

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTIETH SESSION

Official Records



**2422nd
PLENARY MEETING**

Monday, 1 December 1975,
at 11.20 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 124: The situation in the Middle East	1057

President: Mr. Gaston THORN
(Luxembourg).

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Puntsagnorov
(Mongolia), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

AGENDA ITEM 124

The situation in the Middle East

1. The PRESIDENT: This morning we shall begin our consideration of agenda item 124, entitled "The situation in the Middle East".

2. In order that we may be able to organize our work—especially at this advanced stage of the session—I should like to ask representatives to inscribe their names on the list of speakers as soon as possible, and should like to propose now that the list of speakers in the debate on this item be closed tomorrow, Tuesday, 2 December, at 5 p.m. If there is no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

3. Mr. ALLAF (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The first General Assembly resolution concerning the questions of Palestine and the Middle East was adopted in May 1947—that is, more than 28 years ago. Since then, those two interlinked questions have remained concerns of the United Nations and permanent items on the agenda. During these 28 years—which in fact represent almost the entire life of the United Nations itself—the following quantities of resolutions have been adopted by the United Nations on the two questions: 168 by the General Assembly, 85 by the Security Council, 10 by the Trusteeship Council, 8 by the Economic and Social Council, and 9 by the Commission on Human Rights.

4. The questions of Palestine and the Middle East have been examined by every session of the General Assembly of the United Nations since its establishment, with the exception of one session—the first. Two special sessions, in 1947 and 1948 respectively, have been devoted to the two questions, as have two emergency special sessions, in 1956 and 1967, respectively.

5. At each of the regular sessions of the General Assembly, particularly in recent years, delegations of Member States have had to deal with many questions, reports and resolutions in all fields—political, human, economic, social, legal and military—as a

result of Israel's actions in the region, as well as Israel's aggressive, racist, expansionist policy, which has brought untold destruction and suffering to a land that, before the Zionists came, knew only peace and tolerance and fraternal coexistence by all races, sects and religions.

6. The present session of the General Assembly, the thirtieth, is no exception. On the agenda there appear no less than six items directly relating to the consequences of the Zionist aggression against the region. In addition, there are many items on the agenda which concern the present situation in the Middle East although they are not restricted to it. They deal with similar situations in other parts of the world where some peoples are subjected to the same injustice, oppression, occupation and racism to which the Arab people in the region is subjected. Thus, the evils of the Zionist entity, which was implanted by force and oppression in the heart of the Middle East, have spread to every domain.

7. Reports about the crimes and other practices of the Zionist entity pile up, but they encounter the total indifference of some nations that are blinded by a mixture of guilt feelings about the suffering endured by the Jews of the world at the hands of the Western Nazis, under the very eyes of those nations, on the one hand, and unwise submission to the lies and falsifications of the great Zionist propaganda machine, on the other. That machine, unfortunately, dominates all the audio-visual means of information in the Western States and the internal and external policies of those nations, policies that are mobilized for the interests of Israel, even though they run directly counter to the national interests of the countries concerned.

8. Wherever representatives to the thirtieth session of the General Assembly look they see the effects of one or another of Israel's crimes, Israel's aggression, Israel's violations, Israel's racist and discriminatory practices. The Special Political Committee is now busy examining the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories [A/10272]. The members of the Special Political Committee find themselves once again confronted by the worst kinds of violations practised by the Zionist occupation régime against the Arab populations: mass punishment, imprisonment without trial, expulsion, dispersal, destruction of homes, changes in the demographic character of the Arab territories under Israeli occupation, establishment of settlements in order to entrench the Israeli occupation of Arab territories. In addition to reports, other documents and evidence, and statements—in most cases from Israeli sources themselves—the members of the Committee saw with their own eyes a long documentary film about what the Zionist occupiers are doing to the City of Jerusalem: totally changing the spiritual character of that city,

which for generations has been a source of light for humanity, for the hundreds of millions of people belonging to the three unitary religions.

9. A few days ago, the Special Political Committee was dealing with ways to alleviate the pain of expulsion and homelessness suffered by the 2 million Palestinian and other Arab refugees who have been victims of the Israeli racist aggression for over a quarter of a century and who live in refugee tents and poor huts instead of in their homes and on their lands, which have been usurped.

10. When the Special Political Committee dealt with the policy of *apartheid* practised by the white racist minority régime in South Africa, it found itself automatically considering reports and documents showing the escalation of co-operation and exchanges between that régime and the racist Zionist régime in Tel Aviv. It learned that the two racist régimes follow similar methods in oppressing the legitimate indigenous population and in discriminating against them: the details and forms may vary, but the methods have the same purpose and targets.

11. It would seem that in not one of the items discussed by the First Committee was there reference either directly or indirectly to the racist Zionist aggression in the Middle East area, starting with the economic and social effects of the arms race, and including the causes of disarmament, the setting up of nuclear-free zones, the strengthening of international peace and security. This applies particularly to the Committee item concerning the use of napalm and similar incendiary weapons, which has a particularly deep and sad meaning for the Middle East, where there are thousands of victims who have suffered from Israeli napalm cluster bombs and similar Israeli weapons; women, children and the elderly who are still suffering from the brutality of Zionist attacks against their peaceful villages and refugee camps.

12. The Third Committee, in discussing human rights and social, humanitarian and cultural questions found itself, no matter what the item, discussing racist Fascist régimes which oppress man and trample on basic human rights. Fortunately, those racist régimes are no longer numerous; they can be counted on the fingers of one hand. They are, in particular, the white minority régime in Pretoria, the white minority régime in Salisbury and the Zionist racist régime in Tel Aviv.

13. The Third Committee and subsequently the General Assembly condemned zionism as one of the forms of racism and racial discrimination, just as they condemned *apartheid* and other similar racist practices. Racial and religious discrimination against others just because they do not belong to a particular race or practise a particular religion should be condemned wherever it is practised and whoever practises it. The practices which are condemned when they are carried on by the Pretoria régime cannot be ignored just because they happen to take place in Tel Aviv, and we cannot remain silent about them.

14. With respect to the Palestinian cause itself, the General Assembly has been dealing with it for weeks and has reviewed again the tragedy of the 3 million human beings who have been uprooted from their homes and their lands with a brutality hitherto unknown throughout history. Strangers have taken

the place of the Palestinian people, strangers who were gathered from every part of the world for no reason other than that they belong to one particular religion. They are still being gathered and mobilized, and the occupied territory is being filled with them because racist zionism refuses to recognize the right to life of those who were born and lived in the land of Palestine, as did their ancestors for centuries before them, while that right is given to foreigners and strangers who are not linked to the land of Palestine by nationality, civilization, language or any historic bond—unless religious discrimination and bias can be considered a historic bond and a reason.

15. The General Assembly is now discussing the Middle East question, and the cause of the Palestinian people is at the very core of this problem. Once more it faces the effects of Zionist aggression spreading its arms like an octopus, north, east and south, against the Arab people in every part of the Arab world. The General Assembly has adopted one resolution after another in order to deter aggressive Israel, ensure its withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories and secure recognition by Israel of the rights of the Palestinian Arab people, but without success.

16. Israel was planted in the heart of the Arab world through injustice and aggression, by an unholy alliance between the forces of imperialism and the world Zionist movement. Those forces, which enjoyed a position of power in the United Nations at the beginning of its existence, were able to create a "State" of Israel in a land which belonged to the Arab Palestinian people, in which the Arab Palestinian people constituted the overwhelming majority of the population and owned more than 95 per cent of the land. Thus the international Organization—or, to be more correct, the forces which at that time dominated the Organization—violated not only the principles of justice and international law, but also the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination, sovereignty and territorial integrity, as well as their simplest human rights.

17. In spite of all this, Israel was not satisfied with taking over what had been given to it under General Assembly resolution 181 (II) which established partition. As soon as the British Mandate ended on 14 May 1948—which was organized and timed in accordance with the plans of the Zionists—the Haganah, the Irgun and the Stern Gangs overwhelmed the peaceful Arab villages. After those brutal massacres and many battles waged by the forces of the Palestinian people and the Arab forces which rose to defend them, the United Nations imposed various truces, which ended with the occupation by the Zionists of an area 18 per cent greater than the area given to the Zionist State under the partition resolution.

18. For eight years after the 1948 aggression, Israel continued to attack the Arab population and the neighbouring Arab territories, until it was able to plan the Suez campaign in 1956 in collusion with the French and United Kingdom Governments. The tripartite Suez aggression against Egypt in 1956—which was unsuccessful because of the heroism of the people and army of Egypt and the fusion with the forces of Syria and neighbouring Arab countries, as well as the attitude of the Soviet Union and world public opinion—was an Israeli military manoeuvre in preparation for the perfidious and comprehensive aggression against

Egypt and Syria and the rest of the Palestinian territory on 5 June 1967.

19. In spite of the resistance of the heroic Arab armies in Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Palestine, the Zionist aggression was able at that time to occupy all of Sinai and the West Bank and part of the Golan.

20. After six futile years of abortive international efforts to force the aggressor to withdraw from the Arab territories and recognize the rights of the Palestinian Arab people, the Syrian and Egyptian Arab forces found no alternative but to liberate the land which had so long been occupied. Thus came about the war of liberation of October 1973 as proof that the Arab people would not remain silent, would not agree that an inch of Arab territory should remain under occupation, and would no longer tolerate the violation of the right of the Palestinian people to return to their lands, their right to sovereignty, independence and self-determination.

21. After the October war, the international community became convinced that peace in the Middle East could not be achieved at the expense of the Arab territories or of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. The magnificent solidarity among the countries of the third world in Africa, Asia and Latin America and the Arab people contributed greatly to isolating further the aggressive Zionist régime.

22. The attitude of friendly countries, socialist countries and northern countries was an honourable one which had helped strengthen the front against the racist Zionist aggression against the Arab people. The economic and security impact of the liberation war of October increased the positive tendency among many friendly Western European countries finally to admit that a just and durable solution of the Middle East crisis would directly affect the economic and security interests of European countries.

23. But what we really regret is to find one exception to this almost unanimous international belief: the only major Power which pretends to lead the peace efforts in the area and which, more than any other country, has the greatest influence and domination over Israel. The United States gives Israel an inordinate amount of support and provides it with enormous quantities of complex weapons, missiles, aircraft and other means of destruction, as well as billions of dollars in the form of donations and assistance so that Israel's share of American external aid is greater than the aid given to all the other countries combined. The United States also supports Israel in international organizations and forums in a manner totally incompatible with the status and dignity of the United States as a major Power.

24. The United States bias in favour of the Zionist régime is not restricted to the United Nations but extends also to the specialized agencies and other organizations. The United States attitude in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO] is only one example. But the latest and strangest illustration of that attitude is the United States statement concerning its determination to withdraw from the International Labour Organisation [ILO]. Why? Because that organization has agreed to give observer status to the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO] in implementation of the relevant resolu-

tions of the General Assembly and the International Labour Conference.

25. The threat to withdraw from international organizations in support of the racist Zionist régime has not been restricted to ILO or UNESCO. A similar threat has been repeated here and by United States information media, both overtly and covertly. But the question to be posed by the delegations and representatives of Member States in confronting this illogical American bias in favour of Israel is no longer whether the United States should leave the United Nations, but whether the United Nations should leave the United States.

26. Such an attitude on the part of a major Power like the United States causes particular regret because of the important positive role that country could really have played in establishing peace in the Middle East on the basis of a durable and just solution had it used its special influence on Israel to force it to give up its aggressive expansionist policies, to respect the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law, to implement the numerous United Nations resolutions which call upon Israel to withdraw from all the occupied Arab territories and to respect the basic national rights of the Palestinian people.

27. The United States always asserts that it is trying to establish a durable, just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East, but in practice it follows a policy that contradicts that objective and promotes the fragmentation and liquidation of the cause, as it diverts the attention of the world public by taking inch-by-inch steps which do not constitute actual progress towards the just and comprehensive solution it is allegedly seeking. In fact, those steps are used by the aggressor as a pretext for entrenching its aggression and occupation.

28. On this basis and for these reasons, the Syrian Arab Republic has, from the very start, expressed serious doubt concerning the usefulness of the step-by-step American policy. In spite of the fact that it was convinced of the uselessness of that policy, it wished to give that policy a chance and proved its good faith by accepting the Agreement on Disengagement between Israeli and Syrian Forces, which was signed in Geneva on 31 May 1974, on the understanding that the Agreement, as clearly stipulated and provided for in its last article, should be a step towards a comprehensive solution for the establishment of a just and durable peace in the area and should be followed by serious, meaningful and sincere measures for the achievement of that main goal. But one and a half years have passed during which Israel and its supporters have not allowed any real progress to be made towards a just and comprehensive solution. In fact, the opposite has taken place. The Zionist authorities have increased their intransigence and day after day have placed obstacles in the way of peace, thus gradually revealing their expansionist designs and their settler ambitions. Only one month after the first Agreement on Disengagement between Syrian and Israeli Forces was signed, the French newspaper *Le Monde* printed the following news from Tel Aviv in its issue of 6 July 1974: "Forty-four new agricultural colonies will be established by Israel during the next five years, 25 of which will be in the occupied Arab territories."* The

* Quoted in French by the speaker.

news item added that one of those agricultural settlements would be set up immediately to the south of the Golan Heights, on the basis of a resolution adopted by the Israeli Labour Party before the October war which states: "Israel's frontier of peace will pass through the Golan."

29. The British *Sunday Times* has indicated how Israel maps out the frontiers of the territory it wants to annex, and the newspaper's correspondent in Jerusalem said the following on 4 May 1975:

"There is, of course, no need to draw maps on paper. The lines have been drawn on the ground, in stone and concrete, in the last eight years—in the shape of Israel's settlements in the Golan, the Jordan Valley and around Jerusalem. Work to consolidate these is still going on feverishly."*

30. That expansionist settler policy has compelled even the Israelis themselves to denounce what is being carried out by their racist authorities. Israel Shahak, leader of the Israeli Union for Human Rights, held a press conference in Paris on 24 June 1975 at which he denounced the Israeli colonization of the occupied Arab territories and affirmed its increasingly racist behaviour *vis-à-vis* the Arab peoples.

31. The report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories [*ibid.*], which is being examined by the Special Political Committee at this time, in paragraphs 30 to 102, sets out details of the Zionist policy of annexation and settlement in all the occupied Arab territories. From it we can also see that Israel has so far established no fewer than 62 settlements in the occupied Arab territories and plans to set up another 80 during the next three years.

32. Radio Israel announced in Hebrew on 9 September last that the Ministerial Committee for Settlement Affairs had decided to set up six new settlements for the immigrants, including two in Rafah, one in Gaza and one 15 kilometres south of Jerusalem. The Israeli Minister of Police and Interior, Shlomo Hillel, visited the people of the settlements established in the Golan. He put their minds at ease—according to the report in *The Jerusalem Post* of 19 September 1975—and said that the Israeli Government would not permit the establishment of settlements in the Golan Heights only to remove them later. In fact, Israel no longer hides the fact that it wants to annex the occupied territories by force and not withdraw from them even after the establishment of peace.

33. The *Jewish Telegraph Agency*, in dispatch No. 219 of 19 November 1975, issued here in New York only a few days ago, reporting statements by high Government sources, said:

"The sources"—top-level Israeli Government sources—"saw little hope for the negotiation of a second interim accord with Syria since Israel could 'offer only cosmetic' border changes within the context of an interim agreement and even in the context of a final peace settlement would never agree to a total withdrawal from the Golan Heights."*

34. The Israeli Labour Party, the governing party, set out with great insolence at the end of last June what it called the final Israeli peace frontiers which in-

dictated, according to the statement of General Meir Zarmi, Secretary-General of the Party, on 18 June 1975, the definitive annexation of the Golan Heights, the Gaza sector and the City of Jerusalem.

35. What, then, is the peace that Israel talks about? And what is the purpose of this step-by-step policy which it is alleged aims at the establishment of peace? This step-by-step policy will only lead, given Israel's settler ambitions, to a gradual consolidation of occupation, because this policy, by providing the Israeli aggressor with further time and delaying a real and comprehensive solution, serves the plans of that aggressor, knowingly or unknowingly. Otherwise, what would be the need for a second agreement on disengagement of forces in Sinai after the actual disengagement has taken place in accordance with the first agreement? At the time it was said, as a pretext for the first disengagement agreement, that it was imposed by the need to create a suitable climate for the prevention of conflict, to separate the forces and to reach a final solution. Why was not the second step a genuine search for that just and comprehensive solution on all the fronts of the struggle against Israeli aggression?

36. The real aim of the determination of Israel and the United States to substitute partial solutions and small individual steps for a comprehensive solution—as recognized and admitted by the former American politician, George Ball, in *Newsweek*, following the Sinai Agreement—is to shatter the unity of the Arab States confronting Israel, remove the strongest Arab force from the battle and avoid another October war in which the Syrian Arab forces in the north would join the Egyptian Arab forces in the south in rooting out the Israeli aggression against the Arab people, and completing the task of liberating every last inch of land besmirched by the Zionist occupation of the Arab territories.

37. We are now uncovering the dangers of this agreement one after the other, and the last thing to be revealed is the truth about what are called "American technicians", who will direct the early-warning systems, for these are agents of the Central Intelligence Agency [CIA]. It is not we who are saying that; it is a comment in the Israeli paper *Yediot Aharonot*, and, as stated on Radio Israel, in Hebrew, at 9 a.m. GMT on 22 September 1975:

"*Yediot Aharonot* lifts an eyebrow over Defence Minister Shimon Peres' visit with the head of the CIA, especially after Mr. Peres said that during this visit the duties of United States technicians in Sinai had also been discussed. The Soviets have been contending that the interim settlement worried them, particularly the clause about the technicians, who, in their view, are nothing less than United States intelligence personnel. We have denied this and have asserted that the Soviets are exaggerating. What will our answer be to their contentions now, asks *Yediot Aharonot*:"*

38. The Syrian Arab Republic has refused to be trapped into these Israeli plans to change the possibilities of the Arab people to confront the basic danger, represented by the Israeli occupation of the Arab territories and its violation of the rights of the Palestinian

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

people, and divert their efforts by manoeuvres to alternative measures.

39. President Hafez Al-Assad, in his important speech of 6 October 1975, on the occasion of the second anniversary of the October war of liberation, said that the Syrian Arab Republic would not accept any new negotiations concerning the forces unless they covered the two fronts, the Syrian and the Palestinian at the same time, and that any new action on the Syrian front should run parallel with similar new action on the Palestinian front, through the PLO, the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

40. The Syrian Arab Republic has imposed this condition, affirmed by its President on the basis of its belief that a durable and just peace can only be established through the full recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people to their homeland and their territory, and complete withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories. It was in accordance with this position that Syria insisted last night that, if the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force [UNDOF] in the Golan area was to be extended, the Security Council must at the same time adopt a decision to reconvene on 12 January 1976 to follow up the discussion of the Middle East question, including the Palestinian cause, with the participation of the representatives of the PLO, and on the basis of all the relevant United Nations resolutions.

41. For the past 18 months, since the signing of the Agreement on Disengagement between the Syrian and Israeli Forces, aggressive Israel has tried to make UNDOF an international force which would continue *ad infinitum* and whose mandate would be renewed automatically every six months, or possibly every year, as though it was a force to maintain Israeli occupation for ever, to perpetuate it, and to protect the security of the Israeli troops occupying Syrian territories.

42. In spite of the fact that the Agreement on Disengagement of forces on the Golan Heights is not a peace treaty, but only a step towards the establishment of a durable and just peace in the Middle East; in spite of the provisions of Security Council resolutions 363 (1974) of 29 November 1974 and 369 (1975) of 28 May 1975, which represent two successive renewals of the mandate of UNDOF and which express the Council's concern at the continued tension in the area; and in spite of the fact that the two Middle East disengagement agreements are only a step towards the implementation of Security Council resolutions and the establishment of a durable and just peace in the Middle East, Israel has refused to give in and to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations.

43. It has impeded any real progress towards peace. It has tried to freeze the situation and gain time to consolidate the *fait accompli*, and as a result, there is no discussion of the tense situation in the area until a few days before the mandate of UNDOF is due to expire. The insolence of the Zionist leaders has reached such a point that they consider that the extension of the mandate of UNDOF is an end in itself, and that no other topic should be discussed in conjunction with it, even if that other topic is the basic reason for the introduction of those into the area: namely, an attempt to improve the atmosphere in order to permit the implementation of the Security Council and General Assem-

bly resolutions aiming at a just and durable peace in the area.

44. Three days ago, we heard Yitzak Rabin, the Prime Minister of the Zionist régime, threaten that Israel would consider itself free of any obligations resulting from Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) if the Security Council linked the extension of the mandate of UNDOF to "matters not directly connected to this subject".

45. The matters which Mr. Rabin does not consider related to the extension of the mandate are the Middle East problem and the Palestinian question, which are the very basis and core of the whole subject we are discussing. But if the question of the Middle East is not connected with that of the mandate of the United Nations forces observing the disengagement of the warring forces in the Middle East, then with what is the question of the mandate of UNDOF connected? Is it with Korea? Or is it with Cyprus? And when did Israel ever fulfil its obligations arising out of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973)—in spite of their shortcomings—so as to allow it to threaten us today by saying it feels free of those obligations?

46. Security Council resolution 381 (1975), which was adopted unanimously yesterday, hits Israel with a painful truth: namely, that the United Nations forces stationed between the Syrian and the Israeli forces, are not stationed in the Golan Heights for a picnic and there is no intention of transforming them into an international occupation force which would provide a line of defence and a protection for the Zionist forces of aggression. The mandate of those forces will not be extended *ad infinitum* and its extension will not become automatic, so that it will be sufficient for Israel to press a button for it to take place.

47. In the important resolution that it has adopted, the Security Council has indicated also that it will not waste any time and that within six weeks it will deal with and study the whole Middle East problem and the Palestine question which is the very core of that problem and the reason for it. More important than that, the Security Council, in the important resolution to which we have referred, considers that those two issues should be examined in the light of all the United Nations resolutions concerning Palestine and the Middle East, including, of course, General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX), concerning the inalienable national rights of the Arab Palestinian people and General Assembly resolutions 3375 (XXX) and 3376 (XXX) adopted during the current session concerning, respectively, the invitation of the PLO to participate in all peace efforts concerning the Middle East on the basis of resolution 3236 (XXIX), and the establishment of a Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

48. The statement made by the President of the Security Council¹ on behalf of the majority of its members, following the adoption of resolution 381 (1975), and concerning the invitation to the representatives of the PLO to participate in the debate on the Middle East and the question of Palestine when the Council reconvenes on 12 January next, is a historic affirmation by the Security Council of the right of the PLO, which is the only legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, to participate in all that concerns the rights and the destiny of that militant and heroic people.

49. The representative of the Zionist régime, Mr. Herzog, in a statement to the press yesterday following the unanimous adoption by the Security Council of its resolution 381 (1975), revealed the aggressive and expansionist nature of his régime and proved that Israel does not really want the United Nations forces, except as a cover for its expansionist ambitions and its aim to impose a *fait accompli* based on occupation and usurpation. The Zionist representative spoke yesterday, in his statement, and said that he saw that "resolution as a surrender to Syrian blackmail and Soviet dictates".

50. Security Council resolution 381 (1975) was adopted unanimously. Does the representative of the Zionist régime mean that all those who voted for that resolution gave in to Syrian blackmail and to Soviet dictates? At the least I do not think that Mr. Moynihan, the representative of the United States, will be happy with that accusation. If the invitation to the Security Council to fulfil its responsibilities and duties as stipulated in the Charter by discussing a question that is a threat to international peace and security, and the call for respect for United Nations resolutions concerning this question constitute a surrender to blackmail, then the Syrian Arab Republic is proud that it is practising such blackmail.

51. The Syrian Arab Republic welcomes Security Council resolution 381 (1975) and hopes that the comprehensive discussion of the two questions of the Middle East and Palestine which the Council will engage in during the month of January next will provide the Council with an opportunity to fulfil its important role as the major international organ for the maintenance of peace and the prevention of aggression. We also hope that the Council will be able meaningfully and with all sincerity to discharge its obligations and use the means provided by the Charter to force Israel to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations which it has long ignored, and thus pave the way to the fulfilment of the two basic conditions for a durable and just peace in the Middle East: namely, first, total withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories, and secondly, full recognition of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people including their rights to sovereignty, to national independence and to self-determination in their homeland, in implementation of General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX).

52. The Syrian Arab Republic, which did not have an opportunity to participate in the formal discussions of the Security Council, would like to pay a tribute to the great efforts exerted by the Secretary-General, particularly during and after his most recent trip to the Middle East, to prevent an explosion of the current situation emanating from Israel's intransigence and continued occupation of the Arab territories, and its violation of the rights of the Palestinian people. Those efforts undoubtedly contributed to the adoption of resolution 381 (1975), which now transfers the responsibility for dealing with the current dangerous situation in the area once more to the Security Council, with all the hope that this implies that the Council will be able to put an end to Israeli occupation and to Zionist aggression against the Arab peoples.

53. Syria would also like to express its gratitude to the sisterly non-aligned States represented in the

Security Council which took this successful initiative, crowned by the adoption of the resolution, and to the socialist States, the northern States and the Western European States, all of which participated in defusing the situation that threatened to explode as a result of Israel's intransigence and its continued attempts to impede efforts to establish peace.

54. The responsibility entrusted to the Security Council under its resolution 381 (1975) and the statements of the majority of the members of the Council concerning that resolution are fully in line with the responsibility which would be entrusted to the Council under the draft resolution on the Middle East now being prepared by the non-aligned States, which will soon be put before the General Assembly. That draft resolution affirms the unity and indivisibility of the cause of peace and states that a just and lasting peace can only be established by means of a comprehensive solution within the framework of the United Nations, taking into consideration all the elements of the conflict in the Middle East and particularly the right of the Palestinian people to exercise their inalienable national rights, and with complete Israeli withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories. The draft resolution also asks the Security Council to take the necessary measures within the framework of its responsibilities under the Charter to speed up the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on the basis of a suitable time-table. We think that, by adopting that resolution on the Middle East, the General Assembly would be adding to a series of integrated and compatible resolutions concerning Palestine and the Middle East, all characterized by positiveness and practicality and all aimed at one legitimate objective which must be attained if we really want to have a lasting and just peace in the area: namely, respect for the resolutions of the United Nations, and their implementation.

55. The Arab people aspires to peace based on justice. As long as one inch of Arab territory remains under occupation, and as long as even one of the rights of the Palestinian people is subject to violation, there will be no justice, and thus there cannot be peace. The security of the Middle East is linked to the security of the world. Unless a just peace reigns in that area, the world will not enjoy peace. For this reason, the Arab people would like to direct a warm and sincere appeal to all the peoples in every part of the world. It is time for injustice and occupation to be eliminated from our suffering region. The will of the Arab people, supported and strengthened by the will of the friendly and brotherly nations in the non-aligned world, the third world, the socialist countries, the Western European countries and the northern countries—this united determination of all peace-loving nations—can deter aggression, put an end to occupation and restore rights. Will this appeal be answered?

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.

NOTE

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirtieth Year*, 1856th meeting, para. 23.