hague Convention of 1917, provide that the warring State does not obtain sovereignty on the land it occupies. Contemporary international law considers occupation:

"A temporary effect of war, based on force and which is maintained by force." This explanation clearly shows the difference between military occupation and annexation.

Today, we see the Zionist entity flouting all international laws, principles and accepted norms. It does not stop at going beyond the limits of the authority given by international law to the occupying Power. Indeed it breaches international law in a fundamental way because it transforms occupation to annexation. Annexation cannot be legitimate unless the sovereign State explicitly concedes its sovereignty over the occupied lands.

Abba Eban in 1949, when he was Permanent Representative of the Zionist entity in the United Nations, claimed that what he calls his Government had annexed the territories which go beyond the borders laid down by the partition resolution with the agreement of the neighbouring State.

He considered that the agreement of those States was understood in the truce agreements. Who could believe such an incredibly far-fetched justification? The truce agreements reflect only a temporary state of affairs in which the war has ended and a cease fire prevails. They do not give privileges to any party.

The Zionist entity repeatedly ignores the international community. It has ignored United Nations resolutions and belittled those of the Security Council. When on 30 June 1980 the Council deplored Israel's persistence in changing the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem and called upon the Zionist entity to desist forthwith from that policy and measures affecting the status of that City, the Zionist entity replied that its annexation was "final and irreversible". And indeed, the so-called Israeli Knesset voted in favour of the annexation of Jerusalem. Following that, we witnessed the annexation of the Golan Heights and then of the West Bank and Gaza.

Moshe Dayan, the former Defence Minister, stated: "Israel will not return to the ridiculous borders of 1948." And Abba Eban, the former Minister of Foreign Affairs and Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the so-called Israeli Knesset, stated:

"I do not believe it is possible to return to the map showing the borders of 5 June 1967."

Levi Eshkol, the Israeli Prime Minister, stated on 6 August 1967:

"Something like the Suez Canal cannot be regarded as a natural barrier or frontier."

They came to the Suez Canal twice in the past and, who knows, they may return a third time.

In spite of the thuggery of the Zionist entity, in spite of its flouting the United Nations and in spite of the fact that it ignores all the resolutions of the Organization, even humanitarian resolutions that call for the return of Palestinian refugees to their homeland, from 1967 to date, that entity refuses even to allow

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

the refugees to return to their homes, in defiance of the resolutions of the United Nations, the principles of the Charter and basic human rights, which include the right of every citizen to return to his homeland. Yet in spite of all that, the United States of America, the strategic ally of the Zionist entity, continues to take time every year to express regret that the Palestinian refugees are not allowed to return to their homes. That regret is traditionally couched in a meaningless way through the submission of a draft resolution calling upon various countries to contribute to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA).

We believe that, as a result of its strategic alliance with the Zionist entity the United States of America is an effective and direct accomplice that bears the lion's share of responsibility for all the aggressive and expansionist wars the Zionist entity has waged to realize the establishment of Eretz Israel. In addition, the United States of America is responsible for all the Israeli practices in the occupied Arab territories, practices that are in violation of every law, legal norm and international convention.

The United States of America has placed at the Zionist entity's disposal its treasury, its military arsenals and its technological know-how. Indeed, the Zionist community is not content with that limitless giving; by illegitimate means it attempts to obtain even more information and more military secrets, encouraged by the increasing sympathy and understanding being shown by the American Administration for its aggressive expansionist plans, to the extent that Israel has become the United States of America's big stick, to be brandished in the face of this or that Arab State whenever it chooses.

We in the Middle East are facing the arrogance of United States power. The policies of defiance and confrontation of the United States Administration in the Middle East, in defiance of United Nations principles and totally ignoring the principles of the Charter, have created a very explosive, tense and unstable

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

situation in our region. We face the danger of nuclear weapons deployed by the United States of America in every part of the world, and particularly in Europe and near our own shores. From time to time the United States of America has attempted to carry out military manoeuvres using various aircraft, naval vessels and weapons inside our territorial waters and on our eastern borders. During the periods between such manoeuvres, American military aircraft violate our airspace and their ships violate our territorial waters. Such aircraft and vessels come from American military bases in southern Europe.

Last August we witnessed joint Egyptian-American manoeuvres in the western Egyptian Sahara, on our eastern borders, which is their favourite place for such manoeuvres. In the same week as those manoeuvres were being held, American aircraft violated Libyan airspace.

We are facing the arrogance of power and the policy of intimidation of the United States of America, which is designed to terrorize people, to force them to bow to American hegemony and to hand over their wealth. The United States of America has prepared the ground for such practices carried out by it or by those under its orders by statements that emanate now from the White House, now from the State Department, all attempting to involve my country in any issue or problem confronting the United States of America because of its continually biased policy, always on the side of the racist fascist régimes in Palestine and South Africa. The United States blames my country for anything that happens to any of its allies anywhere. The latest example of this is the hijacking of the Egyptian civilian aircraft at Athens Airport, an aircraft that had earlier been intercepted by American warplanes and forced to land at an American base on Italian soil. Some American sources attempted to accuse my country of having had a role to play in the hijacking of that aircraft after the extremely bloody events that occurred when it was stormed by Egyptian paratroops. The United States of America wants to make my

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

country assume responsibility for the hijacking and for the tragic events that occurred after it as well, in spite of the fact that the whole world knows that my country played no part in the hijacking of that aircraft and in spite of the fact that my country has always condemned hijacking.

All those accusations are made as part of its attempt to justify any act of aggression occurring anywhere near the Jamahiriya, at a time when news agencies are filled with reports of Egyptian forces massing on the eastern borders of my country. Those troop concentrations, which include various air, land and sea weapons, as well as air defence weapons, clearly show that there is a careful plan to launch a large-scale military attack against the Jamahiriya, to force it to its knees and force it to concede. The Arab Libyan people have chosen.

The United States of America has not stopped at those provocations and pressures. Indeed, it has taken a series of economic steps against Libya in an attempt to starve our people. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya regards such American practices, which violate the principles of the Charter and the purposes of the United Nations, as a threat to peace and security in our region. We believe that they are aggressive acts against the Jamahiriya and part and parcel of its policy of aggression of the United States directed against small peoples. They are all clear violations of the principles of the international community which call for peace.

We believe that such practices and pressures are an integral part of United States policy aimed at spreading fear and terrorism in the world and threatening the peace and security of third-world States. Such manoeuvres and measures are merely links in the long chain of American policies aimed at subjecting others to its control and hegemony. The Jamahiriya will continue to combat such policies. We shall continue to resist them, whatever the cost, whatever the effort and whatever the sacrifice.

Mr. ICAZA GALLARD (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): The situation in the Middle East - particularly the question of Palestine - is a problem that the United Nations has been considering without interruption almost since our Organization's creation. For 38 years, to be more exact, this Organization has been making great efforts to resolve the problem, without yet having achieved concrete results that could lay the foundations for a just and lasting solution for the situation in the Middle East.

It is important to recall resolution 3236 (XXIX), in which the Assembly reaffirmed the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination without external interference, the right to independence and sovereignty and the right of the Palestinians to return to their homes and have their property restored to them. That important resolution also reminded the international community of the need to implement resolutions 181 (II) and 194 (III), adopted in 1947 and 1948 respectively. In the first of those resolutions the Assembly recognized the right of the Arab people of Palestine to an independent State in Palestine.

In 1975 the Assembly adopted resolution 3375 (XXX), in which it invited the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, to participate in all peace efforts made under United Nations auspices on an equal footing with other parties. The Assembly also decided in 1975 to set up the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, whose vital work and recommendations are approved by the Assembly year after year.

Today, as we celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the founding of our Organization, and after 38 years of efforts to find a solution to the problem, there is a general consensus, shared by the overwhelming majority of Members, on certain fundamental questions having to do with the situation in the Middle East.

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

First, the question of Palestine is the core of the Middle East problem. Therefore, there can be no solution that does not ensure full respect for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people - in the essence the right of the Palestinians to return to their homes, the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and independence and the right to establish its own independent State in Palestine. Secondly, the PLO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, must participate on an equal footing with all the other parties in all the initiatives, meetings, negotiations and conferences under United Nations auspices.

It is also essential to bear in mind the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. Therefore, any solution must be based on Israel's total and unconditional withdrawal from all the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories.

To those matters we must add another series of principles adopted during the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held in Geneva in September 1983. They include: the inadmissibility and rejection of Israeli policies and practices in the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem; the nullity and invalidity of all the legislative and administrative measures and provisions adopted by Israel whereby that occupying Power has sought to change the character and status of the Holy City of Jerusalem; and the right of all States in the region to exist within secure and internationally recognized boundaries, with justice and security for all the peoples.

It has not been possible to bring all those principles, resolutions and recommendations together in a compromise formula that could be the basis of the just and lasting peace that we all hope to see in that strife-torn region. We must say that the main obstacle is Israel's intransigence and lack of political will, buttressed by the unwavering support of the United States, support that has only continued to encourage that country to persist in disregarding the relevant

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

resolutions of the United Nations, to increase the number of colonial settlements in the illegally occupied territories, to annex new territories, to apply measures designed to change the demographic composition of the occupied territories, to seize land, to apply collective sanctions against the legitimate inhabitants of those territories, and to use force against the Arab nation. The most recent examples are the barbarous acts of aggression against our Palestinian, Lebanese and Tunisian brothers.

The lack of political will to which I have referred has also been reflected in the specific case of the implementation of resolution 38/58 C which, endorsing the Geneva Declaration on Palestine, adopted on 7 September 1983, calls for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East on the basis of the principles already set out. The invitation addressed to the Security Council in that resolution to facilitate the organization of the conference has gone unheeded, and the stubborn position of one permanent member has also prevented the Secretary-General from initiating the necessary preparations.

Dr. Sergio Ramirez Mercado, Vice-President of the Republic of Nicaragua, said at the opening of the Latin American regional meeting held in Managua from 12 to 15 April 1983 to prepare the International Conference on the Question of Palestine that we welcomed the holding of that meeting

"imbued with a sense of duty and responsibility clearly resulting from our membership of the United Nations and consequently as a country responsible for implementing its agreements, and principally from our active solidarity with the cause and the rights of the Palestinian people".

He added that Nicaragua had shown its active solidarity with the Palestinian cause

"not only because we believe that that cause is just and necessary and should be recognized, and because the rights of the Palestinian people should prevail, but also because we have found that both Nicaragua and the Palestinian people are the targets of the same imperialist interests".



(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

There is no doubt that the peoples of the Middle East - particularly the Palestinian people - of southern Africa, and of Central America are facing the same enemy and fighting the same fight for independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, self-determination and justice. We reiterate yet again that to face that enemy we must, first and foremost, be united.

Our people and our Government wish to reaffirm their commitment to and solidarity with the Palestinian people and its vanguard movement and sole legitimate representative, the PLO, and their solidarity with all the peoples of the brother Arab nation in its struggle for peace, which is our struggle as well.

Mr. OMAR (Brunei Darussalam): The question of "The situation in the Middle East" has been discussed by the General Assembly virtually since the very formation of this Organization. Over the past 40 years we have seen a long series of efforts under United Nations auspices to resolve that conflict by peaceful means. But despite all those efforts we have seen four major wars break out in the Middle East.

It is regrettable that, despite the length of time and the relentless efforts of the international community in the search for a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the conflict in the Middle East, the problem persists, with increasing cost, in terms both of lives and of property. Israel's intransigence is the prime reason for the lack of progress in finding a solution. Israel has deliberately defied United Nations resolutions, in utter disregard of the will of the international community and the authority of the United Nations. We therefore condemn Israeli rejection of all peace initiatives adopted by the international community to put an end to the Middle East conflict.

The question of Palestine remains the core of the Middle East problem and the root cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Brunei Darussalam therefore firmly believes that any efforts to find a durable and lasting peace in the Middle East

(Mr. Omar, Brunei Darussalam)

must take into account the question of Palestine and the right of the Palestinian people to a homeland if that peace is to materialize. Brunei Darussalam believes that these things are indivisible and must be perceived as a whole.

Solution of the Palestinian question is the prerequisite for peace and stability in the region. Israeli occupation of Palestinian territories and other Arab territories is the cause of tension in the region and a threat to international peace and security. No just and lasting peace in the Middle East can be established so long as Israel refuses to withdraw its forces from all the Palestinian and other Arab territories it has occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem.

In the absence of a just and lasting solution to the Palestinian question - and indeed to the question of the Middle East - tension and violence will only increase in the Palestinian and other occupied Arab territories. That situation can only continue to deteriorate until the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people have been fully recognized.

Israel continues to pursue relentlessly its policy of consolidating its strangle-hold on the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories. It is continuing vigorously its illegal actions aimed at altering the demographic and geographic status of the occupied territories, including the establishment of Israeli settlements. We are deeply concerned over the persistent policy of Israel to confiscate Arab land in the occupied Palestinian territories and to establish Jewish colonial settlements there. That runs counter to the Security Council resolution affirming that the establishment by Israel of settlements in Palestine and other Arab territories occupied since 1967 is legally null and void and that those settlements constitute a serious obstruction to the achievement of a comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East. Israel's expulsion of Palestinian inhabitants and its oppression of the Arab population of the occupied

(Mr. Omar, Brunei Darussalam)

Arab territories also constitute a grave obstacle to the attainment of peace. It is therefore imperative that Israel relinquish unconditionally all the Arab territories it has occupied since 1967 and that it dismantle all its illegal settlements, in order to facilitate the attainment of a genuine peace based on the principles of justice and morality.

As the question of Palestine is the core of the problem of the Middle East, an essential element through which Middle East peace could be attained is the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their rights to return to their homes and property, to exercise their right of self-determination, and to establish their own State in Palestine within secure and recognized borders. The right of self-determination is a sacred right of all peoples. The struggle of a people to secure the self-determination and independence unjustly denied it has not only led to conflict in the region, but constitutes a constant danger to international peace and security. Genuine peace can be attained only by means of negotiations among all parties concerned, not through military superiority, territorial expansion and policies of terror and repression as has been advocated by Israel.

The Palestinian people have chosen the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) as their sole legitimate representative. The participation of the Palestinian people through the PLO, on an equal footing with other parties, in all negotiations relating to the Middle East problem is indispensable. Yet Israel has continued to manifest its intransigent stance by outright rejection of negotiations with the PLO. We believe that the long-standing barriers created by Israel, which has been obstructing the peace-negotiation process, are artificial and therefore can be eradicated by Israel discontinuing its present policies of expansion and its intransigent attitudes.

(Mr. Omar, Brunei Darussalam)

In that respect, Brunei Darussalam welcomes and lends its support to the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, as specified in the relevant United Nations resolution; that offers the only realistic and practical way of achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the problems of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The international peace conference on the Middle East should be convened under the auspices of the United Nations, with the participation on an equal footing of all the parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict, including the PLO.

The solution of the Palestine problem could be achieved through the establishment of an independent Palestinian State in Palestine on its own national territory, in conformity with the relevant United Nations resolutions.

Mr. CESAR (Czechoslovakia): Another year has passed and we again review at this forum the developments in the Middle East, a region that has long been a source of serious concern for the international community. So far the discussion has shown not only that the dangerous situation in the Middle East continues but also that its prospects are becoming increasingly dim.

In the United Nations the problem of the Middle East has been considered a number of times in various organs of this universal Organization. Substantive discussion on the issue has always reached the conclusion that the main cause of the dangerous situation lies in Israeli expansionism and aggressiveness. The past year, too, has brought new evidence of the peril inherent in the policies of Israel. Let us recall, for example, the barbaric practices of the Israelis in their occupation of the territory of Lebanon, their continuing repression of the Arabs on other unlawfully occupied Arab territories, their intensified colonization efforts or the recent vile terrorist bombardment of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) headquarters in Tunisia. Those acts have rightly met with the resolute condemnation of world public opinion. However, as has happened many times in the past, the policy of Israel has been defended by the United States. During the long period of the Middle East crisis the United States itself has more than once practically revealed that such a defence is prompted by the selfish interests of United States imperialism. This fact has been proved irrefutably a number of times in the course of our debate. The international community has also resolutely condemned zionism as an ideological and political instrument designed to protect such interests. It has been rightly pointed out that zionism makes it possible to conceal the class and social background of the neocolonialist policy of imperialism in the Middle East and that it poses a threat to both the Arab and the Israeli people.

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

In order to achieve its goals the United States has not hesitated even to use the threat of direct military intervention. As a result of the regrettable affair of the hostages taken from a United States plane, it has launched a new campaign against the Arabs, made an open display of force and taken repressive measures against Lebanon that have further increased tension in that country and in the whole region.

Concurrently with those overt manifestations of the true nature of the policy of the United States Administration and its allies in the Middle East the United States has continued what its propaganda calls peace efforts. Yet its efforts pursue in fact nothing but its own interests and the interests of its protégé, Israel, while the essence of the Middle East problem - the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to self-determination and to the establishment of their own independent State on their own territory - is being constantly ignored.

The seriousness of the situation in the Middle East requires the international community to find effective ways and means of solving this crisis.

The Czechoslovak delegation considers that the starting point for the solution of the problem is contained in the united course of action of the Arab States as outlined at Fez. This agreement in fact reflects the relevant decisions of the United Nations.

We support the proposal of the Soviet Union of June 1984 encompassing the six well-known and generally recognized principles that constitute the prerequisite for a comprehensive and just settlement of the Middle East crisis. We accord priority to the question of Palestine for without a solution of this question through recognition of the right of the Palestinians to self-determination, there can be no peace in the Middle East.

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

Our delegation joins the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations that regard an international conference as the most appropriate mechanism for settling the crisis. Such a conference should be attended by all the parties concerned, including the PLO, Israel, the Soviet Union and the United States and should be conducted on the basis of equality. The PLO must not be denied its right granted to it by the United Nations General Assembly - the right to represent the Palestinian people in the international arena. The right of representation applies both to bilateral and multilateral relations.

We resolutely oppose attempts to influence the situation in the Middle East by means of separate negotiations. Our position is based on the objective fact that the Middle East problem has long grown beyond the bilateral sphere and has a number of widely ramified aspects of a multilateral character. To allow separate talks on a collective issue means to give the green light to attempts at a hopeless degeneration of the Middle East problem. The developments in the Middle East so far have shown convincingly that the policy of concessions to the aggressor and of separate steps has not produced the desired peace in the Middle East which the signatories of the Camp David Accords used to speak of. Such a policy has made no progress towards safeguarding the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine. The very opposite is true. The peace treaty with Egypt has provided a foothold for further Israeli aggression - this time against Lebanon and the Palestinian resistance movement. The agreement between Israel and Lebanon of May 1983 was not successful either and was annulled as a result of the opposition of the Lebanese patriotic forces.

Those examples offer convincing evidence that the solution of the Middle East crisis requires a collective mechanism that would safeguard the equal and fair protection of the interests of all the parties concerned. The Czechoslovak

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

delegation considers that the United Nations system is capable of providing effective backing for such negotiations. Yet, at the same time, we wish to emphasize that even the best mechanism cannot produce the required results if the parties in question are not ready to show good political will to achieve an equitable compromise. It should also be recalled that our Organization is equipped with efficient instruments for safeguarding international peace and security - even against the will of the aggressor.

The Declaration of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member States says that:

"A turn for the better in international affairs requires a new political approach corresponding to the realities of the present-day world, as well as mutual restraint." (A/C.1/40/7, p. 4)

Such an approach can undoubtedly offer a key also to the solution of the problems of the Middle East.



Mr. SAHBANI (Tunisia) (interpretation from Arabic): Once the fortieth session of the General Assembly has concluded and stock is taken of its work, it will be clear that this year, too, the question of the Middle East has been one of the main questions on which international public opinion has centred. But it will also be clear that once again there has been no movement towards an outcome offering any solution in the near future; on the contrary, the issue will be seen to have been bedevilled by further complications and ambiguities and will be even further removed from a settlement.

That does not mean, of course, that our interest in the problem has lessened or that the danger it embodies has abated. But a kind of weariness has overcome people, some of whom think that this problem is an ulcer with which we will have to learn to live. That feeling arises from the failure of the many plans that have been put forward to solve this problem - plans that have come up against an immovable wall of refusal and lack of understanding.

In these circumstances how can people not be overcome by scepticism about the statements we make from this rostrum, as long as we meet the same hard line attitude, arrogance and scorn towards the opinion of others?

Everyone agrees that the heart of the Middle East problem lies in the Palestinian question and that the solution to that question will lead to détente throughout the region. Two days ago in this Assembly I expressed the Tunisian Government's point of view on this subject. Nearly all the speakers who came to this rostrum agreed on the conditions that must be met to ensure the success of any dialogue on this question.

Unfortunately, I am afraid that those statements have not met with any favourable response. For we have heard a statement which distorted the problem: there was no attempt to deal with it on the basis of an approach which looks

(Mr. Sahbani, Tunisia)

towards the future and tries to meet others half-way; there was no attempt to look for the road to a real peace based on the points on which most States and peoples have agreed; and another opportunity which could have been useful has, alas, been deliberately thrown away.

The United Nations has frequently been called upon to assume fully its responsibilities in the implementation of the resolutions it has adopted on the Middle East question. But what can the Organization do when the country principally responsible for the situation - Israel - refuses to recognize those resolutions and fails to comply with the obligations it is under as a Member State according to the Charter of the United Nations.

Henceforth, our calls should no longer be addressed to the United Nations but to the Member States, which are urged to assume their responsibilities in order to make this recalcitrant State respect the rules and resolutions of the Organization.

In the case in point, we should make every effort to understand the precise significance of peace and to convince Israel of it. We understand it as a peace that is not based on intolerance and humiliation; a peace which respects the natural and fundamental human rights; a peace which grants peoples the right to self-determination, without exception, and the right to make their own choice as they wish; a peace which permits people to work to meet the challenges of their time; a peace which enables States to coexist in a spirit of understanding and mutual assistance and respect.

Those are the concepts which today are in the minds of the Arab peoples. The Arab Governments gave an eloquent illustration of this in the Peace Plan adopted at Fez in November 1982.

Those concepts do not contradict the appeal made in this forum for a halt to the war and the renunciation of conduct condemned by international law; nor do

(Mr. Sahbani, Tunisia)

those concepts clash with the invitation extended to States of the region to take the steps necessary to achieve peace and stability; and even less do they conflict with the principle of sincere negotiations. But in adhering strictly to the letter of statements we are likely to achieve only a pretence of truth and disguise what is false, and ultimately end by distorting the nature of peace and falsifying its meaning.

To be sincere the appeal for peace must be accompanied by acts that are in harmony with peace. That implies the recognition by Israel of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and, to choose their representatives freely; it also implies Israel's withdrawal from the occupied territories on the West Bank, El Qods, the Golan and Gaza; this means, moreover, that Israel must renounce the use of force, aggression, extension of conflicts and the incitement of communal differences; that requires, in addition, an end to driving Arabs out of occupied territories, to expropriation of their properties and to the violation of the true nature of their country. Lastly, a love for peace requires the implementation of United Nations resolutions and respect of their principles, not the shirking of the obligations that have been assumed towards the Organization.

(Mr. Sahbani, Tunisia)

Those are the pledges with which Israel must begin if its call for peace is to be believable. As for the Arabs, they have publicly given sufficient proof of the broadness of their views and of their readiness.

Then a meeting of the various parties could be envisaged not only to negotiate peace in the region but also to contribute to the advent of universal peace and to save peoples from the horrors of war, from fear and from underdevelopment.

Despite the doubts that haunt us, despite the bitterness of successive failures, we intend to continue to hope and never to despair of reason and solidarity among people. May the détente on the horizon in international relations spread to other areas, including the Middle East.

Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda): The situation in the Middle East has been a major concern of the United Nations ever since its inception. For the last four decades the United Nations has grappled with the problems posed by the Middle East crisis but a solution has continued to elude us.

Over the last four decades the region has been embroiled in five major wars whose ramifications have been felt all over the globe. As the Secretary-General had occasion to remind us last year, the search for a settlement in the Middle East has followed a pattern that has become all too familiar. Each war has been followed by peace efforts spurred by a renewed awareness of the dangers of the continued stalemate. Peace proposals have often been put forward and in some cases partial agreements have been reached. But soon the peace efforts have become deadlocked and the urgency has been lost - until the next crisis has broken out.

Those peace efforts have always foundered because of the intransigence of Israel and the refusal of some powerful Members of this Organization to address the root of the crisis, namely the question of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

(Mr. Irumba, Uganda)

In 1947 the General Assembly adopted resolution 181 (II), which established the State of Israel. That resolution equally required the establishment of an independent Palestinian State, but it has been the cardinal policy of Israel since its creation to prevent the realization of a Palestinian State. Instead Israel has pursued a course of absorbing the Palestinian territories and other Arab lands with a view to realizing its dream of Greater Israel. The annexation of the Golan Heights and Jerusalem, the implantation of colonial settlements in the West Bank and Gaza and the continued occupation of southern Lebanon are part and parcel of that policy. Failure to restore the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people has been and remains the genesis of the Middle East crisis.

It has been suggested by Israel that because the Arab countries or the Palestinians did not accept resolution 181 (II) when it was adopted they cannot claim the benefit of that resolution. However, resolution 181 (II) and other relevant resolutions remain valid and enforceable. Israel has no right to resist their implementation. To do so would be to deny its origin and to tear into pieces its birth certificate. Israel formally accepted that resolution and that acceptance precludes it from occupying or annexing Palestinian and other Arab lands. It is a well known equitable principle that one cannot deny the validity of a document out of which one claims a benefit. The fact that the Arab countries did not accept the partition envisaged does not confer on Israel the right to appropriate Palestinian and other Arab territories.

Resolution 181 (II) was not abrogated or annulled by the wars of 1948 and 1967 between Israel and the Arab States. They may have prevented the immediate implementation of the resolution; they did not affect or impair its validity.

It is just over a decade since the General Assembly adopted its resolution 3236 (XXIX), which appropriately recognized that the question of Palestine and the right of the Palestinians to self-determination and to an

(Mr. Izumba, Uganda)

independent State of their own were the core of the Middle East crisis and ought to be a major concern of the international community. That resolution recognized the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) as the sole and authentic representative of the Palestinian people. Following that momentous resolution, the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people became a top priority on the United Nations agenda.

Over the years we have deliberated on the way to achieve that objective in this Assembly and other United Nations forums. The International Conference on the Question of Palestine showed the way by which genuine and durable peace could be achieved. It called for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, to be attended by the permanent members of the Security Council and all concerned, including the PLO.

Since the General Assembly endorsed that recommendation our Secretary-General has made strenuous efforts to initiate steps for the convening of the Conference. The insurmountable obstacle to this has been and continues to be Israel's obstinate refusal to accept any meaningful proposal for peace. The Israelis have rejected out of hand the idea of an international conference. It is for us a matter of deep regret that Israel has been supported in this regard by one powerful Member of this Organization. In our view durable peace in the Middle East requires the full participation of both super-Powers. The exclusion of one from the peace process means that the ensuing outcome of any settlement achieved can be only fragile. The 1973 Geneva Conference on the Middle East, of which the United States and the Soviet Union were co-Chairmen, proved that the co-operation of the super-Powers is a help rather than a hindrance to the peace process. Indeed, subsequent events have proved that the exclusion of one super-Power in favour of the other in the peace process only complicates the situation.

(Mr. Irumba, Uganda)

A number of proposals taking into account the genuine concerns of Israel which could have led to a genuine settlement have been advanced over recent years. The Fez Plan of 1983 clearly demonstrated the sincerity of the Arab countries and the PLO in the search for a peaceful settlement of the Palestinian question and the Middle East issue as a whole. Recently, the PLO and Jordan put forward proposals for a peaceful settlement of the issues which, any objective observer would agree, go a long way to meet the genuine concerns of Israel. Israel's response to the goodwill of the Arab countries and the PLO has been negative and provocative.

At every stage when there has been a fresh initiative to establish a structure for comprehensive negotiations, Israel has embarked on aggressive and provocative actions to frustrate the peace process. It is not surprising, therefore, that the flagrant and unprovoked air raid on the headquarters of the PLO in Tunisia occurred at the very moment when meaningful efforts were afoot to revive the peace negotiations.

In the past, whenever pressed to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories in compliance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which it accepted, Israel has claimed that it was holding the land for bargaining purposes only. An impression was given that they would withdraw in the context of a comprehensive settlement in return for recognition and acceptance by the Arab States. But Israel's response to all genuine proposals aimed at a comprehensive settlement clearly unmasks its real objectives. It appears that the only settlement Israel is prepared to agree to is one that gives it title to its illegal acquisitions. That we cannot accept.

Israel has turned its contemptuous rejection of all peace initiatives into hostility to those who bring forth such initiatives. Needless to say, the United Nations which ironically gave birth to the State of Israel, has become the prime target. Instead of responding positively to United Nations resolutions

(Mr. Irimba, Uganda)

which are a result of Israel's violation of international law, it accuses our Organization of adopting unbalanced resolutions and of fanning the flames of the conflict. The United Nations should not be deterred by such diversions from defending the principles it stands for.

Uganda has always viewed the essentials of a meaningful peace plan as a composite whole, each part being integrally related to the others. We have maintained that the conflict can be resolved only through a comprehensive settlement covering all its aspects. The United Nations must provide the framework for a just and comprehensive peace. A framework for peace can be just if it restores the rights of the Palestinian people and it can be comprehensive if it takes into account all the legitimate aspirations in the region and provides for the participation of all the parties concerned.

Such a solution must include the following elements: first, the withdrawal of Israel from the occupied Arab territories; secondly, recognition of the right of the refugees to return to their homeland; and thirdly, the exercise by the Palestinians of their right to self-determination.

Since the restoration of Palestinian rights constitutes the centerpiece of a settlement, it follows that the Palestinians, through the PLO, their sole and authentic representative, must necessarily be involved in the negotiations.

There have been strenuous attempts to deny the PLO a role in the peace process. Today, it ought to be recognized that an important component of the Palestinian national consensus is that the PLO is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and is the only authority that is competent to negotiate on their behalf nationally, regionally and internationally. Virtually all countries acknowledge the representative character of the PLO. Even those few which are outside this broad consensus grudgingly accept its representative character. Yet, despite this acknowledgement, Israel and its



(Mr. Irumba, Uganda)

supporters continue in their efforts to try to identify more pliable representatives whose political programmes would betray the Palestinian cause. The Palestinian people have correctly rejected and frustrated such manoeuvres. The search for a negotiator other than the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people will continue to be in vain.

If genuine peace is to be achieved, it is imperative that both Israel and its supporters agree to talk to the Palestine Liberation Organization.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate Uganda's support for and solidarity with the Palestinian people and the PLO, their sole and authentic representative, in their struggle.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have to thank the President sincerely indeed for this great opportunity, which has been offered to me, in order to speak on the very important issue of the situation in the Middle East. We think that it is primarily our issue, but basically it is, for the time being and at present, the issue of our small and compact globe. We hope that all the representatives present here and those who, for whatever commitments, are absent will refresh their minds regarding the situation in the Middle East and will ultimately take a very courageous, decisive and constructive step in order to resolve this already unduly prolonged situation.

I shall begin my statement with a verse from the Holy Koran which has been recited in this General Assembly more than once because, as I have said before, it is most appropriate to the core of the problem in the Middle East, which is the occupation of Palestine by the Zionist entity.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

"I take refuge in God from Satan the accursed. ... Sanction is given unto those against whom war is made" - meaning the Palestinians - "because they have been wronged" -

that is the justification for the sanctions, the Divine mandate -

"and Allah is indeed able to give them victory" -

that is the Divine support for the struggle and for the victory -

"Those who have been driven from their homes in defiance of right because they said, 'Our Lord is Allah, for had it not been for Allah's repelling some men by means of others, cloisters and churches and oratories and Mosques, wherein the name of Allah is often mentioned, would assuredly have been pulled down. Verily Allah helps the ones who help Him. So Allah is all strong and Almighty." (The Holy Koran, S.xxii, 39 and 40)

At every session of the General Assembly we find the situation in the Middle East worse than it was the year before. The Zionist forces of occupation are still holding Palestine hostage. The homeless Palestinians are still in refugee camps, many of them living on the mercy of the International Committee of the Red Cross, while habitats, farms, belongings, indeed the entire homeland, of those same refugees are still at the disposal of the Zionist usurpers. Ironically enough, the same so-called generous hands that make donations to the International Committee of the Red Cross are also strongly and without any reservations supporting the enemy. This simply means that they feign humanitarianism and good, although they are indeed evil because of their support for the occupation of Palestine.

Just for a change, however, there has been a small - or perhaps not very small - development that ensures that the situation this year is slightly worse than it was last year; that is, the sad incident of the aerial bombardment of the

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

Palestinian camp in Tunisia. O.K., three years ago the Zionist usurpers were building new settlements in the West Bank of the Jordan River - they are probably still doing it today - and attacking Lebanese villages. Two years ago they invaded Lebanon in a full-fledged war of aggression, and then they registered the massacre of Sabra and Shatila. The story is too well known to require any repetition.

Last year, the defensive struggle of the Moslems of Lebanon continued; it claimed hundreds of thousands of lives, of Moslem combatants as well as innocent civilians in the Islamic land of Lebanon. There were also retaliatory attacks by the Zionists against innocent Moslems all over the place in Lebanon. The Zionists bombarded Mosques and killed people who were conducting their prayers in a congregation. To all that has been added the internal, civil war in Lebanon. Since we are talking about the situation in the Middle East, that too must be taken note of. Beautiful Beirut has fallen apart, thanks to the Zionist invaders, and the face of Lebanon is covered with blood. In addition to all that, the Zionist enemy - in pursuit of the savage policy of the total liquidation of the Palestinian nation that it has been following since the early days of its occupation, particularly in Deir Yassin and Sabra and Shatila, poisoning Palestinian females and bombarding them in the most distant refugee camps, as far away as Tunisia - has registered it as a historical fact that no matter how far away the Palestinian camps may be, they remain the perennial target of the expansionist Zionist usurpers.

The Zionist base is a charity base, of course. Its main source of revenue is the United States. Hence, at least some of these crimes must be written down in the record of the achievements of United States foreign policy.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

During the past year, the United States has, I have been told, offered \$4 billion to the Zionist base. This modest contribution, when divided by the figure for the population of the Zionist base occupying Palestine, gives the per capita contribution that this base has received from the United States. It definitely equals more than \$2,000 per individual. I have used the figure of 2 million for the population of the Zionist base. Now, definitely, the population of the Zionist base does not number 2 million. I have referred to \$4 billion as the officially registered figure for the United States contribution to the Zionist base. The actual sum, however, might be much larger. Therefore, the per capita contribution to the enemies of mankind is at least - by any standard - \$2,000. I ask the representatives of sovereign States here: What is the per capita income of your people? How many of them have an income of \$2,000? We know that the representatives of some States here would have to produce a figure for the per capita income in their countries far below \$1,000. That is the sad situation. In how many countries represented here is there really a per capita income above or equal to that of an Ashkenazi Zionist immigrant residing in occupied Palestine? And does anyone think that this so-called contribution is made to the Zionist occupier free, for the sake of God? Or is it a reward for the actual contribution that that agent is making to the occupation of Palestine?

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

As I said, this is only the officially declared cash sum that the Government of the United States is paying to the Zionist base of terror. There are also loans and other forms of assistance in the form of strategic alliance, for instance, and technical co-operation. As for the private sector, certain begging institutions are also collecting every donation they can, from the pocket money of children, to the big lump sum donations that, thanks to the bewitching power of the Zionist media in this country, may not be much less than the official contribution of the United States.

We may ignore the very relevant explanation of why the Zionist base is now biting the hand of its own mother and spying against the United States administration. What we cannot ignore is the fact that all the American unreserved support for that base is to make sure that the occupation of Palestine is perpetuated, until gradually it becomes a regionally recognized entity. That is the plot. The plot is to keep the kettle boiling until gradually the occupation gains recognition. But the Assembly knows how many are involved in that process of manoeuvring, contriving, trying to gain and moving towards getting recognition. Both the beast of imperialism and its sinister baby know very well that an artificial illegitimate entity cannot become a country; but they, in collaboration with some others who have ganged up against the entire Moslem world, are trying their best to make it work. They are overwhelmed by the enthusiasm and fascination of the occupation of Palestine, so overwhelmed that they cannot understand that all their efforts are in vain. They just cannot see that the plot is not going to work.

They are just cheerfully and wishfully thinking that it works. They just invest in this silly wishful aspiration. They thought that by registering that illegitimate base in the United Nations - I am speaking of the early days - the problem would be solved. The Assembly knows that the actual course of events was

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

quite the contrary. Then they thought that if they adopted the expansionist policy, probably the Moslem people of the Middle East, in the neighbouring countries, would be ready to exchange the safety of the terrorist base in return for their own lands, already occupied. That was how Camp David came about. They first decided to occupy and then exchange the very land of Egypt in return for the silence of Egypt towards the occupation of Palestine. That is called the Camp David conspiracy. There is the Camp David peace plan; then the Reagan peace plan; and then some simple-minded Arab peace plans. The enemy felt so happy that the concept of "peace plan" was gaining popularity among certain puppets that they never realized that the manoeuvrability of those puppets is very limited. That is why even now, the United States and some of its allies are still trying to seduce certain kings and probably presidents, into joining the Camp David accord, so to speak, the Camp David conspiracy. They are insisting upon their peace proposals.

But the fact is that so long as the Zionist base exists, the region of the Middle East will never see the countenance of peace. So, the supporters of the so-called peace plan might as well know that those who make the real decisions are the Moslems of the Middle East and not certain selected monarchs who under the pressure of the imperialist beast are to be seduced into a treacherous peace negotiation.

For, there are homeless Palestinians all over the Middle East; and people just cannot forget that - definitely, Palestinians cannot. There are Islamic sanctuaries under occupation, and the Moslems will not forget that. There is, above all, the Zionist base of terror in our region, and nobody will forget that. Those facts will always keep the injury as fresh as ever, and the people as determined as ever. Only fools can think that if they somehow pacify some Palestinians, some certain people in the region, and bring them to a refugee camp

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

somewhere in the East Bank, or in the West Bank of Jordan, and call it a home for the Palestinians, then the problem will be resolved. Such resolutions are not going to work. The fact is that as long as the base of terror is in occupation of Palestine, there will be no peace. Those who are wasting their efforts on such silly peace proposals should use their common sense.

I should like to address myself to all the arrogant Powers and to bring to their august attention that there must be nothing less than a total restoration of Palestine and complete evacuation of the Zionist base; otherwise, there will be no peace. The longer they keep our Palestinian brothers and our Palestine under occupation, and our brothers in their refugee camps, the stronger the determination of the Moslem people of the region becomes, and indeed, the more widespread the awareness of this tragedy on the part of the Moslem masses. Today, awareness and readiness is more than it was yesterday.

Look at Egypt and what one reads about the Moslems of Egypt, even in the American papers. I assure the Assembly that Egypt is not the only one.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

The longer they keep our Palestine under occupation, the stronger the determination of the Moslem people of the region and, indeed, the more widespread the awareness of the Moslem masses of their tragedy. Thus, the situation in the Middle East is bound to go from bad to worse continuously, but in the long run, the course of events is in the right direction.

It seems that the international body also deliberately pleads ignorance of the situation. In the four years of my pleasant and amusing experience watching the silly game of international politics here, I have already observed a deliberate ignorance regarding the gravity of the situation in the Middle East, as if the self-deceiving assumption here is that, if certain ambassadors are convinced by the conjuring tricks of international diplomacy at the United Nations, then the millions of Moslem masses in the region will automatically be convinced as well. That is a very silly assumption. What poor reasoning.

It may be good for diplomats to go to the masses sometimes and talk to them directly, and not only act on the basis of instructions received from the capital. Of course, they will act according to those instructions, but they have to think according to their direct communication with the masses and, if possible, with those in Lebanon, in Tunisia and in the rest of the Moslem world. However, such naive assumptions led to the deployment of multinational contingency forces in Lebanon. Remember, those people who sent the forces thought that if they could convince certain diplomats or certain politicians, then everything would work. But they were wrong. Everyone saw it. And the consequences are well known. Regrettably, however, even now, who is going to learn the lesson?

And after all the monumental banalities emitted by supercilious Powers, here we are with the situation in the Middle East worse than ever before.



(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

Millions of peoples' homes are destroyed and their homeland is occupied. Even their refugee camps are bombarded regularly. What should they do? What should those people do? The ambassadors pushed the button in favour of the resolution - we know that. But what about those people? I am sure everyone here is very glad that those people will not come after us. I am sure that they will ultimately impose their will upon the buttons here.

Should they do nothing? Of course the enemy says, Yes, they should do nothing; they should just come and negotiate, or else they will be called terrorists. Is it not true that the Palestinians are called terrorists because they do not recognize occupation and they do not negotiate? If they were prepared to recognize occupation and to negotiate, then they would no longer be called terrorists. Terrorism is, indeed, one of the new developments in our region, and it requires honest and responsible consideration.

Let me take an example. Suppose a gang of Zionist burglars were to attack a small district in your home town. I do not know where you all come from, but can you imagine that exactly the same thing that happened to Palestine - just for the sake of argument - happens to your own home town: they come and occupy part of your very own homeland. They come and occupy it and simply remove the residents - your friends, your relatives, your neighbours, all of them. They remove the residents, particularly those who resist and protest. Now, those well-equipped burglars will definitely kill some of the resisting forces; they will kill some and keep some of the others somewhere in the occupied territory, somewhere where they can feel immune from the threat they represent and where they can be controlled. They have the weapons and they are equipped; we know that. So let us say that they send the rest of them to the western part of your home town.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

Now, it is quite clear that these well-equipped burglars have all the weapons and all the manpower to smash any resistance. We have to assume, as honestly as we can, that the situation in this example is as similar as possible to what happened to Palestine, in order to make it as expressive as possible. These occupiers, these burglars, well equipped, skillful and, sometimes, knowledgeable as they are, have the support of the major interest groups in other cities, and they therefore enjoy their full political backing as well. Any attempt by the victimized people to expel these distinguished burglars fails, and they remain in their fortress. Naturally, the local people will not give up, and surely they cannot defeat the burglars by the conventionally recognized methods of warfare, because if they could, their homes would not have been occupied.

First, they go to the court available to them, to the next city or elsewhere in the country - let us say to the United Nations Security Council. They go there, and they see how far from honest that court is, they see it occupied by the same burglars, and - to the victims' surprise - the court is still functioning in spite of its being occupied. So, officially speaking, there is a court. It is only malfunctioning. It is an active court: it has resolutions, decisions, amendments, rules of procedure and ordinances behind it, and it is a very serious court. It has a ritual and the dignitaries of the court carry their beautiful bags and speak a very beautiful language - definitely a very beautiful English. That is the situation.\*

---

\*Mr. Oyoue (Gabon), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

There are so many innocent, learned ignorants and misinformed erudites also in the court. They sincerely believe it is a just court; they believe it is a court, at least according to its Charter, according to which it is in charge of peace and security. So everybody brings his case with all sincerity and innocence to that court - and he will wait, like the Palestinians, for 35 years, to no avail.

The Palestinians finally decide to resort to all sorts of unconventional methods of warfare, right and wrong, in order to fight back against the enemy. They have no other option. They have tried all the other avenues. As soon as they start their struggle, they are called terrorists, because they do not negotiate and because the conventional methods of warfare are not available to them. They do not have supersonic aeroplanes; they do not have star wars ambitions; they do not produce the best missiles, the most powerful war technology. Therefore, they must be satisfied with the minimum, with the primitive means available to them, and make use of it in the most reasonable way. It becomes unconventional, and therefore they are terrorists - are they not?

Please tell me, Mr. President, who are the real terrorists - the Palestinians, or many others? Many distinguished representatives might be representing terrorism here, and meanwhile accusing the Palestinians of terrorism. The Palestinians are not terrorists. Who are the terrorists? Are they really the Palestinians or the Zionist usurpers who have occupied Palestine and brought about all the tragedy?

By no means do we condone terrorism. We are all against terrorism. Everyone knows that. All of us strongly condemn terrorism. The Palestinians, too, condemn terrorism. On the sense and meaning of terrorism we all agree, and we condemn it. It is the use of the term that is controversial. Does any representative believe that it is the local people whose land was occupied in my example - or, in the case

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

of the Palestinians, the occupied Palestinian land - who are really the terrorists, and not the burglars who occupied the land and destroyed, plundered, killed and even bombarded the refugee camps? Is it fair to say that they are not the terrorists and that the Palestinians are?

It is only the application of the term "terrorism" that must be corrected. We all condemn terrorism; only some condone the super-terrorism being applied against the Palestinian people and the whole of the Middle East.

I turn to the anti-terrorist propaganda and anti-terrorist experts. Have representatives seen how many anti-terrorist experts appear on television? There are experts in religious terrorism, experts in secular terrorism, experts in Middle East terrorism, experts in Far East terrorism - also sorts of experts all of a sudden mushroom in this country. There are all kinds of anti-terrorism experts and experts in anti-terrorist firms. There are so many that even the local victims become confused and apologetic. That is the tragedy of the situation.

The media and the professional interviewers are ready. They know how to condition the minds of the audience, to the extent that even those who are victimized become conditioned and therefore apologetic. But should we just go along with the trend of all this group pressure, media pressure and all other forms of pressure? Definitely not. The people in the Middle East will definitely not go along with that.

Many representatives have brought the truth to me; many representatives know the facts, fortunately. We understand that because of the outbreak of such unconventional methods of defence - the only option available to the victims - very sad events take place, such as the case of the TWA aircraft or the Egyptian aircraft. The latter was a really tragic and painful fiasco, but in spite of all that the President of the United States supported and heralded the Egyptian operation.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

Mr. President, do you think that if the passengers of that aircraft had been left in the hands of the hijackers their destiny would have been much worse? It is awful, it is amazing, how certain politicians and statesmen can simply lose their common sense. Let us pray that we do not have many of them amongst us in the Assembly. At least, here people say "I am sorry. I was instructed by the central Government."

Another aspect of the situation in the Middle East is that the enemy never addresses the situation honestly and on its merits. Late last night, after 1 o'clock in the morning, I was watching "Crossfire". The writer of the famous book "The Zionist Connection" was in the show. Someone told him "There is a besieged country", and he simply responded "Well, if you occupy a land that does not belong to you, you will have a besieged country." He was very honest, and I am glad that side by side with the blind technocrats and naive administrators of the United States, who believe that decisions - even the wrong ones - can be implemented if enough force is used, the writer of "The Zionist Connection" exists, too. In the interview he briefly and very honestly addressed the real nature of the situation in the Middle East - namely, its Islamic character, which others always deliberately ignore.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

The Zionist enemy and those behind it always speak of their Zionist base as in a confrontation with the Arabs. They think they can exploit Arab nationalism, thus misrepresenting the issue and insulting the intelligence of the Moslem world. Nothing excites us more than seeing that many, if not all, of our Arab brothers have detected the fallacy and are themselves addressing the situation in terms of a confrontation between zionism and Islam; that too is a very important development in the Middle East situation.

That is indeed the correct, honest and, of course, constructive way to address the issue. The Zionist base occupying Palestine must know that this is not an Arab cause, but rather an Islamic cause. The General Assembly too should exhibit the wisdom to confirm that appropriate identification of the situation.

Taken together, these developments indicate that in spite of all the isolated sad incidents and the great many crimes and acts of savagery perpetrated by the usurpers of Palestine, the main stream of events is flowing in the right direction. As I have already stressed, soon - in our own lifetime - the Moslem ummah, or nation, will start to discharge its religious duty regarding the liberation of Palestine from Zionist occupation. The United States is strongly advised to use reason and common sense and to conduct itself properly lest it find itself stuck in the middle of an unwanted conflict. That is the best advice I can offer the United States.

Before that inevitable moment comes, representatives can give the appropriate advice and make the appropriate recommendations to their Governments, to make a constructive collective effort peacefully to send the Ashkenazi immigrants back where they came from, which would resolve the issue once and for all. If not, we will share the responsibility for the great confrontation which, at this stage, members of the Assembly might still be able to prevent.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

The situation in the Middle East will never see the face of peace unless the occupation of Palestine by the Zionist usurpers - the real core of the whole conflict - comes to an end.

Mr. BASENDWAH (Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): Recently the General Assembly considered the question of Palestine, and it is now discussing the situation in the Middle East. This reflects the fact that the two problems are closely linked and interrelated. It is right to say that the question of Palestine is at the core of the Middle East problem, because the latter is the natural consequence and result of the former. That is a fact of political history borne out by the course of events: had there been no question of Palestine there would be no Middle East problem. Moreover, the culprit in both cases is the same - Israel and Israel alone.

If it is not possible to solve the problem of the Middle East in isolation from the question of Palestine, it is equally true to say that there can be no total and permanent solution of the question of Palestine without a solution of the problem of the Middle East. That demonstrates the close organic connection between the two questions.

It is clear that the United Nations is well aware of these facts, as shown by its call for an international conference with the participation of all parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), and of the permanent members of the Security Council. The conference would discuss under United Nations auspices not one, but both problems.

The historical background of the Middle East problem shows the inevitability of recent developments such as the following: the Israeli occupation of Palestine; the denial to the Palestinian people of its homeland; the complex consequences of repeated Israeli wars of aggression against neighbouring Arab countries and

(Mr. Basendwah, Yemen)

occupied Palestine; and the seizure of portions of those Arab States, including the annexation of parts of their territory, as in the case of the Syrian Golan Heights.

The principal reason for the absence of a just and lasting settlement of the question of Palestine and the Middle East problem is Israel's intransigence and its rejection of the United Nations call for the convening of an international conference under the auspices of the Organization, with the participation of the permanent members of the Security Council and all the parties concerned, including the PLO.

The persistence of both unresolved problems poses a grave threat to the peace and security of the region and to international peace and security as a whole. It is illusory for Israel to believe that, by force of arms alone, it can dictate and control the entire situation in the Middle East and perpetuate the hegemony it seeks through military superiority achieved with the unlimited support it receives from certain great Powers, particularly the United States. As the saying goes, we can never expect constancy in human affairs. Sooner or later things will change, and the present unjust situation will explode.

By defying the United Nations, Israel is defying not only the Palestinian people and the Arab States, but the entire international community. The international community, as represented by the United Nations, should take a firm stand in the face of that ongoing Israeli defiance, because Israel's disregard of resolutions, laws and recognized norms poses a serious threat to all of mankind. As the saying goes, a small spark can ignite a great fire. The United Nations must assume its role and shoulder its responsibility before it is too late.



(Mr. Basendwah, Yemen)

Our call from this international rostrum is for the restoration of rights. It is in no sense a cry in the wilderness and we hope that it will not be carried away by the wind. As long as their legitimate holders seek them, those rights cannot be suppressed.

As the details of the question under consideration are well known to the Assembly, and have been for many years, I see no need to weary members by reiterating them. Suffice it to say that my country, the Yemen Arab Republic, urges the United Nations to take firm and positive measures to rectify the situation and to restore their rights to the legitimate holders. We warn of the consequences that will ensue if the United Nations fails to do this.

Mr. MAITHA (Kenya): The situation obtaining in the Middle East has for a long time remained one of tension and unending conflicts. On a number of occasions in the recent past the situation has erupted into outright war between some Arab nations on the one hand and Israel on the other. In the course of the continuation of this unstable situation much loss of life and destruction of property has taken place. The root cause of this unstable situation, while there may be many other causes, is the unresolved problem pertaining to the plight of the Palestinian people who have been uprooted from their motherland and property and forced to move out and live as refugees in foreign lands. Those other Palestinians who have remained in the territories occupied by the State of Israel continue to endure Israeli harassment, oppression, repression and suppression. All the Palestinians continue to suffer the indignity of being denied the opportunity to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. Those who have left continue to be denied the right to return to their homes and property. This, in our view, constitutes the core of the current problem of Palestine as well as the root cause of the tensions and conflicts in the Middle East.

As I have already stated, the core of the ongoing tensions and conflicts in the region of the Middle East is the question of Palestine. The question demands

(Mr. Maitha, Kenya)

an all-embracing solution covering all aspects of the problems in the region. Without such a solution the situation will continue to be one of increasing tension and conflict, which will increasingly bedevil relations among the States of the region and threaten international peace and security for a long time to come. It is our hope that the parties directly involved in the problem will realize the dangers that are likely to arise as a result of the lack of an acceptable solution to the problem. We feel that the parties could avoid such dangers by moderating their positions and promoting a just solution. The necessity for the international community to exert every effort towards the peaceful settlement of the problem cannot be over-emphasized. In the view of my delegation, the international community has an obligation to the people of Palestine and must engage itself fully and continuously in the efforts to bring about a comprehensive and peaceful settlement of the question of Palestine.

Ever since the problem of Palestine arose the United Nations system as a whole has devoted much time and energy to finding a solution to the issues involved. But such efforts have not to this day been able to lead to a solution of the intricate aspects of the question. Every effort has been met with defiance and intransigence on the part of one of the principal parties to the conflict. Even the most recent resolutions of the General Assembly, adopted last year, have met the same fate as those adopted in the past.

On many occasions the international community has pronounced itself unequivocally on the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by the use or threat of use of force, but Israel has violated this principle with impunity. The international community has again and again reiterated the need for all countries to respect the principles of non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States and respect for the territorial integrity of other States. Yet, again, Israel has interfered with and infringed upon the territorial

(Mr. Maitha, Kenya)

integrity of other States. Kenya upholds these principles of the international community and would like to see them respected by all nations. In this regard, therefore, Kenya calls upon Israel to withdraw from all territories occupied since the 1967 war and its interference in the internal affairs of other States and its incessant violation of their territorial integrity.

Various aspects of Israeli practices in the occupied territories have been reported in documents submitted to this Assembly. From them my delegation notes with dismay the fact that infringement of the rights of the Palestinian people continues unabated. We note that the situation relating to the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people has continued to deteriorate; that the Israeli policy of illegally maintaining and establishing new Jewish settlements and confiscating Arab-owned land continues; that measures designed to stifle all forms of political, cultural, social and economic expression by the Palestinian people in the occupied territories continue to be implemented; that indiscriminate detention and torture are being used for the purpose of political intimidation, repression and suppression of the Palestinian peoples' aspirations.

We condemn these practices, which, by and large, are akin to the practices the apartheid racist régime in South Africa is using to intimidate, repress and suppress the demands of the opponents of apartheid and the people of Namibia.

When this question has been debated, over the years possible solutions have been suggested. Yet the Israeli authorities have not seen fit to implement them. My delegation wishes to underscore that the United Nations bears full responsibility for the plight of the Palestinian people. Consequently, the Organization must take firm action against Israel to force it to heed the will of the international community and enable the Palestinian people to exercise their right to self-determination and independence.

(Mr. Maitha, Kenya)

In the exercise of those responsibilities, my delegation holds the firm view that no nation should ever be allowed to justify its own right to existence at the expense of others. We believe that the legitimate rights of the Palestinians to self-determination and an independent State of their own in the region must be realized, and hence support the cause of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. Further, we believe that the attainment of the rights of the Palestinian people would provide the only key to a just and durable peace in the Middle East, on the basis of equal rights for all States in the region to exist in peace and security within internationally recognized and secure borders.

In conclusion, it has been proposed in resolutions of this Assembly that an international conference on the Middle East be convened. Kenya endorses the proposal in the hope that such a conference will deal with all aspects of the situation in the Middle East. We regret to note, however, that agreement by all the parties directly concerned has not yet been reached. Nevertheless, we note also in this regard that in the efforts in search of a peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem some parties directly concerned have reached agreement to move together towards the achievement of a peaceful and just settlement of the crisis and the termination of Israeli occupation of Arab territories. We urge the other party also to show understanding and agree to undertake negotiations within the framework of the proposed international conference, which should be held under the auspices of the United Nations.

Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): The proceedings of the commemorative session of the General Assembly began in an atmosphere of optimism and hope which was reinforced by intensive diplomatic presence when leaders of the world came here and addressed the General Assembly from this rostrum, reaffirming the importance of the United Nations since it

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Democratic Yemen)

represents the only forum which provides universal representation of the peoples and countries of the world; they reaffirmed confidence in and commitment to the United Nations Charter and the need to revitalize the United Nations role and increase its effectiveness in dealing with regional and international problems.

Now we are approaching the final days of the fortieth session but still find ourselves facing the stark political facts which cannot be diluted by good wishes or moral appeals. The surge of hope has now evaporated and it has been proved that the General Assembly has no power except to adopt resolutions which remain unimplemented. That is where we stand today as we consider the situation in the Middle East. Tomorrow the Assembly will adopt a revised version of resolutions adopted at previous sessions. It will reaffirm again the ingredients for a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, namely, the need for complete Israeli withdrawal from occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories; exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable national rights and establishment of an independent State on its own land. It will also call for the convening of an international peace conference under United Nations auspices with the participation of all the parties on an equal footing, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), as a framework for achieving lasting peace in the Middle East.

As usual during the past few years, Israel and the United States of America will challenge the collective will of the international community by rejecting those General Assembly resolutions. They have decided to ignore those resolutions, as Chaim Herzog, a former Israeli Permanent Representative to the United Nations, did when he tore up a General Assembly resolution at this very rostrum. The Arab-Israeli conflict was thus transformed into a confrontation between Israel and the United States, on one side, and the international community, on the other. How

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Democratic Yemen)

dare Israel persist in challenging international law when it derived its very legitimacy from the United Nations following the adoption by the General Assembly of the partition resolution in 1947?

Acknowledgement by the General Assembly that Israel is not a peace-loving State was only a faithful reflection of a hard fact because Israel's aggressive policy is yet another variation of Zionist terrorism directed against the Palestinian masses under the British Mandate. With Meir Kahane spearheading Zionist terrorism on a community level, the Israeli leaders who headed the Zionist terrorist groups during the British Mandate in Palestine are now practising terrorism on a State level. While Meir Kahane openly advocates the expulsion of Palestinians from Palestine and the transformation of Palestine into a Jewish State to accommodate all the Jews of the world, Israeli aircraft hunt down Palestinian leaders in Tunisia and Israel takes all kinds of oppressive measures against the Palestinians. Israel is also enacting laws and institutions to force the Palestinians to leave and emigrate so as to achieve the very same goals pursued by Meir Kahane.

Israel's aggressive tendency is a natural reflection of Zionist racism which considers Jews to be the chosen people of God. Thus the General Assembly was quite right when it adopted its historic resolution considering Zionism a form of racism. Indeed, that accounts for the similarity between Israel and the white minority régime of South Africa: both régimes pursue a policy of oppression and discrimination against the indigenous population, aggression against their neighbours, and receive aid and support from Washington.

In fact, United States support for Israel, which encourages it to pursue a belligerent and aggressive policy in the region and one of defiance and rebellion at the international level, goes beyond economic and military support. The United

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Democratic Yemen)

States of America does not support Israel merely militarily and morally. Indeed, it adopts the Israeli policy at the regional and international levels. The United States employs everything within its power to bring political and economic pressure to bear on other countries. Indeed, it also uses its veto power to protect Israel by preventing the Security Council from punishing Israel under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter for being an aggressor and a non-peace-loving State.

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Democratic Yemen)

But we are not surprised at the continued American commitment to support Israel in both war and peace, for Israel is the strategic ally of the United States in the Middle East. What does strike us, however, is the American commitment to implement Israeli policy within the framework of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the peaceful settlement of that conflict. That becomes crystal clear when the United States promises Israel that it will not recognize or deal with the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) as a party to the conflict except on Israel's terms.

Has not the United States long been searching for Palestinian personalities so that it can deal with them instead of the PLO, which has been recognized by the international community as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and its official spokesman? Furthermore, has not the United States tried to justify the aerial bombardment of the headquarters of the PLO in Tunis, whereas the international community has condemned that raid as an act of State-sponsored piracy and terrorism?

The world is almost unanimous in stating that a peaceful and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem cannot be achieved except within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with its resolutions. Nevertheless the United States, in response to Israel's wish and to serve its own interests, opposes that international consensus. The United States is working very hard to eliminate any role for the United Nations, and it endeavours to shift efforts aimed at achieving a peaceful settlement from the United Nations to Camp David once again, so that it can be the sole mediator and compartmentalize the solution in line with the interests of the American-Israeli alliance.

Yes indeed, the United States seeks to solve the Middle East problem alone and through mediation, although it is a part of the problem and a party to the conflict. How could the United States contribute to a fair settlement when it is totally on Israel's side?



(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Democratic Yemen)

We know it is pointless to appeal to the United States to cease providing aid to Israel, or even to decrease it. Israel is an advance base of the United States, and the United States is Israel's strategic hinterland. This also explains the aid the United States gave Israel in the last October war, when American aircraft flew directly to Israeli bases in Sinai to support Israel. It is also futile to call on the United States to pursue an even-handed policy in the Arab-Israeli conflict. It is the Zionist lobby in Washington which fashions American policy towards the Middle East.

We only hope that the Arab friends of the United States will realize that such well-established facts will not change, and that betting on the United States as having the sole role in the Middle East is doomed to failure and will only generate disappointment.

Nevertheless we do call upon the United States, in its capacity as a permanent member of the Security Council, to live up to its responsibility under the United Nations Charter and to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security by joining the international consensus in its conviction that the only way of providing a framework for a comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East is to convene the international conference under the auspices of the United Nations and in accordance with its relevant resolutions, with the participation of all parties concerned on an equal footing.

Will the United States respond favourably to the world consensus and the requirements of international law?

Mr. RANA (Nepal): Once again the General Assembly is discussing the situation in the Middle East, as it has done so often and repeatedly in the past. But if debate on this vexed issue of peace in that troubled part of our planet has become something of a stylized annual ritual, it is also a vivid reminder of the inability of the international community and this world Organization amicably to

(Mr. Rana, Nepal)

resolve a problem which, without any doubt, represents one of the most serious threats to international peace and security.

Such retrospection may admittedly contrast with the effusive glow generated - not unnaturally - by the fortieth commemorative session of the world body. In my delegation's view, only a hard-headed, unsentimental assessment of the situation in the Middle East can help objectively to identify obstructionist factors and thereby aid in determining a safe and secure way out of the Middle East minefield. As it is, a record of four major wars in the region in the four decades of United Nations existence, not to mention the ever present threat of an even more devastating fifth conflict, can hardly be considered encouraging.

On the other hand, as a representative of a country that continues actively to participate in United Nations peace-keeping operations in that tense, volatile region, I would be the last person to ignore the laudable role that this Organization has played and continues to play in the Middle East, especially in the area of peace-keeping. Yet, useful as such a peace-keeping role is, there is no doubt that it cannot be a substitute for a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the basic unresolved problems of that region. That is a goal that has eluded the world for too long, when computed in terms of physical time and lost opportunities for meaningful socio-economic development of the people of that region or, even more, when assessed against the colossal waste of human life and property in the Middle East since the late 1940s.

It has always been our opinion that no solution to the intractable Middle East problem is possible without taking cognizance of the reality of Israel's existence, on the one hand, and recognition and restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, on the other.

(Mr. Rana, Nepal)

Another essential prerequisite for a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East should and must be to ensure that no nation shall enjoy the fruits of aggression.

Although such a plan for peace in the Middle East appears to be just and obvious, it is unfortunate that this has yet to be universally recognized. In this context we wish to recall and reiterate our full support for Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which, as the report of the Secretary-General in document A/40/779 correctly points out,

"spelled out two important principles for a settlement in the Middle East, namely, the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the occupied territories and, secondly, respect and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live ... within secure and recognized boundaries". (A/40/779, para. 37)

(Mr. Rana, Nepal)

We are at the same time conscious that a durable structure of peace in the Middle East cannot be built without the simultaneous settlement of the Palestinian problem, the crux of which lies in the acceptance of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to an independent homeland and self-determination.

No discussion of the situation in the Middle East can, in our view, be complete without reference to two serious obstacles inhibiting the prospects of peace in that region. The first concerns Israel's policy of human settlements in the occupied Arab territories; and the other refers to its equally untenable policy of the creation of so-called "security zones" located within the territory of another independent State and neighbour in this case none other than non-aligned Lebanon. While the former is counter to Security Council resolution 242 (1967), the latter is a security concept that is not only against Charter principles but indeed belongs to an earlier, and unlamented, age of colonialism, buffer zones and spheres of influence that is repugnant to all sovereign independent States.

While my delegation is naturally perturbed that, as the Secretary-General states: "the search for a peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem remains elusive and the situation in the Middle East continues to be unstable" (A/40/779, para. 33), we also share his concern that, since 1977, the United Nations has not been playing as important a role as it had earlier in the Middle East due, among other things, to the "increasingly divergent policies among the permanent members of the Security Council on the Middle East" (para. 35).

More optimistically, however, we note that in recent years a number of peace proposals have been put forward by individual Governments, as well as by groups of Governments. Committed as Nepal is to the peace process in the Middle East - a commitment which is underlined, inter alia, by our current participation in the

(Mr. Rana, Nepal)

United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) - we whole-heartedly applaud such endeavours. In particular, we wish to record our support of the peace initiative of His Majesty King Hussein of Jordan, who proposes negotiations under the auspices of an international conference with the participation, in addition to all the parties to the conflict, of all permanent members of the Security Council within the framework of the United Nations

Finally, we take heart that the Secretary-General has discerned some signs of flexibility on negotiating positions during his recent contacts with the leaders of the parties concerned. We believe that negotiations along the lines proposed in the Hussein plan will not only be a fitting salute to the cause of peace, and this world body, but could also represent the beginning of the end of what has been horrendously long - and costly - decades of violence, tension and terror in the Middle East. If such initiatives fail to get off the ground, the time-bomb that is the Middle East will continue to tick ominously on, until it explodes once again with its ghastly, gory and all-too-familiar impact. Wisdom therefore dictates that we respond to such efforts while there is still time.

Ms. BERGE (Norway): During the last year, we have witnessed some positive and encouraging developments in the Middle East which could, if they are allowed to continue, lead to a climate of more trust and confidence between the parties to the conflict. But there have also been negative events which directly or indirectly serve to undermine or to block the road towards negotiations and peace.

On the positive side, Norway welcomed the decision of the Israeli Government in January of this year to withdraw its forces from a substantial part of those areas of southern Lebanon which had been occupied since the 1982 war. Norway hoped that this decision would lead to a complete Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon. Regrettably, this has not yet happened, but at least it was a necessary step in the right direction.

(Ms. Borge, Norway)

Norway furthermore welcomes the initiatives taken by King Hussein, President Mubarak and Prime Minister Peres. These initiatives have made it possible to conduct more active consultations on how the peace process in the Middle East should now proceed. The Norwegian Government supports the efforts made by the United States representative in the area to see what could be done to bring the Israeli and the Jordanian Governments together on how the peace process would proceed.

Norway has also noted the announcement in Cairo that the PLO condemns all terrorist acts, whether carried out by States, groups or individuals. We welcome the suggestion that the PLO will abstain from all terrorist acts outside occupied territories. This declaration is not enough, however, since it allows for terrorist acts against civilians inside the occupied territories. The Norwegian Government, for its part, firmly rejects all acts of terrorism against civilian targets, regardless of where they occur. The PLO declaration is therefore a long way from being sufficient. Nevertheless, it should be welcomed as a step in the right direction.

On the negative side, the Middle East continues to be the scene and the source of acts of terrorism. There has in recent months been a new upsurge of terrorist acts against civilians - in Cyprus, on the Achille Lauro and on civilian aircraft. Such acts are indefensible and abhorrent and can only contribute to acts of reprisal or punishment. Besides the tragic loss of innocent, civilian lives, the peace process in the Middle East itself could be another victim.

The debates on the Middle East in the United Nations have been centred both on defining the general principles for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East and on defining a framework for the negotiations which will ultimately lead to this peace.

On the question of defining the general principles, significant agreement between some of the parties most directly involved has been reached within the

(Ms. Borge, Norway)

United Nations system. These principles are defined in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), both of which Norway firmly supports. These resolutions state that the acquisition of territory by force cannot be accepted and that all States in the area must have the right to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized borders. A third condition for a lasting peace in the Middle East is the recognition and implementation of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination. It follows from these principles that the Israeli occupation of territories conquered in the 1967 war should be brought to an end as part of a lasting settlement in the area. In the meantime, Norway - in the same way as the 10 members of the European Community, as stated on 3 December - considers that the 1907 Hague Convention and the Fourth Geneva Convention are applicable to the situation in these territories.

(Ms. Borge, Norway)

The question of finding the right framework for peace negotiations in the Middle East has proved to be almost as elusive as peace itself. While Israel has insisted on direct negotiation between Israel and the neighbouring countries, the Arab parties to the conflict have insisted on an international peace conference on the Middle East under United Nations auspices. Some promising signs of a possible compromise between Jordan and Israel emerged as a result of statements made in this Hall by King Hussein of Jordan and Prime Minister Peres of Israel earlier this autumn. The Norwegian Government urges all parties to the conflict to consider taking the extra step on this procedural question towards a compromise which will allow substantial negotiations to begin.

The Norwegian Government is, for its part, willing to support any model for negotiations which is acceptable to the parties themselves. Norway supported the idea of arranging negotiations on a comprehensive peace agreement within the framework of the Geneva Conference on the Middle East in the 1973-1977 period, as called for in resolution 338 (1973). We also supported the Camp David process and the peace agreement between Egypt and Israel as extremely important steps towards peace in the Middle East. We would also be willing to support the idea of an international peace conference if this is acceptable to the parties which, by necessity, will have to take part in the negotiations within that conference. We would, however, find it relatively pointless for the General Assembly to insist on the convening of such a conference as long as two important parties, Israel and the United States, find that the conditions that would make it possible to convene such a conference have not yet been met.

The Norwegian Government has always supported the efforts made within the United Nations system to pave the way for peace in the Middle East. We believe that the United Nations system could make a major contribution to the negotiating process, both through the good offices of the Secretary-General and through the



(Ms. Borge, Norway)

Security Council. We view as interesting the suggestion made in the Secretary-General's report in document A/40/779 that the machinery of the Security Council should be used to enhance the search for a settlement in the Middle East. It is an idea which deserves to be given further consideration.

Southern Lebanon is one area where the entire United Nations system for the maintenance of international peace and security is heavily involved. Norway is one of the countries contributing troops to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). We therefore have a direct stake in developments in that region.

The Norwegian Government is deeply worried about the current situation in southern Lebanon. The continuing Israeli presence in southern Lebanon, the establishment of the so-called security zone north of the international border and the activities of the Israeli-supported South Lebanese Army (SLA) have left UNIFIL in an extremely difficult situation. Since the Norwegian battalion of UNIFIL is located entirely within the security zone, Norwegian UNIFIL soldiers have been exposed to repeated harassment, attempts at infiltrations, shellings and other activities hindering them in fulfilling the job entrusted to UNIFIL by the Security Council. Some of these incidents have seriously jeopardized the safety of our troops. Other UNIFIL contingents have had similar experiences.

The Norwegian Government does not accept the concept of a security zone defined and controlled by Israel on Lebanese territory. We do not agree that the so-called SLA is a legitimate Lebanese organization as long as the Government of Lebanon - whose sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity Norway supports - declares that the SLA is not a legitimate group under its sovereign authority. Norway therefore holds Israel responsible for the acts committed by the SLA in the security zone and in the UNIFIL area. We urge Israel to co-operate with UNIFIL and to allow the United Nations Force to deploy all the way down to the international border. Even though the areas included in the security zone have

(Ms. Borge, Norway)

been relatively quiet in the last few months, except for the incidents between UNIFIL and the SLA, we are afraid that this situation will not last. There are already disturbing signs that the zone could soon become a focal area for resistance or terrorist groups in the region, and that a new cycle of violence and retaliation might be in the offing. As a friend of Israel and a firm supporter of Israel's right to live in peace within its recognized boundaries, we strongly appeal to Israel to accord the same rights to Lebanon.

In conclusion, Norway would like to express its appreciation to the Secretary-General and his staff for their continuous effort to assist UNIFIL in the implementation of its mandate. The Secretariat and UNIFIL's own staff have been untiring in their endeavours to find formulas for lasting and mutually acceptable security arrangements in southern Lebanon, in accordance with the decisions of the Security Council. Together with the other countries contributing troops to UNIFIL, Norway has been looking for ways and means to assist the Secretary-General in this effort. We believe that it is now incumbent upon the members of the Security Council, and particularly its permanent members, to give their strong and determined support to UNIFIL in the present difficult situation. It is particularly important that the permanent members of the Security Council be willing to shoulder the responsibility for giving UNIFIL the possibility of fulfilling its mandate. A more consistent effort is required if the peace-keeping effort in southern Lebanon is to succeed as envisaged in the decisions made by the Security Council.

Mr. FARAH DIRIR (Djibouti): The situation in the Middle East has become a source of international tension which presents a constant challenge to the international community. For almost four decades the Palestinian people and other Arab populations in the occupied territories have been subjected to a kind of colonization and subjugation that hitherto was unknown. The situation has provided

(Mr. Farah Dirir, Djibouti)

the world with tragic scenes of horrible atrocities that have caused and continue to cause incalculable human suffering and conflict.

At no time in the history of the area have the misjudgements and mistakes of history been so tragically the cause of horror and pain as when hundreds of innocent Palestinians were massacred in Deir Yassin and in the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps. Such appalling massacres of innocent civilians have proved to be part of the Zionist campaign of implementing a persistent policy of annihilation directed against the Palestinian people inside and outside the occupied Palestinian and other Arab lands.\*

---

\* Mr. Moreno-Salcedo (Philippines), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Farah Dirir, Djibouti)

The Middle East is perhaps the most volatile and coveted region in the world. Yet it has become a region whose instability is almost certainly the greatest threat to world peace and security. The constant internal and external strife, as a result of the Israeli war of encroachment, attrition and annihilation against the Palestinians and other Arabs inside and outside the occupied Arab lands, in Palestine, the Golan Heights, in Lebanon and recently in Tunis, threatens the growing prosperity of the region and certainly deprives the people from enjoying the benefits of the financial, material, social and cultural well-being that can thrive only if Israel can accept to live in peace with its Arab neighbours, in accordance with the principles and the Charter of the United Nations. Nowhere in the world have international laws, United Nations principles and international agreements and norms been violated as much as they have been in the Middle East.

The partition resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947, whatever intentions it has carried, has created an irreconcilable entity in the Middle East. If that resolution did anything, it allocated the major part of the territory of Palestine to an alien population the majority of which were and continue to be immigrants; and with the adoption of that resolution the Palestinian problem has become the responsibility of the United Nations and particularly that of the Security Council.

No Member State in this Assembly is more indebted to the United Nations than the State of Israel for its very existence. It was a United Nations decision, as embodied in the partition resolution mentioned above, that gave legitimacy to the existence of the Jewish State. Ironically, however, no Member State other than Israel has so arrogantly flouted the fundamental principles of the Charter, international conventions and norms of international behaviour, in utter contempt of world opinion, in spite of the fact that Israel, during the debate on the partition resolution and on its admission to the United Nations, gave assurance that it

(Mr. Farah Dirir, Djibouti)

would observe the principles of the Charter. At that time Israel also declared that it unreservedly accepted the obligations of the Charter and would undertake to honour them from the day when it became a Member of the United Nations.

Alas, from the moment of its inception, the Zionist State established a new modus vivendi in the Middle East. It introduced violence and terror as a means of implementing its policy of expansion, colonization, spoliation and usurpation of land, water and other properties and alienation of the original Arab inhabitants by systematic terrorism and collective punishment.

Because of the Israeli unremitting intransigence, the Palestinian issue has widened into a broader and bitter Arab-Israeli conflict.

The unwarranted aggression and atrocities the Israeli forces systematically inflicted and continue to inflict on the Palestinian and other Arab people inside and outside the occupied Arab lands, as well as inside independent sovereign States, such as in Lebanon and lately in Tunisia, are well documented and need not to be reported here. Suffice it to say that the belligerent behaviour of the Zionist State and its provocative armed encroachment towards its Arab neighbours give us clear proof that Israel is not a peace-loving State.

Far from making peace with the Palestinians and other Arab neighbours, the Zionist State tenaciously pursued a policy in which renewed escalation of violence and terror in the occupied Arab territories has become the order of the day. Such a policy perpetrates terrorist practices and encourages the Israeli settler gangs to carry out terrorist operations against the Arab populations to frighten and evict them from their homeland and then usurp their land, buildings, water and other properties in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

The Zionist régime uses all kinds of pressure to force the Palestinians and other Arab citizens to leave the occupied Arab homeland. As a result, the land

(Mr. Farah Dirir, Djibouti)

occupied by the Zionist régime has tripled since the 1967 Israeli war of aggression and has thus come under the control of the reign of violence and terror perpetrated by the Zionist régime. It is obvious that this policy proved to be the major obstacle to the efforts of promoting peace and security in the Middle East.

At a time when there are many sincere efforts being made in many interested camps, we find the Zionist entity bent on consolidating its hold on the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories, by strengthening its military presence and expanding the establishment of the Israeli settlements in deliberate inflammation of hostilities in the area and in violation of the fundamental Palestinian rights.

The Israeli régime refused to depart from the main components of its policy in the Middle East, which has always been opposed to negotiating or dealing with the Palestinian people and their legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). Thus the omen of stagnation of the Palestinian problem still prevails, in spite of past and present efforts in search of an equitable solution. We believe that unless a final solution to the Palestinian problem, which is the core of the Arab-Israeli conflict, is reached, it will be impossible to bring about a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

We believe that there can be no durable settlement of the Middle East crisis if the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people are denied. We also believe that no peace settlement in the region can be negotiated without the participation of the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, on an equal footing; and only the total withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, can lead to the establishment of a lasting peace in the Middle East.

The Fez peace plan, based on justice and international legality, has demonstrated the Arab nation's genuine desire for true and lasting peace. The

(Mr. Farah Dirir, Djibouti)

Djibouti delegation also welcomes any initiative or approach that could facilitate the search for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Any international peace process attempting to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict should take into account the legitimate rights and aspirations of the Palestinian people to return to their homeland, gain their sovereignty and self-determination, without any foreign influence, and establish their independent State on their territory of Palestine.

In this connection we support the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East where all parties directly involved should participate on an equal footing, as called for by the Geneva Declaration and Programme of Action of the 1983 International Conference on Palestine.

The factional and fratricidal war that has ravaged the territory of Lebanon for a decade, claiming the wastage and loss of countless numbers of people and the destruction of incalculable properties, must be stopped. The already existing calamities, which were compounded by the unwarranted Israeli invasions and attacks in 1982, continue to inflict tremendous suffering on the Lebanese population. Today, Lebanon is in need of international solidarity and support to guarantee its sovereignty and territorial integrity, to restore its national unity and to begin its reconstruction efforts.

It is our sincere hope to see Lebanon regain its security and live as the peaceful and prosperous country it once was.

(Mr. Farah Dirir, Djibouti)

In conclusion, the Middle East region is likely to witness more grave developments if Zionist intransigence is not arrested. We therefore earnestly hope that the United Nations - and especially the Security Council, which is the best forum for the discussion and settlement of peace and security disputes - will prevail upon Israel to abide by the principle of the inviolability of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States by withdrawing its troops from all the occupied Palestinian and other Arab lands.

Mr. PERMANAND (Trinidad and Tobago): It is necessary for us to ensure that history will never record that while this Assembly and the world fiddled the Middle East burned. The situation there is becoming increasingly critical - to use this terminology in the way nuclear scientists do - when the mass reaches that stage it becomes self-generating, and the energy and power so produced could be used either destructively or constructively. Although the situation in the Middle East has not yet reached that critical stage, it is fast approaching it, and something must be done to prevent that region from self-destruction.

The problems of the region, although seemingly intractable, are not incapable of solutions. They are largely man-made and thus not beyond the scope of our intelligence or capabilities either in finding answers or in devising ways whereby solutions can be achieved. What is needed to accomplish this is a clear admission on the part of all concerned that there is an urgent need for peace and tranquillity in the area and for the necessary political will to bring it about.

The following are, in essence, the ingredients of the problems of the Middle East: the Arab-Israeli conflict and the occupied territories, the Iran-Iraq war and the situation in Lebanon. All are of urgent and immediate concern to this Assembly, but the Arab-Israeli conflict is as old as the United Nations itself. The Assembly has listened over the past couple of days to statements elaborating on



(Mr. Permanand, Trinidad and Tobago)

the causes thereof, but all were clear in adherence to the concept that the core of the problem is the unacceptable situation of the Palestinian people. The continued denial to those people of their inalienable right to self-determination and a homeland of their own is without doubt the single most important factor in the matter.

Trinidad and Tobago can only continue to hope, therefore, that the call for an international conference, under the auspices of the United Nations, to deal with this problem and to arrive at a mutually acceptable settlement will be heeded by all the parties concerned. Indeed, it must be heeded, for it is the only sane solution. If it is not heeded, I fear that we shall continue to see continued acts of terrorism, whether individual or State inspired, and subsequent retaliation.

The second part of the Middle East equation is the Iran-Iraq war. In spite of considerable and persistent efforts by the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Secretary-General and the Non-Aligned Movement, this five-year-old conflict shows no sign of abating, and this can only be a cause of grave concern to all peace-loving nations, which we all profess to be. It has become a war of attrition, which in our view can be of benefit to neither of the combatants; it can only result in untold suffering for the inhabitants of both countries. The continued loss of life, the bombing of civilian targets and so on can only serve to destroy the economies of the combatants and benefit the purveyors of arms and armaments. Is that what the parties desire? Do they wish to enrich the already rich at the expense of their own economic and social development, or will they see the futility in continuing a war that can serve only to keep their peoples in a constant state of fear and cultivate hatred with a passion for revenge?

It is our hope that the leadership of both countries will demonstrate those qualities of statesmanship that are now called for, put an end to this fratricidal

(Mr. Permanand, Trinidad and Tobago)

conflict and sit down at the conference table to iron out their disagreements. Trinidad and Tobago commends the efforts of all who have been striving to achieve this and wishes to encourage them to continue and to persevere in their search for a formula by which it could be obtained.

Last, but by no means least, in the Middle East equation is the continuing sectarian strife and foreign intervention in Lebanon that have pushed that country closer to a state of anarchy within the last year. It is not our intention to go into the causes of Lebanese problems; those have been aired over the years and even during this debate. What is of concern to Trinidad and Tobago is the apparent inability of the Lebanese Government and its army to curb this sectarian violence, since that failure can only serve the political interests of foreign Powers and not only encourage external interference in the internal politics of Lebanon but conceivably lead once more to invasion.

The leaders of the various warring factions ought to realize that no one wins in a civil war and that they must lay down their arms and work together to rebuild Lebanon with the rapidity and efficiency of which we in Trinidad and Tobago know they are capable. The call made by this Assembly last year for international action to assist in the process of rebuilding and reconstruction can only be answered in an environment conducive to such a process. At this point that environment does not exist. Not even the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) is permitted to perform its functions properly. However, we remain hopeful that the Government will be able to bring about reconciliation among the warring factions and so create the environment and restore the peace and tranquillity for which Lebanon yearns. Trinidad and Tobago therefore calls upon the world community, and particularly Lebanon's neighbours, to do only that which would further this process.

The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the Observer of the League of Arab States, in accordance with resolution 477 (V), of 1 November 1950.

Mr. MAKSOUD (League of Arab States) (interpretation from Arabic): The debate on the Middle East comes at a time of many developments, both positive and negative. One positive development is the possibility of a lessening of international tension in the aftermath of the Geneva summit meeting between the leaders of the two super-Powers. The Geneva summit has restored channels of communication in the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union that had fallen into disuse, and that in itself constitutes a step forward.

It is true that the Middle East crisis was not dealt with in a substantive manner at the Geneva summit meeting. Perhaps that was because of the central position that the issue of disarmament occupies in the equation of relations between the two super-Powers. Nevertheless we were surprised when President Reagan, in listing the crisis spots around the world, left out both South Africa and the Middle East.

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

That could hardly have been an oversight; rather, we should consider it an indirect admission that, in dealing with these two crisis areas, the United States pursues a policy that runs counter to the international legitimacy established by United Nations resolutions.

Neither does the exclusion of those two regions from Mr. Reagan's list of regional conflicts necessarily mean failure to recognize that mounting crises exist in the Middle East and South Africa. It was, in our view, simply an attempt to buy time to help the racist régimes of South Africa and Israel maintain their policies of aggression pursued by the Pretoria Government in southern Africa and by Israel in the occupied Arab territories. That is especially true in the case of Israel, which has rejected all proposals for a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

This situation constitutes an ongoing negative factor. But it can be said that the meeting of the American and Soviet leaders will gradually help to ease international tensions and restore a measure of confidence between those two Powers, since those tensions threaten not only the peace of the world but human survival itself should the two Powers ever become involved in a nuclear confrontation.

It is from this viewpoint that we seek to evaluate the Geneva Summit, not so much in terms of practical results, which were few, but rather of the atmosphere that the meeting generated, an atmosphere that encourages discussion and understanding and eventually could produce a view of existing problems and crises not as a reason for super-Power competition but as threats which, if not dealt with, would undermine the understanding reached at Geneva.

That is why we believe that the time is opportune strongly to advocate the plan for an international conference that would deal with the Middle East crisis in all its ramifications and serve as a framework within which solutions to all

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

the problems emanating from the Arab-Israeli conflict would be found. We also think that the United States will reduce its strong opposition to this conference, which was supported by General Assembly resolutions, when it realizes that the Middle East crisis, if left unresolved, would be an explosive threat to the stability of the region, and furthermore would result in failure to redress the historic injustice committed against the Palestinian people, a failure that could have dangerous consequences in the Arab world, which still keenly feels the pain of that grievance.

The United States is aware that its strategic relationship with Israel is being exploited to maintain Israeli occupation of Arab lands. Moreover, Israel is using United States support to further its plans for hegemony, expansion and annexation and to continue to create circumstances meant to prevent the Palestinian people from exercising their right to self-determination in their own land.

United States decision-makers, who keep an eye on their country's interests, will discover that the United States-Israel strategic relationship can interrupt the process of international friendship and harm prospects for a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East. This shows that international stability is intimately linked to a just peace in the Middle East, which is possible only if Israel withdraws completely from all the occupied Arab territories and if the Palestinian people is allowed to exercise its natural right of self-determination.

Those are obvious imperatives that have been legitimized by the United Nations and the international community. Any attempt to dilute those conditions or to undercut their international legitimacy will necessarily derail the peace process. Therefore, when we address ourselves to the decision-makers in the United States we do so in the knowledge that the most serious threat to prospects of a just and

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

comprehensive peace is United States permissive attitude towards Israel's aggressive, expansionist policies and its violations of international laws and norms of civilized conduct.

Otherwise, how can we explain the United States position on the continuing presence in southern Lebanon of Israeli forces, which claim the right to commit repeated acts of aggression against the towns and villages of Lebanon, the latest example of which occurred just two days ago against Rashiyah al-Wadi in the eastern Bekaa? Does not the United States realize that the Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon prevents the Lebanese Government from exercising its full authority, including the stationing of its army along Lebanon's borders? Moreover, it is well known that the Israeli presence in southern Lebanon is the principal reason for the country's continuing tragedy, because Israel is evading Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), which call for Israel's immediate withdrawal from the occupied territory. And it was United States permissiveness that enabled Israel to ignore the United Nations resolutions and to violate the sovereignty of Lebanon.

In addition, Israel wants to make its illegal flights over Lebanon, and at times over Syria, as an acquired right which cannot be challenged without Israel's raising a cry about its need to violate the skies of Lebanon and Syria. That dangerously lopsided logic not only exposes Israel's arrogance, but threatens to deepen the Middle East crisis and lead to more violence and conflict. The United States attitude in this context was also reflected in President Reagan's justification of Israel's barbarous raid against Tunisia, which caused the death of scores of Tunisians and Palestinians. The air strike elaborated on and widened Israel's interpretation of the outrageous right it arrogates to itself to violate the sovereignty of any State and to raid the territory of any country, totally

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab  
States)

ignoring international law and the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly in this regard.

All this is due to the fact that the policy of the United States is predicated on absolving Israel of any blame after, or even before, an act of aggression. The recent Pollard case uncovered an Israeli espionage operation that showed how United States leniency towards Israel was exploited in the shoddiest manner. It proved beyond a doubt that Israel is suspicious even of its closest ally, and that it is prepared to undermine United States security and, as was claimed in United States mass media, to violate the limits of friendship. The shock of the spying discovery forced the Zionist forces, the ruling circles in Israel and their supporters in the United States to concentrate on limiting the damage to United States-Israel relations.

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

There have been intense efforts to portray Israeli leaders as having been ignorant of what was going on. Then what was described as an Israeli apology was eagerly cited by Israel's supporters as justification for closing the case as quickly as possible. But the impact this Israeli espionage has made on United States public opinion will not be effaced so easily. Even the United States investigative authorities are becoming aware of the evasive and tricky tactics Israel regularly uses in its dealings with the United Nations, the international community and with its victims; they are becoming aware of Israel's normal violations of civilized conduct.

Although the Israeli espionage case is still under investigation, its dangerous repercussions are already obvious. The most alarming aspect of the case concerns the attempt by Israel and its supporters to counter its effects by claiming that the operation was not aimed at penetrating United States security, but at collecting information about the defence capabilities of the Arab States - as if that claim would justify the Israeli espionage. The Zionist news media have even charged that the United States had forced Israel to resort to espionage by refusing to divulge information. There is thus an attempt to convert the Pollard case into an "isolated incident" for which the United States, not Israel, is to blame.

If that is the way Israel deals with its principal - perhaps its only - ally, it is not hard to imagine how it deals with its victims and with those it considers to be its enemies. That sort of behaviour has its roots not only in Zionist aims, but in the very nature of Zionist ideology.

In recent weeks Israel and its supporters in the United States have launched an intense campaign against the General Assembly resolution declaring Zionism to be a form of racism. The vitriolic attacks which came on the tenth anniversary of the adoption of that resolution did not address the United Nations decision on its



(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

merits, but simply denounced it, as if denunciation were an adequate alternative to that resolution.

Israel has failed to refute the charge that it follows a racist ideology and policy. It has resorted instead to a hysterical campaign of slander against the resolution, a campaign that posed what almost amounted to a loyalty test for certain opportunistic United States politicians. In that regard, we called to task several previous United States Ambassadors and the present representative of the United States when they regrettably vied to take part in a carnival laid on by the Zionist movement, with the aid of the Israeli Mission, in a room at the United Nations. They wanted to join in echoing Israeli slogans and demands without bothering to learn the damning facts on which the resolution was based. Had they done so they would have seen that their responsibility before history required them not to endorse Zionist falsifications, but rather to behave with the modicum of responsibility consonant with their position.

We do not want today to review Israel's aggressive practices over the past 10 years, which have included two invasions of Lebanon, air strikes against Iraq, Tunisia and Syria, illegal annexations, and the establishment of settlements in the occupied Arab territories in an attempt to prevent the creation of an independent Palestinian entity within the framework required by international legitimacy. We do not want to draw the attention of the international community to Israel's defiance, to its violations of the United Nations Charter, or to its persistent refusal to abide by the resolutions of this international Organization. We have no wish to recall the massacres committed by Israel against peaceful civilians in southern Lebanon, the West Bank, Gaza, the Golan Heights and Jerusalem, nor do we want to allude to the daily tragedies faced by the victims of Israeli aggression now suffering under repression, even seeing their homes destroyed for the flimsiest

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

of reasons. We do not want to touch on those violations and crimes, because they already stand vividly in the memory of the international community and this Organization.

But our not wishing to read out a list of the acts of violence, terrorism, aggression and expulsion being committed by Israel does not mean that Israel and its backers can hide the documented facts through their unparalleled impudence. Only Israel's twin racist régime, that of South Africa, can match it for aggression and impudence. Our aim is to induce the international community to act with courage to put an end to this aggression and to find solutions which would curb those violations of the rights of the Palestinian people and of the sovereignty of the Arab States, solutions which would give peace a chance. But we must not forget to counter Israel's attempts to buy time to enable it to harvest the fruits of its aggression and distract world opinion and the international community from the causes of the conflict in the Middle East by launching periodic Zionist campaigns of lies and obfuscation aimed at achieving hegemony in the region.

The Arab States committed themselves to peace when they unanimously adopted the resolutions of the 1982 Fez summit conference and reaffirmed them at the extraordinary summit meeting held at Casablanca in August 1985. On the basis of that commitment we continue to ask the United Nations to work vigorously to promote the convening of the international conference on the Middle East, which we have supported and which we hope will be convened as soon as possible. We say "as soon as possible" because time is of the essence: there is still an opportunity to promote a peaceful solution and to prevent Israel from blocking the Middle East peace process once again, as it has done so many times in the past.

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

Negotiations in the Israeli sense would be aimed at eliminating the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and not at the establishment of an independent national State on the basis of that self-determination. Moreover, Israel has exploited the absence of negotiations on its own terms to annex and Judaize these areas, as in the case of Jerusalem, the Syrian Golan Heights and Egyptian Taba, not to mention its establishment of settlements in those areas in such a way as to make the notion of a withdrawal totally meaningless.

Thus, when it is said that Security Council resolution 242 (1967) is one of the major bases of a solution, it should be recalled that that should mean total withdrawal, the rescission of annexation and the dismantling of the settlements. Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which decrees total withdrawal, also involves the return of sovereignty over the occupied territories to their original Palestinian and Arab owners.

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

Similarly, when we hear that recognition of resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) is a pre-condition for recognizing the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), we reply - especially to the United States - by raising the same question: Is it possible for the Palestinians to agree that the question of their survival, their future and their rights be dealt with as a "refugee" issue?

The international legitimacy, represented in resolutions of the United Nations, and the Arab legitimacy, represented in the Fez Summit resolutions, affirm a strong and clear commitment to the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination in their own homeland. The incremental consequence of these resolutions since 1967 is aimed at guaranteeing the Palestinians the exercise of this inalienable right within international legitimacy.

Therefore, there is clearly a necessary and organic link between the need for withdrawal, on the one hand, and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, on the other. It follows that negotiations cannot be - as Israel considers - dictated by the occupier, and there cannot be negotiations for the sake of negotiations. Otherwise, the process becomes one of submission and acceptance of the status quo - as Israel wants - or perhaps after slight modifications.

Negotiations are meant to produce a concrete outcome, and the expected outcome of any negotiations to resolve the Middle East crisis must be in tune with international legitimacy. That is why we supported the United Nations call for an international conference that would clearly seek to establish the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and bring about the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied Arab territories.

In light of these circumstances, it is clear to us that the mechanism of negotiations must include means to deal with all problems resulting from the

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

Arab-Israeli conflict, so as to achieve a just and comprehensive peace in keeping with the requirements of international legitimacy as represented in all relevant United Nations resolutions.

Prospects for peace are at a crossroads. And, as we have indicated, the opportunities now available may not last long. Therefore, we urgently request the Secretary-General and the institutions of the United Nations system to utilize their intellectual, political, moral and organizational capacities to create the structure of the international conference and to do their best to win over those who are still reluctant to support the plan, so that opposition to the conference will not become another pretext for violence, tension and lack of stability in such a vital area as the Middle East region.

It is time to restore to the United Nations its dignity and credibility and to make the implementation of its resolutions possible. It is time to impose on those who defy the Organization the sanctions decreed by the Charter and to reward those who abide by its dictates.

The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item. The voting on the draft resolutions to be submitted under this item will take place at a subsequent meeting of the General Assembly to be announced in the Journal.

The meeting rose at 7.45 p.m.