



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 25: The situation in the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General (<i>continued</i>)	1557
Agenda item 107: Financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East (<i>continued</i>): (a) United Nations Emergency Force and United Nations Disengagement Observer Force: report of the Secretary-General Report of the Fifth Committee (Part II)	1570

President: Mr. Salim Ahmed SALIM
(United Republic of Tanzania)

AGENDA ITEM 25

The situation in the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT: I request delegations wishing to submit draft resolutions on this item to do so as soon as possible. It is expected that the debate will be concluded tomorrow morning.

2. Mr. SHARIF (Somalia): The continuing danger to international peace and security posed by the festering Middle East conflict makes it imperative that Member States exert every effort to ensure the implementation of United Nations decisions on this question. My delegation wishes to affirm its strong support for the following principles and decisions aimed at bringing about a Middle East settlement.

3. In the first place, all measures, of whatever kind, taken by Israel in its attempt to change the demographic and social character and the political and legal status of occupied Palestinian and Arab territories in contravention of the fourth Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949¹ must be nullified. The Israeli practice of establishing settlements in occupied territories is a particularly serious obstacle to peace. This practice should be ended forthwith and the illegal settlements must be removed.

4. Secondly, Israel must withdraw completely and unconditionally from all occupied Palestinian and Arab territories, in accordance with Security Council resolutions which emphasize the inadmissibility of acquiring territory through aggression. This obligation applies with particular force to the Arab city of Jerusalem, which must be returned to Arab sovereignty.

5. Thirdly, the Palestinian people whose plight is at the core of the Middle East problem must have their

¹ Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973, p. 287.

inalienable rights restored, including the right to return to their homes, the right to self-determination and the right to a statehood of their own in Palestine.

6. Furthermore, the Palestine Liberation Organization, [PLO], the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, must participate as an equal and independent party in all international conferences on the Middle East.

7. As Member States are well aware, there is a long and complex history behind these principles and decisions formulated by the United Nations in its efforts to bring about a Middle East settlement. However, it is pertinent to note that while some of the external features of the Middle East question have changed since the problem arose early in this century, the essentials of the situation have not changed. If we view the last 50 years in retrospect, it becomes apparent that today the opportunist machinations of zionism in the Middle East have the same objectives as in the past, namely, to usurp, to exclude and to dominate.

8. A few echoes from the past heard recently are sufficient to confirm what has been common knowledge to many. For example, former Israeli Prime Minister Rabin has admitted, in his recently published memoirs, that at the start of the Israeli-Arab conflict of 1949 Israeli military commanders received an unmistakable signal from Zionist political leaders that they were to use force and intimidation to expel the Palestinian population from their lands. Another recent memoir, that of a Secretary in the Cabinet of Sir Anthony Eden at the time of the Suez crisis, reminds us that Israel was the aggressor in 1956, as it was in 1967.

9. Today Israel can no longer hide behind its hypocritical claims to moral and political righteousness. It stands condemned as an arrogant violator of international law and internationally accepted standards of human rights. It is indicted by its illegal annexations and its openly expansionist policies; by its cruel occupation practices whose inhumanity has been confirmed by committees of the General Assembly and of the Security Council; by its continued illegal occupation of Palestinian and Arab territories, in defiance of the United Nations; by its genocidal policies which deny the right and even the existence of the Palestinians as a people and seeks to eliminate them by military aggression, particularly in Lebanon. The long list of Israeli crimes must also include its repeated attacks on Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity and its interference in the internal affairs of that country.

10. Israel's belligerence and intransigence could well lead to a new Middle East conflict. In this situation so fraught with danger, both for the region and for the world, my delegation believes that the solution of the Middle East problem should be reached through a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the question, including the inalienable rights of the Palestinian

people, and with the participation on an equal footing of all the parties, including the PLO. Such a comprehensive settlement should aim at achieving and guaranteeing the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the region.

11. If Israel persists in its gross violations of international law—and the experience of the past leads us to believe that this will be the case—then the Security Council must exercise its responsibility under the Charter to take measures necessary to ensure the implementation of United Nations resolutions on the Middle East.

12. The United States, which has consistently given Israel massive economic, military and moral support in spite of that country's flagrant contraventions of international law, has a particularly heavy responsibility in bringing pressure to bear on Israel to act in accordance with the principles and measures adopted by the United Nations.

13. Israel must be made to understand that it cannot continue to defy the United Nations with impunity. It must not be allowed to continue on its present course, which seriously threatens regional and international peace and security.

14. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) [*interpretation from Russian*]: In the Middle East today, as in the past, one of the most dangerous conflicts in the world continues to exist. The persistence of this conflict makes the Middle East an unstable and dangerous region containing the threat of an outbreak of open warfare that may well extend beyond that region. That is why the people of the world are deeply concerned at the events taking place in the Middle East.

15. This concern was also expressed in the report of the Secretary-General on the UNDOF, of 23 November 1979, in which it is stated that:

“ . . . the situation in the Middle East as a whole continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached.”²

16. The hopes of the Arab peoples have been dashed, as have been all the hopes of those who seek the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. It was expected that the United States would give up its policy of separate agreements, which was contrary to the Soviet-United States joint statement on the Middle East of 1 October 1977³ and the very clear-cut resolutions of the United Nations. However, the opposite was the case. The United States-Israel axis was extended, and that axis was aimed at Arab interests in order to impose imperialist *diktats* on the Middle East and on the Arab countries, as occurred immediately

upon the signing of the Camp David agreements,⁴ none of which, however, led to a détente in the Middle East. Quite to the contrary: the tension has only increased in that region.

17. The arms race has escalated in the region, and the threat of Israel's nuclear capability has increased. The attacks on southern Lebanon have intensified, and the situation in the occupied Arab territories has deteriorated. After the Camp David agreements the armed attacks by Israel against Lebanon became more frequent, and the number of Israeli settlements illegally set up in occupied territories also increased through the further expropriation of Arab territory and lands. The Israeli authorities have recently laid down set regulations prohibiting all political activity in the region, resulting in twice as many arrests and detentions of Arabs there. The terrorist acts against the Mayor of Nablus is just one of the many incidents that have followed those rulings.

18. If these events are examined in the light of the Israeli policy of the so-called “solution of the problem of Palestine” we see that the fundamental objectives of that policy are the gross violation of human rights and the strengthening of Israel's hand in order to allow the occupying power a free hand in the region. The separate agreements of Camp David have become wittingly or unwittingly an obstacle to an over-all, just solution to the problem of the Middle East. The majority of representatives of States, in the course of the thirty-third regular session of the General Assembly, had already warned of the effect of a policy of this nature that does not take into account a crucial question that must be solved if a just and lasting peace is to be attained in the Middle East. The United Nations, in its important resolutions—for example, in paragraph 2 of resolution 33/28A—has repeatedly drawn attention to the fact that:

“ . . . a just and lasting peace in the Middle East cannot be established without the achievement, *inter alia*, of a just solution of the problem of Palestine on the basis of the attainment of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right of return and the right to national independence and sovereignty in Palestine, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”.

19. Yet, how can we deal with the basic problem of the Middle East when separate agreements such as that of 26 March of this year⁵ are concluded? In that agreement, it would appear that these are merely secondary matters. The Arab people of Palestine and their sole, legitimate representative, the PLO, are not given a chance to express their views on decisions which involve nothing so much as the open annexation of Palestinian territory by Israel. The Palestinians living under Israeli occupation are only allowed to determine such matters as food, subsistence and certain minor questions. The beautiful word “autonomy” here is used to conceal the true condition that exists, namely colonization.

20. This means that the Camp David agreements do

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fourth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1979*, document S/13637, para. 25.

³ Joint statement on the Middle East issued on 1 October 1977 by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Secretary of State of the United States of America in their capacities as Co-Chairmen of the Peace Conference on the Middle East.

⁴ A Framework for Peace in the Middle East, Agreed at Camp David, and Framework for the Conclusion of a Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel, signed at Washington on 17 September 1978.

⁵ Peace Treaty between the Arab Republic of Egypt and the State of Israel, signed at Washington on 26 March 1979.

not provide binding formulas for a solution of the basic problem of the Middle East: the right of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination and to an independent State of their own. The agreements completely ignore the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, the PLO. Israel's policy of aggression is not even condemned, and Israel is not required to withdraw all its forces from the territories occupied in 1967.

21. By an empty allusion to Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), and by claiming that these are peace treaties, efforts are being made to prevent the attainment of an over-all solution and to thwart an agreement on the problem. The Camp David agreements have allowed the aggressive Israeli leading authorities to manoeuvre with greater leeway. Thanks to these separate agreements, and the supply of American weapons, Israel is constantly pursuing its policies of aggression. Thus it is obvious why the separate agreements and their destructive effects, which have finally been noted, have drawn all-round condemnation, leveled not only by the Arab States but by the international community as a whole, despite the frenzied efforts made by the imperialist circles, in the face of these waves of protest to try to force the Arab States to accept these so-called peace treaties. The majority of Arab States and the patriotic Arab forces have created a broad front against this policy of separate agreements.

22. The participants in the Baghdad⁶ and Tunis⁷ Summit Conferences resolutely rejected the policy of separate agreements, since that policy does not lead to a comprehensive, democratic or just solution to the problem of the Middle East. The agreements of the Heads of State of Arab countries have shown that a just solution and the establishment of lasting peace in the region can be obtained only by Israel's withdrawal from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, including the city of Jerusalem, and the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including the right to create their own State.

23. At the meetings of Arab heads of State, it was decided to give the Palestinian people and the PLO all the help necessary to continue their struggle to win their national rights. The German Democratic Republic fully understands this approach adopted by the Arab countries and attaches great importance to the decisions taken at their Summit Conferences, which were designed to ensure respect for and to implement the rights of the Arab and Palestinian peoples, who refuse to bow to the will of the imperialists in that region. We fully support that policy.

24. The German Democratic Republic rejects all efforts whatsoever to induce the United Nations to approve the separate Camp David agreements, which themselves are a threat to peace.

25. As the Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker, stated in a message sent to the President of the Executive Committee of the PLO, Yasser Arafat, on the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, on 29 November 1979:

⁶ Ninth Arab Summit Conference, held at Baghdad from 2 to 5 November 1978.

⁷ Tenth Arab Summit Conference, held at Tunis from 20 to 22 November 1979.

“There can be no just or lasting solution to the conflict in the Middle East without a just solution of the problem of Palestine. It is for this reason that we resolutely insist on the aggressor's full withdrawal from the territories it has occupied since 1967, and we further insist upon recognition of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, including the rights to self-determination and to the creation of their own independent State. I can assure you of the unwavering solidarity of the German Democratic Republic which, according to the internationalist principles of its foreign policy, will always be ready, as in the past, to stand shoulder to shoulder with the Palestinian people.”

26. The German Democratic Republic, like the majority of the States Members of the United Nations, is convinced that an over-all solution to the Middle East problem can be achieved only through the participation, without pre-conditions, of all parties concerned—particularly the PLO—and that a just and lasting peace must be based on recognition of and respect for the true interests of all peoples and States in the Middle East.

27. In view of the fact that realism should be recognized in the Western world and in Israel, in the interest of Middle East peace, a new appeal should be made to Israel and its allies to put an end to this aggressive and expansionist policy—which entails the escalation of the arms race and weapons development—and to revert to realistic positions that will allow effective negotiations to take place. It is high time that the Government of Israel stopped flouting the rights of the Palestinian people. If Israel were to take such a stand, it would be making a positive contribution conducive to peace in the region and would help ensure the security of all Arab States in the area and of Israel itself.

28. There can be no lasting and stable peace in the Middle East until the causes of tension are eradicated and until the legitimate rights of the people of the region are ensured. Those who believe that in a period of national liberation a people can be held under constant occupation and domination seem to be ignoring present-day realities. There is a natural law that prevails today. Neither the bantustanization of South Africa nor the creation of Israeli bantustans to which the Palestinian people are restricted on Palestinian soil will solve the current problems.

29. Therefore, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic is convinced that the dangerous situation prevailing in the Middle East can be solved only if all States Members of the United Nations redouble their efforts to implement the relevant resolutions of this Organization for the establishment of just and lasting peace in the region. The German Democratic Republic will pursue its policy of détente and will continue to support any measure likely to promote a genuine solution to the Middle East conflict.

30. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): As in previous years, the General Assembly is again seized this year of the agenda item entitled “The situation in the Middle East”. There is a report by the Secretary-General [A/34/584] made up of six parts including status of the cease-fire, situation in the occupied territories, Palestine refugee problem, Palestinian rights and search for a peaceful settlement.

31. The report is an objective portrayal of events, developments and symptoms and is deserving of our commendation. I shall, however, attempt to convey a different perspective of the ubiquitous and ever-present phenomena represented by such terms as UNEF, UNDOF, UNIFIL and UNTSO, but I do not intend to describe again the plight of the Palestinian refugees, Palestinian rights and General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on such subjects. I have already spoken at length on those pivotal issues. I shall go to the heart of the problem as I see it emerging within the wider context of the totality of its dimensions.

32. My first point of departure is that the term Middle East is a misnomer, coined in the Second World War, for the more effective pursuit of functional military purposes and retained in usage in the aftermath of that deadly war to camouflage, cover up and obliterate one of the most heinous crimes of the contemporary era, namely the aggression against and colonization of Palestine and the uprooting of its Palestinian people.

33. Thus to erase that crime from the consciousness of the world community, as experts erase the real and stored memory of a computer, it was found extremely attractive by the Zionists and their supporters and sometimes their protégés, to popularize the term Middle East, even though geographically it is flawed and arbitrary.

34. The tragedy and catastrophe surrounding the term the Middle East is that it has been used and misused as little more than a geographical expression for an area within which there have occurred a few short-lived wars, conflicts, tensions and, the bewildering discovery of relatively recent vintage, that that geographical location happens to be endowed with a preponderance of energy resources indispensable to the maintenance of contemporary society. Thus the Middle East has been degraded over the past several decades and even earlier, into a heartless geographical habitat, relevant only in terms of the abundant availability of an important material resource.

35. I wish to tell this Assembly what this so-called Middle East is in human terms, which are the only terms in which situations can be understood and related to in any meaningful and fraternal context.

36. The so-called Middle East situation is inextricably related to the 150 million people of the Arab world which in turn is a relatively small portion of the far larger 800 to 900 million of the Islamic world. It is an area of consensus, which shares common values, common traditions and beliefs and equally strongly, common hopes and aspirations. Its people form a community in the real sense, regardless of geographical location or dislocation and transcending them.

37. They have belonged to that area of community for the greater part of their existence, for the last 1,400 years. The sense of belonging, though occasionally in apparent disarray in consequence of physical separation, political disintegration and deliberate vivisection, particularly after the First World War, has never been deeply eroded or undermined. For the real volitional force in any area of community consists of those cultural and spiritual legacies which mean so much in the life of nations.

38. At the present time that area is the scene of great turbulence and profound and seething unrest, sometimes characterized by unfortunate and unpalatable excesses. Simplistic and shallow explanations are proffered as the cause of the malaise and turbulence.

39. The Arab and Islamic worlds are in rebellion against modernization, as many theorists would explain it, oblivious of the fact that if there is one overriding factor for the deep discontent, it is precisely a desperate desire to overcome a relative backwardness which has been caused by a prolonged spell of suspended animation and immobility. That has exposed them to unconscionable exploitation, calculated disdain, humiliation and above all, aggression and threats of further aggression against their domains, their legacies and their most hallowed spiritual anchors.

40. In the age of television, satellites and radio, each and every one of them felt the most piercing wound when he saw and heard Menachem Begin boast and vow unchallenged, from the lawn of the White House, that Jerusalem was to be the eternal capital of Israel—Jerusalem, that same hallowed city of God and peace, whose forefathers fought for its preservation and sanctity, for the adherents of the three great monotheistic faiths for centuries on end.

41. Other outside observers have tried to depict the pervasive and ever-widening turbulence as anti-Western or even as anti-Christian or anti-Judaic. Are those observers not aware that Islam claims to be but a continuum and completion of the two earlier great faiths? If they are not aware of that fact then I need only cite one emphatic verse right from the text of the Koran addressing the Muslims which reads:

“And thou shalt find that the most sincerely friendly to those who believe are those who adhere to Christianity; for you shall find amongst them priests and hermits and they are averse to arrogance.”

42. Those who ignorantly or wilfully strive to interpret the present turbulence in the region within a framework of religious strife, bigotry or intolerance would be well advised to take a course or two in comparative religions, before they pursue any further their current themes of religious strife and bigotry, which serve only to poison a glorious confluence of like-mindedness, in devotion to what is good and virtuous in this life and the hereafter. Unity in diversity is a source of strength rather than of weakness and differences of interpretation on certain non-essentials should enrich rather than weaken the over-all unity of purpose.

43. There are yet others who would interpret the current commotion in terms of anti-Westernism, again oblivious of the fact that our area is not only the cradle of contemporary civilization, but even more specifically that of Western civilization. Religious experiences, the Greek and other classics, the fabulous wisdom of the East, the arts and sciences, the discovery of the zero, algebra, optics, chemistry, medicine—Avicenna works were still textbooks at Oxford in the nineteenth century—astrology, the reconciliation of philosophy and religion by Averroes, which is almost identical to St. Thomas Aquinas's great treatise *Summa Theologica*, the incipient theories of classical music by al-Farabi, Ibn Khaldun's pioneering contribution to the social sciences, and other fields of modern civilization,

were not only nurtured in our part of the world, but through that conduit were passed on and expanded in modern Western civilization. Chauvinistic utterances by Kipling and others in the nineteenth century that "East is East and West is West and never the twain shall meet" were the transient reflection of the arrogant era of colonialism at its peak when the colonial Powers were taking advantage of their undoubtedly superior skills, over an East just starting to awaken from a long lethargy.

44. If my postulates are correct, as I am convinced they are, then why is there widespread and rampant hostility towards the West? I would go further and ask: why was it minimal, if indeed it existed, in the nineteenth and early parts of the twentieth century, when the United States was the most favoured nation in our part of the world? The reasons are demonstrably political and underlie a reaction against what the Arab and Islamic worlds rightly regard as persistent hostility in deeds as well as in words to our part of the world and an incredible insensitivity to its vital interests, national pride and even survival.

45. The imposition of the State of Israel entirely at the expense of the Palestinian people, is undoubtedly the underlying cause and an overriding symbol of what is wrong. The total acquiescence in acts of expansion and aggression against the Palestinian and other Arab peoples is beyond the stipulations of minimal even-handedness and justice, and United Nations solemn resolutions. There is a massive transfer of finance, technology and the most lethal instruments of destruction to an Israel that publicly announces and pursues such policies of expansion unchecked. All this blind and dangerous support, in total and audacious violation of the letter and spirit of international law, conventions and the rule of law, has more than anything else prompted others to treat with disdain the sanctity of the rule of law, the binding nature of conventions and United Nations resolutions—even though Jordan abides categorically by all the conventions and the rule of law. Such support not only is abhorrent but will ultimately lead to a break-down of an orderly international system and a relapse into the laws of the jungle which the United Nations conventions and other binding instruments were painstakingly made to supplant.

46. What I have just said in attempting to diagnose the symptoms of the turbulence in our area of the world is obviously not meant to be absolute and monolithic. All resurgent and developing countries inevitably encounter the pains of the dynamics of rapid internal transformations, internal power struggles, conflicts over values which social, economic and technological changes inevitably generate.

47. But such convulsions would naturally be internal and not oriented or geared to external countries or forces, if such countries had not inflicted grievous wounds and had not taken persistent hostile attitudes towards them. This was definitively expressed in the Final Declaration of the tenth Arab Summit Conference held in Tunisia during the third week of November 1979 [see A/34/763, annex].

48. The 21 Arab States which participated in the Conference and issued the Declaration have varying shades of political, social and economic orientations and even differing external relationships. I would even be willing

not to contest the popular clichés about their categorization—inaccurate as such clichés often are—about their being conservative, radical, moderate, semi-moderate and the rest of the jargon. Yet, in a unanimous voice, which no external or internal forces could have dictated, the heads of States and Governments of the 21 Arab States and the PLO, expressed the conviction of the vast masses which they represent, in ringing the alarm bell over the increasing and ever-accelerating dangers to the very fate of the Arab nation, in consequence of a continually beefed-up Israel and an adventurous and reckless Zionist movement of fanaticism.

49. The Arab Summit Conference, the Declaration asserts, reiterates that the Palestinian question is the core of the long drawn-out struggle, in which the Arabs are engaged against zionism and all the dangers that zionism poses militarily, politically, economically and culturally and which threaten the fate of the Arab nation in its entirety.

50. That is not a statement put out by those who are called radicals, fanatics and so on. It represents a genuine and profound conviction shared by all the Arab countries in Africa and Asia and the much wider dimension of the Islamic world in these and other continents as well. There is no intention on my part to defend my own area's mistakes, but it is my duty and my determination to pinpoint and deplore hostile acts against my people's freedom and survival.

51. Only yesterday, in a "Meet the Press" television interview, Shimon Peres, former Israeli Minister of Defence, was asked twice, and pointedly, whether the current turbulence sweeping our part of the world would not be eased if Israel were more forthcoming on the Palestine question and willing to co-operate in its just resolution. His insistent answer was that the turmoil had nothing to do with the Palestine problem.

52. As long as such leaders are willing to mislead world public opinion and divert attention to other causes, which he described as a confrontation between what he called the free world and the third world, how can the cause of a just peace ever be successful or, for that matter, the fostering of amity amongst nations in a world of interdependence? That is the reason why I thought it extremely relevant at the outset to explain the real background and cause of most of what is happening, and to break loose from the confinement of geographical expressions and the usual subitems under which the situation in the Middle East is customarily discussed; for I am firmly convinced that, unless and until the right diagnosis of a malaise is made, remedies based on misrepresentation can only compound an already potentially explosive situation which poses a threat to world peace and security.

53. The recent Tenth Arab Summit Conference at Tunis, like the Ninth Conference at Baghdad in November 1978, did not in any way slam the door on a just peace. On the contrary, to quote from the Tunis Final Declaration, it said:

"The Conference . . . confirms that the Arab nation is struggling to achieve an equitable peace based on the precepts of right and justice and the principle of the recovery of the inalienable national rights of

the Palestinian people and the liberation of all occupied Palestinian and Arab lands.

“The Arab nation, which is resolved to face up to the challenge and to persevere in the struggle to recover its usurped rights and to build a future in which justice and peace will prevail, is fully aware that the conflict in which it is engaged against zionism is a battle of destiny and of civilization for which the nation should seek guidance in its cultural values, mobilize all its potential and capabilities, build its own capacities on firm foundations, strengthen its solidarity, unify its ranks and its resolve and seek assistance in its fateful struggle from all the forces of peace and justice throughout the world.” [*Ibid.*]

The Declaration likewise expresses the determination to obtain the support of all forces of peace and justice in the world in this fateful struggle for existence.

54. The Kings and Presidents of the Arab world have reiterated in their Declaration their unequivocal rejection of the Camp David accords and the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty and all the consequences that would flow therefrom. In doing so, in the Declaration they:

“emphasize that, the solution must be a comprehensive one based on the principle of the liberation of all occupied Arab and Palestinian lands and the full recovery of the rights of the Palestinian people and, in particular, its right to return to its homeland, to achieve self-determination and to establish its independent State on its national soil” [*Ibid.*].

They also assert their support for the struggle of the Palestine Arab people, under the leadership of the PLO, their sole legitimate representative.

55. The Summit Conference recalled with appreciation the resolutions of the Ninth Arab Summit Conference rejecting the Camp David agreements. The Tenth Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, held at Fez in May 1979, likewise rejected the Camp David agreements. The Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Monrovia in July 1979, and the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana in September of this year, did so as well.

56. On many occasions, the last one being a few days ago in the course of debating the question of Palestine [79th meeting], we have explained at some length why the Camp David agreements are not only in violation of Palestinian and Arab rights but also of United Nations resolutions, conventions and all other instruments concerning the peaceful resolution of disputes. Indeed, particularly pertaining to the Palestine question, those accords are in blatant violation of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), not to mention all the other relevant and valid resolutions of the General Assembly. After all, does resolution 242 (1967) permit the perpetuation of the Israeli military occupation of the occupied lands under the pretext of the relocation of forces? Does it permit the transfer of the inhabitants of Israel into the occupied territories? Does it condone the colonization policies which have already devoured almost one third of the occupied lands?

57. Therefore it is all the more reprehensible that the Israeli Cabinet, at its meeting yesterday, should have condemned the United Nations for rejecting the agreements instead of recanting on what is a peace of

the grave and the cannibalization of the Palestinian people. I wish to assure the Israelis that the United Nations is not a rubber stamp and not a tool of Israeli lawlessness. They may put the Mayor of Nablus in gaol but they will not leave a dent in the considered judgement of the United Nations.

58. If anyone has any doubt on this score—that is, any doubt about the illegality of the Camp David agreements—we are willing to request a considered ruling on the subject from none other than the International Court of Justice, whose integrity is impeccable. The General Assembly might consider adopting a resolution to this effect, if only to secure a just and objective ruling and thus to put an end to the allegations the Israelis, who refer to “mechanical majorities” and use other abusive terms.

59. I would be remiss in my duty if I did not voice in the strongest terms our objections to a new attitude, which seems to be gaining ground in official and semi-official circles in this super-Power of the United States, concerning the use of military force in the conduct of trade and other relationships. I am not talking about the tragic events in Iran or elsewhere. I am talking about a general trend now being considered for the whole area, including Arab countries which are called friendly. No legitimate trade can be pursued within the matrix of conflict. This was tried in the era of colonialism and proved counter-productive and self-defeating; hence the process of decolonization which the United Nations has proudly achieved. A relapse into re-colonization is a symbol of moral bankruptcy. What is needed is a genuine reappraisal of unjust policies which have poisoned an otherwise most friendly atmosphere. If just policies are pursued in the search for peace in the Middle East based on natural justice, international law and United Nations resolutions, then friendship and amity and not military force can be restored as the most efficacious instrument for the conduct of relationships amongst nations.

60. This is the crux of what we discuss every year as “The situation in the Middle East”.

61. Mr. KLESTIL (Austria): The interdependence of world politics today has made our planet very small, and disturbances arising anywhere on the globe cannot fail to have repercussions in other parts of the world. Some of them, by their nature and through the efforts of the international community, fortunately remain localized, and some of them affect the world as a whole. The conflict between Israel and its Arab neighbours belongs to the latter category.

62. For historical and geographical reasons, Europe's relations with the Middle East have been and will be close and intense. We are convinced that Europe needs co-operation with the Arab world, where today old civilizations are experiencing an intellectual and economic renaissance. A pre-condition for a fruitful exchange, however, is a final and lasting solution to the whole Middle East conflict.

Mr. Piza-Escalante (Costa Rica), Vice-President, took the Chair.

63. This conflict has been before the United Nations for 30 years now. It has been debated in many sessions of the General Assembly, it has constantly been on the

agenda of the Security Council and numerous resolutions have been passed, without any sign of a solution. On this premise, Austria fully recognizes the efforts made by Israel and Egypt, supported by the United States, to overcome this impasse, which finally led to the conclusion of the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty. This peace process is now a reality and it has a value of its own.

64. We have to note, however, that no further steps which are necessary for a comprehensive, just and lasting peace—based on the principles set forth in Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and the recognition of the national rights of the Palestinian people—have been forthcoming. For several years the United Nations, which has the primary responsibility of safeguarding peace and security in the world, has not been able to achieve significant progress with regard to a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict.

65. The situation arising from the present stalemate in the Middle East is fraught with dangers and, in our view, does not permit us to content ourselves with partial successes, as important as these may be. In their statements before the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, the Austrian Federal Chancellor, Mr. Kreisky [49th meeting], and the Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Pahr [9th meeting], both stressed this fact, and also submitted suggestions as to how the United Nations could again resume its rightful role in the peace efforts.

66. The reactions which those suggestions evoked from world public opinion as well as in requests from States Members of this Organization have induced Austria to formalize them and to submit them to the General Assembly for further consideration. This proposal is now contained in document A/34/760. In submitting this proposal, Austria has been guided by the following considerations: first, Israel is a reality and, like every other State, has the right to recognition and to secure boundaries; secondly, the Palestinian people are also a reality and have their national rights, which have to be exercised; thirdly, the PLO has been generally accepted by the Palestinian people as their representative; and fourthly, Israel's obligation to withdraw from the occupied territory has not been fulfilled.

67. To find a solution to the problem of Palestine is the most important condition for a comprehensive settlement. It can be achieved only by negotiations between all parties directly involved. The various possible solutions to this question should, in our view, be sounded out in direct talks, without any pre-condition, between the two parties most intimately and directly concerned, that is Israel and the PLO.

68. Austria fully appreciates the active response, positive as well as critical, which this proposal has found in the international community. The response received constitutes, in our view, a very valuable aid in narrowing down and circumscribing the areas in which views are most divergent.

69. The comments received were, in particular, related to Israel's right to recognition and to secure boundaries. They dealt with Israel's obligation to withdraw from the occupied territories and with a more detailed definition of the national rights of the Palestinian people. There was also a suggestion to consider

whether a specific mandate should be conferred upon the Security Council or the Secretary-General to exercise a supervisory function in the proposed process.

70. In the light of the comments received so far, my Government decided to refrain from presenting a formal draft resolution to the General Assembly at this stage. At the same time, my Government feels encouraged to submit the proposal as a document to the General Assembly that might serve as a basis for further discussion and consideration.

71. May I express my Government's hope that the proposal as contained in document A/34/760 will be conducive to more flexible approaches. We will listen with the utmost interest to all comments, suggestions and ideas consistent with bringing the possibility of peace in this troubled region of the world more within our reach.

72. Mr. HUMAIDAN (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): When we discussed the question of Palestine last week the majority, if not all, of those who spoke on the subject affirmed that the question of Palestine was the crux and basis of the Middle East problem and that we had to find a comprehensive and just settlement of the issue.

73. Today, in discussing the question of the situation in the Middle East, we can only reaffirm that the grave and serious evolution that has recently taken place regarding this problem is undoubtedly due to the conclusion of the Camp David agreements and to the attitude of the Egyptian régime which signed a so-called peace treaty with the Zionist entity. We categorically disagree with those who believe that those agreements constitute a step towards peace. On the contrary, we believe—and this has also been affirmed by our Head of State—that they are a step towards increasing tension and creating an atmosphere propitious for war and armed conflict in the region. These agreements have created a strategic imbalance in the solidarity of the Arab world that is the cornerstone and basis of the struggle of the Arab nation for the recovery of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and the liberation of its lands.

74. The head of State of the United Arab Emirates has affirmed more than once that no Arab leader has the right to take unilateral decisions regarding this question of destiny, for the defense of which the Arab nation has mobilized all its energies and potential. The Secretary-General of the League of Arab States, in his statement before the General Assembly on Friday last, stressed that the agreements

“have displaced the cause of the Palestinian people from the central position it occupied in the Middle East, to put it in a marginal position, and have placed secondary problems in the foreground which now occupy the major part of the international community's efforts” [84th meeting, para. 66],

and all of this in order to keep the national potential of the Arab world in check and neutralize the effects of the international recognition of the legitimacy of the Palestine question.

75. In our statement last Wednesday, on the Palestine question [81st meeting], we mentioned several points

relating to the Camp David agreements and to the so-called Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty. We do not wish to repeat those points here, but we believe that it is necessary to remind the Assembly of three basic points.

76. First, the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination is one of the most important bases on which the United Nations was established. Our international Organization has affirmed this right for the Palestinian people, and continues to reaffirm it year after year. This reaffirmation clearly defines the right of the Palestinian people to return to their homeland, from which they were uprooted, and to establish an independent State on their national territory. The Camp David agreements neglect this right and depict it as a so-called internal autonomy. This autonomy, as Israel has clearly affirmed, is limited to exercising authority over municipal education and health affairs alone, and excludes any sovereignty over the Palestinian territory. In addition, the Camp David agreements ignore the problem of sovereignty over Arab Jerusalem.

77. Secondly, the agreements ignore the affirmation of United Nations resolutions and of international public opinion as a whole of the necessity for the Palestinian people to participate, through its legitimate representative, the PLO, in any negotiations or other efforts aimed at bringing about a solution of this problem, a circumstance that has led the Palestinian people, both within the occupied Arab territories and outside them, to denounce these agreements and totally reject them. In this connexion, I should like to call the attention of delegations to the serious developments that followed upon those agreements, namely, the escalation of Israeli measures aimed at the illegal annexation of the occupied Arab territories. Israel has promulgated a law allowing Israelis to buy land in occupied Palestine and has set up tens of settlements in the occupied territories. It is now planning to set up hundreds more, with the object of establishing a *status quo* that will prevent the creation of an independent Palestinian State.

78. Thirdly, the deterioration of the situation in Lebanon and the increase of the fear of brutal Israeli aggression against southern Lebanon following the conclusion of those agreements are further proof of the falsity of the arguments used by those who claim that those agreements constitute a step towards peace. Since the conclusion of the agreements, Israel has given itself rights over Lebanese territory and sovereignty and considers territorial waters and air space of that State as a vital possession. Behind Israel's brutal aggression as a result of which thousands of civilians, particularly women and children, have died, lies its aim to sow dissent between the Lebanese and the Palestinians, to put an end to the Palestinian presence in Lebanon and to force the PLO to accept the *status quo* imposed by the Camp David agreements.

79. The Security Council has adopted several resolutions concerning the deployment of international forces in southern Lebanon and particularly in the border area, which is subject to domination by elements rebelling against the Lebanese authorities. Those elements have been transformed into a group of Israeli agents, led by Major Saad Haddad. Those resolutions request Israel to put an end to the support it extends to those agents, but Israel has refused to abide by those resolutions.

80. Israel's persistently irresponsible negligence towards United Nations resolutions, whether regarding southern Lebanon or Israel's withdrawal from occupied Arab territories or the granting of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, obliges us to state that not only should our international Organization condemn Israel, but the Security Council should impose on Israel the sanctions provided in the Charter, in order to oblige it to adhere to those resolutions.

81. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This year the debate on the Middle East has a special significance for us. Formally, as we gather from the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization [A/34/1, sect. III] and his report on the situation in the Middle East [A/34/584], very little has been achieved in the implementation of Security Council resolutions on which any global agreement in the zone must rest. On the other hand, it is difficult to deny that there has been a great deal of change regarding the conflict in the Middle East and that change could be interpreted as forward movement.

82. First of all, although my country understands that the peace agreements between Israel and Egypt are not the basis for the peaceful solution that the conflict calls for, it would appear clear that the return to Egypt of the territories illegally occupied by Israel since 1967 is an event of historic importance which affects all the peoples of the area.

83. Secondly, some progress has been made in the recognition of the fact that the acknowledgement of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to a homeland of their own, is the basic condition for that global agreement to which I have referred. This growing recognition is immensely important and cannot be stressed too much, since it shows a significant change in world public opinion and in the policies of many countries.

84. It is true that in itself this does not constitute a solution to the conflict, but without these changes of approach one could not even think of a future solution.

85. We consider it important to stress this aspect of the problem because, as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Spain, Mr. Oreja, stated to the General Assembly on 24 September:

“We believe that it is time for the conflicting parties in a confrontation which has caused so many victims and so much suffering to realize that they cannot pursue as an objective the annihilation or humiliation of the adversary. Israel cannot keep the Arab territories it conquered in 1967 in the belief that the passage of time and the presence of the illegal settlements will create a *fait accompli*; because an illicit act cannot be the source of right, nor can the passage of time legitimize an unjust situation. . . . On the other hand, we cannot deny Israel's right to exist, because the United Nations has recognized the right of all States in the area to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.”
[5th meeting, para. 127.]

86. As far as my country itself is concerned, our position has always been very clear. We believe in the possibility of a peaceful and lasting solution based on respect for the law, the right of all countries of the

region to existence within secure and recognized boundaries, the withdrawal of Israel from all territories occupied during the 1967 war and the recognition of the national rights of the Palestinian people in accordance with the terms of the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. To refer to the communiqué issued by the Foreign Ministry of my country at the end of the visit to Spain by the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO, Mr. Yasser Arafat, last September:

“The Spanish authorities expressed to the Palestinian delegation their conviction that the peace desired for the Middle East could not be achieved without a global, just and lasting solution based on the principles and resolutions of the United Nations and on the exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable national rights.”

87. I should now like to refer to certain Israeli practices, both in the occupied territories and in neighbouring countries, which render prospects even gloomier, discourage any efforts for peace and sow mistrust among the other parties involved in the conflict. I refer particularly to the establishment of illegal settlements and other efforts to alter the demographic and ethnic composition of the occupied zones, as well as the aerial incursions and other punitive operations in Lebanon during the last few months which have become so frequent and so violent that they have awakened the almost unanimous rejection and repudiation of the international community, which sees in the territorial integrity and national identity of Lebanon one of the fundamental conditions for the future stability of the region.

88. In conclusion, I should like to say that my delegation listened with considerable interest to the statement just made to the Assembly by the Permanent Representative of Austria, Mr. Klestil [*see paras. 61-71 above*]. My country feels that it is in that spirit of dialogue, without pre-conditions or prejudices of any sort, that the basis can be found for the peace of which the countries in that region where our civilization was born have been deprived for more than 30 years.

89. In the annex to document A/34/760—which was circulated this morning—my delegation finds the most important elements for some progress to be made towards a global solution of the problem of the Middle East. For that reason we wish to express our appreciation to the Austrian delegation for the submission of such a just and important initiative.

90. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The question of how to effect a settlement of the Middle East conflict and to bring about a just and durable peace in that region is among the most acute and complex problems which require a radical solution. For many years now this matter has been considered at sessions of the General Assembly and by the Security Council and other United Nations bodies. During that time a number of important decisions have been taken aimed at producing a peaceful, comprehensive and just settlement of the Middle East conflict. However, the situation remains a complex one and potentially dangerous, both for the countries of that region and the international situation as a whole.

91. The failure to resolve the conflict in the Middle East has caused concern among all those who cherish the process of deepening international détente and bringing about general peace and security. As the discussion of the Middle East question in the United Nations has shown, the overwhelming majority of Member States are convinced that in order to achieve a comprehensive settlement, the very roots of the conflict have to be eradicated; in other words, it has to be ensured that the following fundamental provisions are implemented: first, the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967; secondly, implementation of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian Arab people, including its right to self-determination and to create its own independent State; and, thirdly, ensure the implementation of the right to an independent existence and security of all those directly concerned in the conflict.

92. It is high time that the Israeli leaders heeded common sense and understood that Israel can count on a secure existence within the 1967 boundaries only provided that those fundamental principles are acted upon. But, obviously, the Israeli leaders—for the time being—are under the influence of other concepts and interests. They seem to be primarily motivated by their desire to seize other territories. However, that point of view and that policy are shortsighted.

93. The delegation of the Soviet Union has frequently said, and would once again like to repeat quite clearly, that the separate Israeli-Egyptian treaty, concluded against the will of the Arab peoples and countries, is simply an overt attempt to legitimize the aggressor's presence on other lands; an attempt not to allow the implementation of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to create their own State.

94. The Israeli-Egyptian treaty, concluded behind the back of the United Nations, runs counter to the interests of achieving a genuine settlement in the Middle East, is in conflict with the relevant fundamental decisions of the United Nations on this point and, above all, with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). For that reason the Soviet Union is firmly against any attempt, by whatever means, to involve the United Nations in the implementation of that transaction. Such a treaty can never and will never lead to peace; on the contrary it will only further tighten the knot of contradictions in the Middle East; it will sow the seeds of fresh conflicts and upheavals in that area. As events have shown, tension in the Middle East has not lessened during the past year; on the contrary, Israel continues more actively to pursue its policy of expansion and aggression against the Palestinian people and the neighbouring Arab countries. The repression by the occupying forces in Palestinian territories has been stepped up. The practice of expelling the Arab populations from their own lands has been further expanded, as have the establishment of Israeli settlements and other illegal activities.

95. Blood continues to flow freely in the southern part of Lebanon where the barbaric raids of Israel are one of the bitter results of the Camp David agreements. The Soviet Union firmly condemns Israel's interference in the internal affairs of Lebanon and demands an immediate end to the actions of the Israeli military against the Lebanese and Palestinians. The Soviet Union sup-

ports the Lebanese people in their struggle to regain sovereignty and national independence for their country and to preserve their territorial integrity.

96. Under cover of separate agreements and treaties, the imperialist forces which are supporting Israel are trying to expand their military and political presence in the Middle East and are paving the way for direct intervention in the affairs of the Arab peoples. For that purpose, active steps have been taken to create the so-called rapid reaction corps, by means of which these troops intend to force the Arab countries to waive their inalienable right to exercise control over their natural resources.

97. From the very outset the initiators of the separate transaction depicted it as a step towards reaching peace in the Middle East and tried, by availing themselves of various political ploys, to involve other Arab peoples in these talks leading to capitulation. However, such political machinations have been unmasked by the Arab States which, upon forming the pan-Arab front to resist that movement, condemned the separate treaty as one that was damaging to the national independence of the Arab peoples and that held the possibility of creating serious obstacles in the path of achieving a durable peace in the Middle East.

98. In the present situation it is particularly important that all patriotic forces of the Arab world should have demonstrated solidarity and become more united on the basis of the decisions taken by the Arab States at the Ninth Arab Summit Conference at Baghdad. The Soviet Union has supported and will continue to support such a position taken by the Arab countries since it is responsive not only to the interests of the Arabs but to the interests of peace as well.

99. At the present time the parties to the separate deal are conducting negotiations on the granting of so-called administrative autonomy to the inhabitants of the West Bank of the Jordan River and the Gaza Strip. These negotiations can be regarded as essentially nothing more than an attempt simply to do away with the Palestinian problem as such and to substitute in its place talks about so-called Palestinian autonomy. It is obvious that such negotiations have nothing in common with a just solution to the Palestinian problem and that they have been decisively refuted, as has the entire Camp David scheme, by the Arab people of Palestine.

100. The facts have shown that any attempt to circumvent a decision on the Palestinian problem or to replace a just solution to the problem by some sort of half-hearted measures not only does not lead to progress in a cardinal and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East but, on the contrary, creates fresh obstacles to the achievement of this aim which did not previously exist.

101. A just peace in the Middle East can and should be established. Such a peace has very clear-cut foundations, which have been approved by the international community and reaffirmed by the relevant decisions of the United Nations.

102. The fundamental position of the Soviet Union with regard to the Middle East remains unchanged. The Soviet Union believes that a just and comprehensive settlement should be reached in the Middle East in

accordance with the fundamental resolutions of the United Nations, on the basis of the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by means of aggression, as well as the complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from Arab territories occupied in 1967, the implementation of the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to self-determination and their right to create their own independent State, and the right of all States in the Middle East to be guaranteed to secure and independent existence and development.

103. The Soviet Union actively supports the struggle of the Arabs for independence and for the removal of the consequences of Israeli aggression and is pursuing a consistent policy for the elimination of this dangerous source of military conflict in the Middle East. This forms an integral part of the struggle which has been waged by the Soviet Union for an end to the arms race, the elimination of sources of military threat and the further deepening of the process of international détente and its application to all parts of the world.

104. It is quite obvious that, in order to be just, a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East must necessarily embrace all aspects of the Middle East conflict and should provide solutions for all problems connected with it. The experience which has been gained, particularly in recent times, indicates that the only correct way is one involving collective efforts by all parties concerned—including of course, the PLO as the sole, legitimate representative of the people of Palestine, recognized as such by the United Nations and other international organizations.

105. The Soviet Union, for its part, will continue to do everything in its power, including whatever it can do within the context of the United Nations, to achieve a durable and just peace in the Middle East. However, we consider that the actual situation is now such that, in order to open the way for the success of collective efforts, which are the only ones which can lead to a genuine settlement, it is necessary first and foremost to put an end to the policy of separate deals. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, Comrade Brezhnev, emphasized quite recently:

“The policy of separate deals has no future. It is only by overturning a separate treaty that matters can be reoriented towards a just and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East with the participation of all parties involved, including the Palestine Liberation Organization.”

106. The elimination of aggression in the Middle East and the guarantee of a lasting and just peace in that part of the world are goals which are demanded by all peace-loving peoples.

107. Mr. ERALP (Turkey): Any debate on the situation in the Middle East inevitably reflects the anxiety felt over a conflict which has provoked four tragic wars in a time-span of 30 years and constitutes the most serious danger for peace and security in the region as well as the world. The Middle East problem should certainly not be considered to be just a regional problem: the tension in the Middle East could easily spill over the confines of that area and thus turn a regional

conflict into a major international catastrophe. To promote a convergence of efforts towards a just and lasting comprehensive solution to the Middle East problem, in conformity with the principles laid down in the basic United Nations resolutions as well as the principles enunciated in the Charter of the United Nations should, therefore, be the task of this Assembly.

108. As a country situated in the area, Turkey is deeply concerned in the peace and tranquillity of the Middle East. My Government's position, as has been stated on several previous occasions in several different organs of this Organization, regarding the elements of a just and lasting comprehensive solution and the procedure for negotiations, remains unchanged. Turkey has always been strongly opposed to the acquisition of territory by force and, in our view, the evacuation of all the territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem, is one of the fundamental prerequisites in this regard.

109. In this connexion, we strongly reject the continued unilateral measures taken by Israel in occupied territories with a view to expanding its settlements, destroying houses and buildings, expropriating land and property belonging to the Arab people and changing the institutional organization of the holy places.

110. In fact, the Security Council met last March to consider these measures taken by Israel in the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, as a result of which it adopted resolution 446 (1979), establishing the Security Council Commission⁸ consisting of the representatives of Portugal, Bolivia and Zambia. My delegation has participated in the Security Council's consideration of this important item and has made its position known on the matter,⁹ while expressing our great concern over the Israeli measures. Such practices, without any doubt, constitute a violation of the principles and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and of United Nations resolutions, as well as of the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949. The international community as a whole, and the Moslem people in particular, cannot remain indifferent to these developments, which seem to be aiming at the ultimate annexation of the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, by gradual assimilation.

111. I should like to take this opportunity to pay a special tribute here to the Security Council Commission established under resolution 446 (1979), consisting of the representatives of Bolivia and Zambia, under the able leadership of Ambassador Mathias of Portugal. They carried out their most difficult and delicate task in the region with extreme care and diligence and submitted a very valuable report on their findings.¹⁰ It is a source of regret to my delegation that Israel refused to co-operate with that Commission and has continued its unilateral measures, in complete defiance of its obligations under international law.

112. The recent detentions, arrests and deportations

⁸ Security Council Commission established in pursuance of resolution 446 (1979) to examine the situation regarding the settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem.

⁹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fourth Year, 2124th meeting.*

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Supplement for July, August and September 1979, documents S/13450 and Add. 1.

of elected Palestinian leaders in the West Bank, as exemplified by the recent arrest of and deportation order against the Mayor of Nablus and the resulting resignation of all the mayors in the West Bank in protest, is a case in point, where the international community unanimously pronounced itself, condemning that act, and called upon Israel to rescind the measure. We have not yet seen a positive response from the Israeli authorities in this regard. We believe that the continuation of such unilateral measures on the part of Israel not only violates international law but also constitutes a major obstacle to the search for a just, equitable, durable and comprehensive solution to the Middle East question.

113. We have always, on the other hand, stressed the view that the Palestinian problem is the core of the Middle East question. The Turkish delegation expressed its well-known views on the Palestine question in some detail as recently as 28 November in this Assembly [*81st meeting*]. We firmly believe that a just and lasting solution to the Middle East question can only be found by taking into consideration the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arab people, including their right to decide their own future and to have their own homeland. We recognize the PLO as the only legitimate representative of the people of Palestine and believe that the PLO must participate actively in any meaningful negotiation on an equal footing with the other parties concerned for the achievement of a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East.

114. Finally, it has been our constant belief that an over-all solution to the problem of the Middle East should imply respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of all States in the region, including Israel, and for their right to live in peace within secure borders. Peace and coexistence among all the countries of the Middle East will, no doubt, contribute more effectively than anything else to the security and well-being of their peoples.

Mr. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania) resumed the Chair.

115. Turkey supports and will continue to support and welcome any peace initiative which conforms to these principles.

116. Before concluding, I should like to dwell briefly on the question of Lebanon, which is another source of deep concern for my delegation. The events of recent years have caused great suffering in that country and put in jeopardy its independence and territorial integrity. The situation in Lebanon is, in itself, inextricably linked with the over-all problem of the Middle East. Repeated attacks by Israel aggravate the situation all the more and constitute another serious impediment in the way of bringing about peace in the area. We urge all the parties involved to show utmost restraint and co-operation so that the current efforts will succeed in achieving stability and tranquility in that country, based on the principle of respect for its sovereignty and territorial integrity, and also in paving the way for an over-all peaceful solution of the Middle East question as a whole.

117. Mr. AL-JEAAN (Kuwait) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The situation in the Middle East has become more serious than ever as a result of the Camp David

agreements and the separate Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel, and still constitutes a grave threat to international peace and security. The possibility of a war as a result of Israel's policy of aggression and expansion, including its eviction and extermination of the Palestine people and the establishment of settlements in the occupied territories accompanied by the illegal exploitation of their natural resources—thanks to the material and military aid furnished by the United States—is an obvious danger that we do not need to confirm or define, particularly when most of the peoples of the world have begun to understand the problem of the Middle East and the cause of the Palestine people.

118. Thus there devolve upon the international community, the Security Council and the General Assembly heavy and urgent responsibilities which can no longer brook delay and postponement.

119. The fragile balance established by the international peace-keeping forces on certain Arab fronts where a sudden flare-up is likely, the critical situation in southern Lebanon and the separate peace agreements will not spare the region from a destructive conflagration whose tragic consequences could engulf the whole world. Firm international will must put an end to the adventures of the Zionist militarists, and Israel must withdraw from all the occupied Arab territories, in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations, particularly those that condemn the acquisition of territory by force. The legitimate rights of the Palestinian people must be recognized, for the cause of that people is the essence of the Middle East problem; we have just finished discussing the question of Palestine on which the General Assembly has adopted adequate resolutions [*resolutions 34/65A and B*].

120. Just and lasting peace must be total and comprehensive. All the parties concerned must subscribe to it, and it must eliminate all the causes of conflict. The solution must take account of the following principles. First, total withdrawal, without conditions or restrictions, from the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories, in conformity with the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. Secondly, the solution of the Palestinian question in accordance with the purposes of the Charter, the resolutions of the United Nations, international law and human rights, including the national rights of the Palestinian people, their right to return to their homes, their right to self-determination and their right to establish a State in Palestine. Thirdly, the return of the Holy City of Jerusalem to Arab Authority and the elimination of all Zionist settlements established there. Fourthly, the elimination of all Zionist settlements from all the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories. Fifthly, the annulment of all the changes effected by Israel in the territories as they affect the system of property ownership and the political, economic, social and geographic situation, because they must be considered null and void and illegal.

121. By nature the Arabs are a peace-loving nation, but they cannot capitulate before a usurper that is foreign to them by its character and its conduct, a usurper that practises discrimination, racism and terrorism, learned in the West, arts in which it has become a past master, arts which it has introduced into the Middle East.

122. Kuwait supports the operations of the United

Nations peace-keeping forces, but it will not consent to their becoming a cover under which aggression and the consolidation of the occupation continues. We consider that the mission of those forces is temporary and that it will last only until the elimination of the sequels of aggression and occupation and until the withdrawal of Israel from the Arab territories.

123. The independence of Lebanon, its territorial integrity and its national sovereignty cannot be the object of any concession, and it is indispensable that the Security Council resolutions 425 (1978) and 450 (1979) be applied in their entirety.

124. Israel thinks that the Camp David agreements and the separate peace between Egypt and Israel give it freedom to seek out, to disperse and to massacre the sons of the Palestinian people wherever they may be—in refugee camps, in southern Lebanon—in order to exterminate them in a process of genocide employing American arms. The world is not unaware that the Palestinian refugees have been forced to live in the camps in Lebanon and elsewhere not because they really wanted to do so but because they have been driven from their homeland, Palestine, and from their houses and stripped of their belongings by the action of world Zionism, which is applying Nazi doctrines in masterly fashion.

125. The United Nations, through its Constitution embodied in the Charter and through its executive organs represented by the members of the Security Council, and particularly its permanent members, has the responsibility for compelling Israel to respect the international will. The Security Council must, therefore, apply Chapter VII of the Charter, with the institution of sanctions against Israel since it does not respect United Nations decisions, violates international custom, international law and human rights, pursues a policy of aggression, expansion and occupation, and constantly threatens international peace and security without regard or consideration for the rules of international behavior. All that, of course, is the result of a plan carefully prepared from the very moment Israel was created in the heart of the Arab Islamic nation.

126. The lack of firmness and the hesitation of the international community with regard to the taking of severe measures against Israel, and the fact that it does not force Israel to withdraw from the Arab territories and recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, are an encouragement to the aggressor, and that is something to which we can never consent whatever the sacrifices may be.

127. Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): The position of my country on agenda item 24 entitled "The question of Palestine" is so well known that we saw our decision not to repeat it during the debate on that item as a contribution to the President's wise admonition regarding the procedures of the work of the General Assembly.

128. As a member of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, we have amply demonstrated our support and expressed our full solidarity for the demand of the Palestinians for national sovereignty and a homeland. I therefore hardly need to emphasize that as the Palestinian question is the

central issue of the Middle East problem, any solution that does not take into account the concerns and aspirations of the Palestinian people cannot succeed.

129. In the Middle East the international community is confronted by a continuing crisis which has ominous implications for international peace and security. For three decades the perennial crisis in the region has stubbornly defied any solution. During all those years the most obstinate obstacle to peace in the Middle East has been the insistence of one of the parties to the conflict that it wished to be secure and independent only at the expense and denial of similar rights to the other party. We are confronted by a nagging problem posed by a people that wish to have and preserve a State in Palestine only at the cost of keeping the Palestinian Arabs stateless and only at the cost of subjugating their Arab neighbours.

130. Hence, the essence of the Middle East question is and will remain the struggle by the Arab people for their national right to statehood, independence, self-determination, freedom and self-respect. By the same token, Arab States which have lost territories as a result of this struggle will not relent in their legitimate demand that the concept of territorial acquisition by force or conquest is inadmissible because it is colonial and a violation of the law of the United Nations.

131. The crucial issue that remains today, as it had remained all these years, is whether Israel is committed to perpetuating the condition of statelessness of Palestinians and clinging to its programme of territorial acquisition by force from neighbouring Arab States.

132. There is yet a parallel problem requiring equal examination and study. This is the issue whether Israel really recognizes that peace is contingent on its recognition of the national rights of the other peoples of the Middle East. Israel's pursuit of territorial expansion in the occupied Arab territories, as has been conceded even by Israel's best friends, constitutes the most formidable obstacle to peace in the Middle East. Successive American Administrations have stated since 1967 that Israel's policy of establishing Jewish settlements in the occupied territories is illegal and an insurmountable hurdle in the way of peace. Even Israel's Western friends within this forum have not failed to censure Israel on this matter, as they eloquently demonstrated last week concerning the provocative detention of the Arab Mayor of Nablus and his planned expulsion in flagrant defiance of the solemn decision of this Assembly adopted as early as last month [*resolution 34/29*].

133. In recent times even celebrated Israeli intellectuals have been unable to hide their displeasure at the policy of their Government on the issue of the Jewish settlements. For example, Dr. Israel Shahak, Professor of Chemistry at the Hebrew University and Chairman of the Israeli League of Human Rights, once suggested the following two reasons for the Israeli settlement in the occupied territories: the establishment of new frontiers for Israel and the holding down of the Arab population in a permanent state of subjugation.

134. The nature of the Israeli economic régime in the occupied territories is explicitly colonialist: direct and indirect exploitation of a cheap labour force reminiscent of the policies of *apartheid* in South Africa, domi-

nation of the local markets and investment of money in and employment of a small section of petty and reactionary elements. No one doubts the fact that Israel exploits the West Bank and Gaza as markets for its goods. It also needs their people as a labour force to do work for which there are not enough Israelis, or which Israelis are unwilling to do. The goal seems to be to attach inhabitants of the occupied areas to the Israeli economy, making those areas economically dependent upon Israel, regardless of a potential political solution.

135. Yet there are more ominous consequences of occupation, which cannot be ignored. The Israeli promotion of settlements involves the systematic and inhuman eviction of Arab families from their lands, cutting them off, in consequence, from their only sources of livelihood. The policies are morally indefensible because on every occasion eviction has been justified by an overstretched formula of shoring up Israel's so-called security, only to turn over the sequestered property to new Jewish immigrants. And, as if further to fuel the indignation of the Arabs, Palestinian workers have indeed been observed constructing houses for Israeli immigrants, often on land which has been confiscated from Arab owners. Or, worse still, Palestinian workers find themselves working as hired labour on the very farms which they themselves once owned.

136. To sum up, the settlements therefore constitute serious violations of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949. The annexation of East Jerusalem is a flagrant violation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

137. The basic and fundamental principles which must continue to guide us in our search for a just and lasting solution of the Middle East problem remain the following.

138. First, the question of Palestine is the core of the Middle East problem and the Arab-Israeli conflict.

139. Secondly, there being an intrinsic interrelationship between the problem of the Middle East and the question of Palestine, both their consideration and the search for their solution constitute an integral whole. Consequently, partial agreements and separate treaties cannot provide a just and comprehensive solution.

140. Thirdly, a just peace in the region can be achieved only on the basis of the total and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all occupied Palestinian and Arab territories and restoration to the Palestinian people of their inalienable national rights, including the right of return and the right of self-determination and statehood.

141. Fourthly, the PLO, having been recognized as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, must be granted full and equal participation in all the international conferences and negotiations relative to the settlement of the Middle East question.

142. Fifthly, all measures, installations, settlements, modifications or changes made by Israel in the political, cultural, religious, natural, geographical and demographic conditions and features which tend to change the political and legal status of the occupied Arab territories are considered null and void under the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949.

143. Sixthly, the Israeli policy of establishing settlements in the occupied territories is considered to be an obstacle to peace and should be rescinded forthwith. All such settlements are illegal and should be removed.

144. Seventhly, the Arab City of Jerusalem should be restored to Arab sovereignty.

145. Before I conclude, I must refer to the tragic situation in Lebanon, which is no longer a side show in the Middle East question. The independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that State, which was renowned for years for its peace and progress, are being wantonly subverted and undermined. The underlying issues led to the original mandate of UNIFIL in March 1978. That mandate was for a period of six months during which UNIFIL was to bring peace to southern Lebanon and restore the authority and sovereignty of the Lebanese Government over the entire area. Unfortunately, the Israeli Government continues to maintain its presence in southern Lebanon by proxy.

146. In the United Nations we have yet to learn of any country, with the possible exception of racist South Africa, that has defied the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations as much as has the State of Israel. It is more than time that we adopted other measures, including possible sanctions against Israel, if it persists in its current defiance and intransigence.

147. The PRESIDENT: I wish to remind Members that we shall conclude the debate on agenda item 25 tomorrow.

AGENDA ITEM 107

Financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East (*continued*):*

(a) United Nations Emergency Force and United Nations Disengagement Observer Force: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (PART II)

(A/34/613/Add.1)

148. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour to present to the General Assembly part II of the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 107 (a), entitled "Financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East" [A/34/613/Add.1]. This part of the report of the Fifth Committee refers specifically to UNEF and UNDOF.

149. In paragraph 7 of the report the Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of two draft resolutions.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Fifth Committee.

150. The PRESIDENT: The positions of delegations with respect to the recommendations contained in the report of the Fifth Committee to the Assembly are reflected in the relevant summary records of the Committee.

151. I would remind Members of the decision taken by the General Assembly on 21 September 1979:

"... when the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in the plenary Assembly, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or in the plenary Assembly, unless that delegation's vote in the plenary Assembly is different from its vote in the Committee." [4th meeting, para. 349.]

152. I shall now call on those representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

153. Mr. RIZO (Albania): For reasons we have already explained on various occasions whenever a vote has been taken concerning the financing of the United Nations Forces in the Middle East, the delegation of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania reiterates once again that it will not take part in the financing of those Forces, and thus the Albanian delegation will vote against the two draft resolutions contained in the report of the Fifth Committee.

154. Mr. GRODSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation, by way of explanation of its vote on the draft resolutions before us, would like to make the following statement.

155. As regards the estimates for the financing of UNEF, we must state that the procedures for establishing these estimates continue to be extremely unsatisfactory, and for that reason delegations cannot be certain about the validity of the financial implications stated by the Secretariat.

156. The Soviet delegation considers also that the process of the disbandment of UNEF and the repatriation of its units has been considerably protracted and has involved an extremely high expenditure on the part of States Members of the United Nations. Accordingly, the delegation of the Soviet Union in the Fifth Committee, before the draft resolution was adopted on the financing of UNEF, made a proposal that the Financial Services should consider very carefully what has been expended during the period concerned and also what funds are left unexpended.¹¹ This well-founded proposal of the Soviet Union was not taken into account. Therefore, in view of what I have said, the delegation of the Soviet Union will vote against the allocations for the disbandment of UNEF.

157. In connexion with the actions recently taken by those Forces, once again we should like to emphasize that the Soviet Union had nothing to do with the Israeli-Egyptian agreement of 1975,¹² which was in fact a circumvention of the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East. Therefore the Soviet delegation can have no responsibility for its consequences, including the financing of additional expenditures for the Emergency Force arising as a result of that agreement. In this connexion, the Soviet Union will not pay that part of the contribution allocated to it by the Secretariat to cover expenses involved in the carrying out by the

¹¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Fifth Committee*, 65th meeting, paras. 54-57; and *ibid.*, *Fifth Committee, Sessional Fascicle*, corrigendum.

¹² Agreement between Egypt and Israel, signed at Geneva on 4 September 1975. See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirtieth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1975*, document S/11818/Add.1.

Emergency Force of additional functions deriving from that agreement.

158. In conclusion, in connexion with the estimates for maintaining UNDOF, the delegation of the Soviet Union considers it necessary to emphasize that many parts of these estimates are extremely high. Furthermore, neither in the Secretary-General's report [A/34/582 and Corr.1] nor in the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions [A/34/688] were there any considerations put forward to justify such a considerable increase in the expenditures involved in maintaining that Force. In view of that, the delegation of the Soviet Union, as in the past, will be unable to support those estimates and will abstain when the vote on them is taken.

159. Mr. CHU Kuei-yu (China) (*translation from Chinese*): With regard to UNEF and UNDOF, the consistent position of the Chinese Government has been stated by the Chinese delegation in the Security Council on numerous occasions. Based on this position, the Chinese delegation will not participate in the vote on the draft resolutions contained in document A/34/613/Add.1 and will not assume any financial obligations relating thereto.

160. Mr. NGUYEN QUOC DUNG (Viet Nam): My delegation would like to take this opportunity to make a brief statement with regard to the item under discussion. The Vietnamese delegation will not take part in the vote on the two draft resolutions contained in document A/34/613 Add.1. My delegation is of the view that the financing of these forces should be borne by the aggressor State and should not become the obligation of all Member States. My delegation will not take part in the funding of these forces.

161. Mr. MUBAREZ (Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation will abstain in the vote on the two draft resolutions contained in document A/34/613/Add.1. We shall abstain for the reasons we have explained previously and which may be summed up by saying that it is the aggressor that should bear the burden of its own aggression and that the United Nations forces should not be used to encourage occupation in any part of the world.

162. The PRESIDENT: We shall now take a decision on the recommendations of the Fifth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report [A/34/613/Add.1]. We shall vote first on draft resolution A. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Su-

dan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Iraq, Mongolia, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Democratic Yemen, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Yemen.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 98 votes to 12, with 7 abstentions (resolution 34/7 B¹³).¹⁴

163. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on draft resolution B contained in paragraph 7 of document A/34/613/Add.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Albania, Iraq, Syrian Arab Republic.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 97 votes to 3, with 17 abstentions (resolution 34/7 C).¹⁵

The meeting rose at 1:15 p.m.

¹³ For resolution 34/7A, see 46th meeting, para. 42.

¹⁴ The delegations of Botswana, Gabon and Samoa subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

¹⁵ *Idem.*