



CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 25:
The situation in the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General (continued) 1573

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. Mr. TIKHONOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): For many years now the situation in the Middle East has been a hardy perennial on the agenda of the General Assembly. That is indeed quite natural because for all those years that part of the world has remained an area of serious tension, creating a threat to peace and security not only in the Middle East but throughout the world. For the overwhelming majority of Members of the United Nations the reasons for this dangerous stage of tension are quite clear, namely: the aggressive and expansionist policy of Israel vis-à-vis the Arab countries, Israel's stubborn refusal, and the refusal of those forces which back it up, to take account of the legitimate rights and interests of the Arab peoples and Israel's aspiration to impose its will on the Arabs by use of weapons, force of arms and intrigue. A so-called theoretical basis in the form of expansionist and chauvinist doctrines is provided to furnish a so-called rationale for this expansionist policy.

2. One of the founders of Israel, Mr. David Ben Gurion, in his book entitled *Israel: A personal history*¹ stated: "Nothing obliges us to talk about territorial borders. A nation which has proclaimed its independence does not have to define its frontiers". Pursuant to this doctrine and the other equally aggressive doctrine of secure borders wars have been unleashed, the blood of thousands of people has been shed and tremendous material damage has been done destroying the work of many generations.

3. I think that everybody can understand that in a century of such rapid military technological development, a country cannot establish the security of any frontier by moving it a few kilometres or even a few dozen kilometres further. Rather, it can make that frontier secure by achieving general recognition and by establishing good neighbourly relations with the countries of the region. This fact—which I think is quite clear even to the leaders of Israel—was very convincingly reaffirmed by the October war of 1973.

4. The leading circles of Israel, having set themselves

the goal of establishing this so-called greater Israel, have set forth on the path of disregard for law and of violence, in mockery of the principle of the freedom and independence of other peoples. That is the path of all aggressors. The aggressor is endeavouring to deprive the Palestinian people of their inalienable sovereign rights, having seized a number of Arab territories. The aggressor did not ask about the justice of this. The aggressor did not draw attention to the death and suffering of hundreds of thousands of people who had committed no crime when Israel embarked on the path of tremendous expansionism.

5. Quite recently, the parties involved made serious efforts to move forward towards an over-all settlement of the Middle East issue. An important event on that path was the joint Soviet-United States statement on the Middle East,² which stated quite clearly:

"The Soviet Union and the United States believe that, within the framework of a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem, all specific questions of the settlement should be resolved, including such key issues as withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the 1967 conflict; the resolution of the Palestinian question, including ensuring the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people; termination of the state of war and establishment of normal peaceful relations on the basis of mutual recognition of the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence."

However, the United States set forth on the path of imposing on the parties to the conflict separate deals and agreements. The Soviet-American agreement which had been welcomed throughout the world was thus left unimplemented.

6. In the Arab world also, leaders have been found who were willing to go along this path of separate agreements with the aggressor, with support from those who supported the aggressor. Many representatives have already given, in the course of this discussion, a critical evaluation of the Camp David agreements³ and the Egyptian-Israeli Treaty⁴ which were concluded with the support of the United States. The Byelorussian delegation would also like to state that these separate accords were designed to help Israel to strengthen its position in the Arab lands, including the Palestinian lands, which were occupied in 1967. They were also intended not to allow the Arab people of Palestine to exercise their inalienable national rights.

² Joint statement 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.

³ 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.

⁴ Peace Treaty between the Arab Republic of Egypt and the State of Israel, signed at Washington on 26 March 1979.

7. By giving up part of the Sinai, Israel received in exchange everything that it wanted: the right to occupy the remaining Arab territories as well as a guarantee that everything would be done to prevent an independent Arab Palestinian State from being established—although that has been covered up by the talks about so-called administrative autonomy for the Palestinians.
8. There is also considerable military action in the Middle East, which is a cause for concern. New flows of American weapons are being poured into Israel. With the help of the so-called rapid reaction corps, attempts are being made to exert pressure to force the Arab countries to waive their inalienable right to dispose of their own national wealth. Basically, the separate deals have not removed the danger from that explosive area nor have they brought us closer to recognition of the legitimate demands of the parties concerned. They have in fact led to a further exacerbation of tension in the Middle East, created a serious obstacle in the path towards achieving a lasting and just settlement in the region and, indeed, pushed Israel to commit acts of aggression against Lebanon.
9. The authors of that deal are trying to make it appear that there are no other Arab countries in the Middle East apart from that which signed the agreement, that there is no Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO]—which is in fact the sole legitimate representative of the Arab Palestinian people—and that there is no problem relating to the liberation of all Arab territories occupied in 1967 by Israel. But the Arabs will never allow themselves to be used as pawns in a game; rather, they will forge their own history; without them there can never be a peaceful settlement of the Middle East issue. Any attempts to disregard and ignore the basic aspects of the true solution to the problem, to sidestep the issue or to fail to take account of the legitimate interests of the parties are doomed to failure and would simply increase instability in the region and the threat to peace.
10. Until the consequences of Israeli aggression have been eliminated there can be no lasting peace in the Middle East, and that has been confirmed by the participants. To establish such peace it is essential to achieve an over-all settlement of the problem, with the participation of all interested parties, including, naturally, the PLO itself. The basis for such a settlement could be the complete withdrawal by Israel from all Arab lands occupied by it in 1967; recognition of the national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their inalienable right to establish their own independent State; and the assurance for all States in the Middle East of an independent and secure existence. Such a settlement would be in keeping with the basic interests of all the States and peoples of the region. This applies equally to the people of Israel, which has become a victim of the racist theory and militarism that it has been practising.
11. The external duties of this garrison, the State of Israel, are already costing more than the annual gross national product. That is an unprecedented example of militarization of a country.
12. This discussion and the recent one on the question of Palestine have shown that the overwhelming majority of States support the just cause of the Palestinian people. The greater the solidarity demonstrated by the Arab countries the stronger will be the pressure for developing co-operation and mutual action and understanding with all progressive forces of the world and the sooner shall we be able to find a settlement for the Middle East problem along the lines of collective efforts by all interested parties, including, of course, the PLO and the people of Palestine, a heroic people which for many years has been the victim of the Zionist doctrine.
13. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, like other countries of the socialist community, has consistently supported the Arab peoples in their just struggle for the elimination of the consequences of Israeli aggression and against the imperialist *diktat* imposed by the parties contrary to the interests of the Arab peoples.
14. The United Nations, whose main objective is the maintenance of international peace and security, has consistently taken the side of the Arab people which have been a victim of Israeli aggression and supported the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. This is the goal towards which our decisions this year should move. We should also condemn separate deals and agreements and reaffirm the just principles for an over-all peaceful settlement of the situation in the Middle East—principles which have been consistently supported and defended by the United Nations in the past.
15. Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): During the past 12 years the Middle East region has endured the tragedies of two wars. During that period, the problem of the Middle East has gone through many phases, for the attempts that were made to attain a just and lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict were either different or contradictory. Consequently, to this day, all the attempts made have failed to realize the desired objective, namely, a comprehensive settlement of that conflict. The only explanation for this failure is that all efforts exerted were concentrated on a single aspect of the problem to the exclusion of all complicating factors. In other words, these attempts dealt only with the disease and not with its causes.
16. There is no doubt that the question of Palestine is the core of the Arab-Israeli conflict. It would be a simplistic deviation from the facts if we tried to describe this conflict as a matter of frontier differences here and there; when actually this is a question that concerns the cause of a people deprived of the exercise of their national and legitimate rights, which the United Nations and other international organizations have recognized.
17. Accordingly, the Middle East problem did not arise from the Israeli aggression against Arab territories in June 1967, an aggression which enabled Israel to occupy the Sinai, the Golan Heights, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip; this problem did not begin following the creation of the State of Israel in Arab Palestine, it actually began at the time the Zionists outlined their plans for the establishment of their racist State in the Arab land. After the First World War, the British Mandate opened the doors of Palestine to collective emigration of the Jews from Europe, in keeping with the colonialist Balfour Declaration.⁵ In the course of 30 years, before 1948, the British Mandatory Power, through its repression of the unarmed Palestinian people, and with the help of the Zionist organizations, set up a Zionist

⁵ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Supplement No. 11, vol. II, annex 19.*

political entity at the expense of the Palestinian people and of the Palestinian territory.

18. The world zionism régime claimed that it had accepted the unjust Partition Plan of Palestine in 1947 [resolution 181 (II)], when actually, that same régime was determined to create obstacles in order to prevent this Organization from establishing an Arab State in the area that was specified in that same resolution. In Haifa, in 1973, Moshe Dayan stated that David Ben Gurion had never accepted the principle of partition. He said that as far as he was concerned, partition was simply a point of departure that would allow them to get into the region and then move into other territories and areas.

19. I do not think that there is any need for me to say that the history of Israel does indeed bear out that expansionist view expressed long ago by Ben Gurion. Today Israel not only occupies the land of Palestine but also occupies the land of two other Arab States. It also uses southern Lebanon as an area in which its armed forces carry out aggression as and when Israel wishes, and in this way it is jeopardizing the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a State Member of the United Nations. As a pretext it uses the right of hot pursuit against the Palestinians.

20. So the present situation in the Middle East remains a serious threat to international peace and security and there is indeed the possibility of another war, given Israel's insistence on pursuing that policy of aggression and expansion and establishing settlements in Palestine and other Arab territories it has occupied since 1967, including the city of Jerusalem. The unlimited military assistance provided to Israel by certain States Members of the United Nations encourages it to continue that adventurous policy.

21. United Nations resolutions since 1967 have been reaffirmed at the Conferences of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, the Islamic Conferences, the Arab Summit Conferences and by the Organization of African Unity [OAU], and those resolutions outline the proper path to follow and provide the basis for a just and comprehensive solution of the problem. Accordingly we feel that the United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, should assume its responsibilities to ensure the prompt implementation of its resolutions.

22. The State of Qatar has affirmed and continues to do so on every occasion the basic principles which should be applied and the conditions which should be met in order to move towards an over-all settlement of the Middle East issue. We shall continue to emphasize those principles as long as the Zionist enemy continues to occupy Arab territories and to deny the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. The first condition is the total and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli troops and presence from the Arab territories occupied since 1967. The second is the recovery by the Palestinian people of all their legitimate national rights, including the right of return to their homeland and the right to self-determination, independence and national sovereignty, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX).

23. There is an important historical fact which should be recognized if not considered as a point of departure

for every effort made towards the achievement of an over-all settlement of the problem—the Palestinian cause lies at the heart of the Middle East conflict. It is the direct and principal cause of the Arab-Israeli dispute. Since the question of Palestine and the Middle East issue form one indivisible problem, partial solutions and settlements could never solve the problem. Consequently, the success of a just and comprehensive settlement calls for the fulfilment of a fundamental condition, namely, the participation of all the parties involved, including the PLO, the sole authentic representative of the Palestinian people. Only the PLO has the right to speak on behalf of the Palestinian people. Accordingly it is entitled to participate on an equal footing with all other parties in the settlement of and negotiations on the Middle East issue.

24. The State of Qatar, which refuses to part with a single inch of the occupied Arab territories—a position adhered to by the other Arab States and by almost all the countries in the world—wishes to reaffirm here that Arab Jerusalem is an integral part of the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967. Accordingly, Israel must withdraw from Jerusalem. Israel must restore Jerusalem to Arab sovereignty, in keeping with General Assembly resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V), which were adopted in July 1967, and Security Council resolutions 252 (1968), 267 (1969), 271 (1969) and 298 (1971). All actions taken by the occupying authorities in Palestinian and other occupied Arab territories are illegal and should be annulled immediately in accordance with Security Council resolution 446 (1979).

25. As we said earlier, we believe that the Camp David agreements cannot provide an appropriate framework for a settlement of the Middle East issue, because those agreements disregard the fundamental elements of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Moreover they are contradictory to the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations and the charter of the League of Arab States. Those agreements have been denounced by the overwhelming majority of States in the world.

26. The Government of Qatar declares its total commitment to the resolutions adopted at the Arab Summit Conferences and the Islamic Conferences as well as those adopted at the Conferences of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries. It maintains its unswerving position regarding a comprehensive solution to the Middle East problem based on justice.

27. My country would like to reaffirm here that it fully supports the sister Republic of Lebanon and its efforts to ensure the unity of the people, the territorial integrity and the national independence and sovereignty of the country. We strongly condemn the repeated barbarous attacks by Israel against Lebanon, which are designed to break up the territory of Lebanon and to control part of that territory.

28. We denounce and condemn the racist practices of the Zionist occupying authorities vis-à-vis the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories. We also condemn the usurpation of the Arab lands, the establishment of settlements and the measures of arbitrary expulsion and repression directed against the Palestinian people and their leaders.

29. The increasingly close co-operation between the Zionist racist régime in our Arab region and the racist

régime in South Africa, particularly in the field of nuclear weapons, not only constitutes a dangerous threat to the peoples of Africa and the Middle East but also to peoples throughout the world. The Security Council is called upon to take all the necessary steps to put an end to these dangerous threats; the countries of the world are also invited to impose a total boycott against those two régimes in order to force them to abandon their policies of aggression and racism, the continuation of which can only cause tragedies to all the peoples of the world.

30. For many years, it has been the fate of the peoples of our Arab region to devote their efforts and resources for the defense of their very existence, which is being threatened by the aggression and Zionist colonialist expansionist ambitions of Israel. It is the duty of the peoples of the region to put an end to any threat or aggression directed against them, so that they may be able to concentrate on rebuilding, in a peaceful atmosphere, their social and economic development to ensure a better life for their future generations. It is the right of the peoples of the world to end this nightmare of tension in that sensitive area which is threatening peaceful coexistence throughout the world. The international community is called upon today more than ever to do all in its power to achieve a settlement in the Middle East in keeping with the requirements of justice, including a just settlement for the Palestinian people so that they may exercise their inalienable rights. The Palestinian people has waged a long and bitter struggle. They have made tremendous sacrifices to win their independence and freedom. Now this is all beginning to bear fruit. We vigorously support that militant people who are determined to wage their struggle until the end, so that they may exercise their legitimate rights. Together with that people, we aspire to a future in which peace and justice will prevail.

31. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The debate which was held last week on the question of Palestine helped our Assembly to gain a better understanding of the particular importance of an examination of the situation in the Middle East and of the need to continue to denounce and condemn the aggressive policy of the Israeli Zionists and the imperialist super-Powers in that part of the world.

32. The situation in the Middle East has remained extremely tense and explosive for many years and is today a dangerous source of tension and threatens peace and security in the region and throughout the world. It is necessary to say at the outset that the enemies of the Arab peoples and the peoples of the Middle East, the American imperialists in particular, are now playing a most dangerous game in this area by stirring up troubles and threatening to set in motion even graver events.

33. The underlying basic causes of the dangerous situation in the Middle East have always been, and remain, the continued imperialist-Zionist aggression against the Arab peoples, the Palestinian people in particular, and the aggressive policy and interference of certain Powers, particularly the two imperialist Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, with a view to establishing their domination and sharing the zones of influence in the region.

34. The greed of the capitalist monopolies and of the

imperialist Powers has always been, and still is, centred on the Middle East. Each of the two super-Powers wishes to seize strategic positions in this crossroads of the continents and the sources of Arab oil. It is to that end that various imperialists and capitalist monopolies have invested enormous amounts of money in the Middle East and are making fabulous profits or have sent expedition corps and armed forces to prevent the true owners of this wealth benefiting from it. To this end the super-Powers and the imperialist Powers are trying to maintain an unstable situation and to continue to destabilize the area in order to preserve certain social structures which co-operate with these monopolies and help to oppress and exploit the working masses in various Arab countries.

35. It is again for these ends that the imperialist enemies, the social-imperialists and Zionists, are using many different techniques to try to stifle the just claims of the Arab peoples and prevent them from fully exercising their true national sovereignty in all areas and over all issues that concern them. It was to permit the continued pursuit of that practice that Israel was created as a bloody instrument of world imperialism in general and of American imperialism in particular.

36. This is why Israel continues to be the policeman, is being used to protect the neo-colonialist interests of the United States, and is thus a great obstacle in the way of the progress of the Arab people. It is because of its role as a source of provocation, aggression and tension in the Middle East, as a weapon pointed at the Arab peoples for the benefit of the interests of imperialism and the imperialist super-Powers, that Israel has been given such a tremendous amount of military, economic and political aid by the United States and is benefiting from the anti-Arab policy of the Soviet social-imperialists.

Mr. Oyono (United Republic of Cameroon), Vice-President, took the Chair.

37. The struggle against the Zionist-imperialist aggression and the hegemonic policy of the super-Powers to liberate Arab territories occupied by Israel and to restore the national rights of the Palestinian people in their lands which have been ravaged by the Zionists is a struggle for the Arab people as a whole. The Arab peoples and countries also have their own particular problems, preoccupations and differences. But in the struggle to resolve this common problem, in the struggle for their common just cause, their unity and solidarity is absolutely indispensable. For this reason their enemies—the Zionists, the imperialists and the socio-imperialists—have tried to make the unity of the Arab peoples a target for many attacks. Today the Chinese social-imperialists are also working against the struggle of the Arab peoples. They support each move of the United States in the Middle East and, indeed, advise the Arab peoples to abandon their resistance to social-imperialist aggression and only to beware of the Soviet Union. It is only for opportunistic reasons that they have not openly come out in favour of Israel's role in the Middle East.

38. The current situation in the Middle East, contrary to the allegations of the imperialists and of the socio-imperialists, is the result of long preparation by the enemies of the Arab peoples. It is the unfortunate consequence of long-drawn-out and complex aggressive

activity which has been engaged in by the Israeli Zionists, the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists against the Arab peoples.

39. In the light of recent events in the Middle East, we can see how timely were the warnings of the sincere friends of the Arab peoples as to the true intentions of the Israeli Zionists and the imperialist super-Powers. Those intentions were to perpetuate the consequences of aggression, destroy Arab unity and liquidate the question of Palestine.

40. The Israeli Zionists have greatly benefited from the rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union and the anti-Arab bargaining conducted by them and have used this to intensify their aggressive activities, to harden their hostile anti-Arab attitude from year to year and to intensify their obstructionism, preventing a solution to the Middle East problem. They have become more obstinate in their claims and their ambitions to take over the occupied Arab lands and to expand their aggression, as they have done in southern Lebanon—in short, to fulfil their dream of a greater Israel.

41. Recent events are the direct results of the plots and intrigues, American and Soviet, to maintain the situation of “no war, no peace” in the Middle East and to ensure their role as arbiter in the events that take place in this part of the world.

42. Over the years the two super-Powers have hatched a whole series of plots, such as the “Rogers” plan, the “Gromyko” plan, the idea of a Geneva Conference, which was advocated particularly by the Soviet Union, and the American policy of “step-by-step” settlement, and even went so far as to issue a joint Soviet-United States statement on 1 October 1977. Under cover of these plans many serious moves have been prepared, and frequently the Palestinian resistance has been stabbed in the back, while Lebanon has been transformed into a battlefield and destroyed.

43. Behind these plans which the two super-Powers have drafted there lie various other plans which are being used one after the other. At Camp David an attempt was made at a so-called settlement which was sought by the American imperialists, but criticized by the Soviet social-imperialists. The United States for a long time had imposed its plans in the Middle East, but it took this opportunity to try to become the sole arbiter in this conflict between Israel and the Arab countries.

44. The Soviet Union launched its campaign of opposition and claimed to defend the Arab cause, but it took that attitude simply because the interests of the Soviet Union were threatened by the American political and diplomatic offensive and the so-called settlement was finalized at Camp David, not at Geneva, and the separate treaty signed under the auspices of Washington, not Moscow.

45. The Camp David agreements have made the situation even more complex and difficult to resolve. The Arab peoples and the world public continue to see them as a blow to the cause of the liberation of occupied Arab territories and the solution of the problem of Palestine, and as support to the Zionist Israeli and imperialist American policy.

46. The enemies of the Arab cause have been attacking the Palestinian people, the Arab peoples and even the United Nations, accusing them of sabotaging the peace process and the negotiated settlement. Their appeals not to lose the opportunity but to take advantage of the so-called favourable present situation continue to be directed at making people forget reality, the crimes and massacres perpetrated against the Arab peoples and forcing them to consent to sacrifice their rights in order to satisfy Zionism and imperialism.

47. But how can we recognize that a new situation prevails in the Middle East if nothing has really changed and none of the causes and consequences of the conflict has disappeared? Who can believe that peace is within our reach when the Israeli Zionists have no intention of renouncing their aggressive policy, their expansionist ambitions, when they arrogantly state that they will not withdraw from the occupied Arab territories, that they will continue their aggression against the Palestinians? The peoples of the world can never accept this mirage of peace as tension continues to mount.

48. American imperialism has intensified the negotiations concerning a separate agreement since the terrible defeat resulting from the downfall of the barbarous and criminal régime of the Shah of Iran, which was established and supported by the United States and which was one of the pillars of its system for policing American imperialist interests in the Middle East. The United States has struggled feverishly to repair its destroyed positions by seeking to strengthen the position of the Israeli Zionists and create new problems for the Arab countries.

49. Now the American imperialists are trying to stir up hatred against Iran, particularly in the Arab countries. They have mobilized their whole propaganda machine to create an atmosphere of war hysteria in order to stir up a feeling of mistrust in the Middle East countries as regards the revolution and the cause of the Iranian people.

50. The tactics being used by the American imperialists now are not unfamiliar to the peoples of the Middle East. They have been used many times to try to intimidate the Palestinian people and to discredit their struggle, but they have never been successful. Using the gunboat policy and blackmail against Iran, the American imperialists want to oblige the Iranian people to capitulate, and to frighten all the other peoples of the region. Thus they hope to kill two birds with one stone.

51. The example of Lebanon is the clearest proof of how the American imperialists and the Israeli Zionists have stopped at nothing, legally or morally, in order to stir up a fratricidal war by using all kinds of provocation and trying to take advantage of religious differences. They hope that in this way they will be able to stop the mounting tide of anti-Americanism in the Middle East and sow the seeds of discord among the peoples in that area.

52. The American and other imperialists are the enemies of the Arab peoples and of the Iranian people, whether Sunnites, Shi'ites, Moslems or Christians. Religious belief is a matter of man's conscience alone. The imperialist enemies must not be allowed to make it a cause of dispute and division among peoples.

53. It is very significant that the Israeli Zionists have shown themselves to be eager for military intervention by the United States in Iran and ready to support it. Once again we have crystal-clear proof of the dangers of the imperialist-Zionist activities in the Middle East.
54. Despite their difficulties, the Arab peoples will certainly win, because they are fighting for a just cause. So-called partial or provisional agreements arranged by the imperialist super-Powers and the Israeli Zionists to defend their own interests will not last for long.
55. The Middle East problem can be settled and peace can be established in that area only when Israel is obliged to withdraw, to put an end to its aggression against the Arab countries and to abandon its policy of expansion and its chauvinistic attitudes and actions. The establishment of peace and stability requires the restoration to the Palestinian people and other Arab peoples of all their inalienable national rights in their territories ravaged by Israel. Peace and stability will be genuine and lasting once the Arab peoples can act as masters of their own countries, preventing any interference by the imperialist super-Powers in the region.
56. The Albanian people and Government support and will continue to support the just cause of the Arab peoples.
57. Mr. KOMATINA (Yugoslavia): The situation in the Middle East is characterized by three basic trends. What is involved, above all, is an aggravation of the main aspects of the situation in the whole region owing to the policy of aggression and expansion continually pursued by Israel, a policy that openly rejects any idea of withdrawal from the Arab territories occupied in the 1967 war. Secondly, there is a growing and ever wider awareness of the indispensable programme for the settlement of this crisis and of the ways and means of implementing it. A positive element in this respect is the evolution of international consciousness in favour of a comprehensive settlement of the crisis and recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, and of the PLO as its sole legitimate representative. Thirdly, there is obviously a very strong sense of urgency regarding the need to make the utmost efforts and to adopt the necessary measures for the settlement of the Middle East crisis. Actually, today it is clearer than ever before that the postponement of a settlement poses an ever more direct threat to peace and security in the region and beyond, a threat that is all the more acute since it is transforming the whole region into an area of direct confrontation of extraregional factors. All this makes it incumbent upon the international community to adopt effective measures and take effective steps towards the settlement of this global crisis. The aforementioned elements clearly indicate what is involved and what should be done in order to change the situation radically.
58. We have already emphasized on previous occasions that in the essence of the Middle East crisis are embodied all the basic principles of international relations; among them the following are the most important: non-acquisition of foreign territories by the use of force and non-recognition of the policy of faits accomplis; recognition of the right to self-determination; recognition of the right of all States and peoples to a peaceful and secure existence; refusal to recognize the results of aggression; the need to solve disputes by peaceful means; support for the struggle of peoples for national liberation and recognition of their liberation movements; and support for countries victims of aggression. The failure to observe any one of those principles inevitably results in violation of the other principles and exacerbation of the crisis. This shows, at the same time, that respect for all the aforementioned principles provides the only realistic basis for a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East crisis.
59. Yugoslavia has always strongly supported these principles—in this case and wherever aggression and the violation of the fundamental principles of the rights of peoples have occurred—constantly and consistently exerting efforts for the peaceful political settlement of the Middle East crisis on the basis of the following three principles: first, complete withdrawal of Israel from all the Arab territories occupied in the 1967 war; secondly, the national right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, to establish its own State and to return to its homeland, and recognition of the PLO as its sole legitimate representative; and, thirdly, the right of all the countries and peoples of the region to secure and independent development.
60. In maintaining this platform we have proceeded from the generally accepted premise that a lasting and just solution of the question of Palestine, founded on the inalienable right to national independence which is enjoyed by all the peoples of the world, is the core of the settlement of the crisis. This was also confirmed in the general debate during the current session of the Assembly. That debate, as we have already emphasized in our statement on the question of Palestine [79th meeting], clearly reflected a positive evolution in the world in favour of the acceptance of the reality that there can be no settlement of the Middle East crisis without the attainment by the Palestinian people of its right to establish its own national State.
61. At the same time, this provides a basis for a common platform that is increasingly acceptable to the international community as a whole. It is becoming ever more evident that the only framework for solving the Middle East crisis is the one that emanates from a comprehensive interpretation of the letter and spirit of numerous United Nations resolutions and the positions adopted at the conferences of the non-aligned countries. What all of these have in common is the recognition of the right of every human being to life in his homeland and of every people to have its own national State and freely to determine its destiny, of the right of every country to live in independence and security, and, above all, of the fact that only a strict observance of these rights can provide a realistic basis for the settlement of the Middle East crisis.
62. Only an over-all and comprehensive approach, with of course, the participation of all parties, is likely to lead to a lasting and just solution. Separate solutions or agreements outside the context of the United Nations framework do not lead to lasting and just peace but, on the contrary, further aggravate the crisis since they do not take into consideration the core of the Middle East crisis: the recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to freedom and independence, a right that cannot be the subject of any negotiations. Past and more recent history has proved beyond any doubt that negotiations can be conducted only with authentic

liberation movements, in this case with the PLO. This reality has also been recognized by the international community, while the PLO has confirmed it by its active, responsible and constructive conduct in international life in general. In the present circumstances, to deny the PLO's right to participate in negotiations is tantamount to rejecting the most important factor in the establishment of peace and stability in the region. In fact, it has never been possible to settle a conflict arising out of an unfulfilled right to self-determination without the participation of authentic liberation forces.

63. We wish to emphasize, in particular, that the role that the United Nations should play in solving the Middle East problem is undoubtedly of the utmost importance. The United Nations has been actively involved in attempts to resolve this question for more than 30 years and was a factor in extinguishing the flames of war. It has been engaged in preventing and limiting aggression, condemning occupation and contributing to the elimination of the consequences of the use of force and annexation. The numerous decisions of the United Nations have been directed as a rule towards resolving the very essence of the crisis, and they are woven into the history of the world Organization with all the details of the problems and relations that existed at the time of their adoption.

64. All the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, from General Assembly resolutions 181 (II) of 1947 and 194 (III) of 1948, relating to the establishment of two States and the solution of the problem of refugees, through Security Council resolutions 237 (1967) and 242 (1967), concerned with the solution of the problem of the persons displaced in the 1967 war and the demand for the withdrawal of Israel from the occupied territories, to General Assembly resolutions 3236 (XXIX) of 1974 and 3375 (XXX) of 1975, which define the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian peoples, have affirmed that the Palestinian problem is the core of the Middle East crisis and that all the parties to the conflict, including the PLO, must participate in the peace-making process. We continue, therefore, to be convinced that the Middle East problem should be settled within the United Nations with the participation of all the parties concerned and in accordance with all the relevant resolutions on the Middle East crisis.

65. All these provisions and principles are embodied in the common stand of the non-aligned countries, which provides a most comprehensive and realistic platform for the solution of this crisis. Thus, the non-aligned countries have been and remain the strongest supporters of the people of this region in their just struggle for the establishment of an equitable, stable and lasting peace.

66. In spite of the gravity of the situation in the Middle East, we are encouraged by the positive evolution that is taking place in the world, in the sense of a growing awareness of the urgent need to settle the Middle East crisis and achieve a lasting and just settlement. Developments have confirmed the obvious, namely that solutions cannot be imposed either by means of force or through partial and separate agreements. Solidarity among the Arab peoples is constantly gaining ascendancy. It is also becoming ever more evident that the persistent Israeli policy of expansion, relying exclusively on the use of force—as demonstrated by the almost daily aggressive actions against Lebanon, the

colonization of the West Bank of the Jordan and other measures condemned by the international community—threatens to provoke a wider conflict with unforeseeable consequences.

67. Therefore, it is high time for us to urge that concrete action be taken in favour of what is just, realistic and lasting and against all that is unjust, unrealistic and transient, in order to contribute to a just solution that will bring to the peoples of that region the peace that they have been yearning for. And this is not only because of our commitment to the unfulfilled national aspirations of the Palestinian people and the liberation of occupied Arab territories, not only because of principles and moral values that we all cherish, but also in the interest of peace and stability in the region and in the world in general.

68. From the beginning of the crisis, Yugoslavia has shown its solidarity with the victims of aggression, that is, with all the Arab countries and peoples, and especially with the Palestinian people. We have consistently advocated a comprehensive, lasting, just and peaceful solution, and we shall continue to exert efforts to that end, in keeping with our non-aligned policy of support for all peoples in their struggle for freedom and independence and our policy of resistance to every form of aggression and intervention.

69. We are convinced that this is the only way to contribute effectively towards the solution of the crisis that threatens all of us. History has proved on numerous occasions that nothing lasting can be built on force, aggression, occupation and the subjugation of peoples. The sooner this truth is realized by us all, the better it will be for peace in the Middle East and in the world.

70. Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria): All the statements which have been delivered so far from this rostrum have endorsed the conclusion drawn by the Secretary-General in his annual report on the work of the Organization [A/34/1, sect. III]—namely, that the situation in the Middle East continues to be a destabilizing element in the over-all international situation and poses a severe threat to international peace and security. My Government cannot but be seriously concerned at developments in that region. Moreover, Bulgaria is situated in geographic proximity to it. We consider that it is high time that efficient measures were taken to defuse this dangerous hotbed of tension.

71. The socialist countries have repeatedly made known their stand on the ways and means to regulate this conflict. The very fact that the Middle East problem has persisted for such a long time in a state of stalemate bespeaks in the clearest possible terms the necessity of arriving at a comprehensive political solution with the participation of all parties concerned in the conflict. That is the correct way to go about it—indeed, the only way.

72. We frequently hear allegations that the Camp David deal was an initial step towards an over-all settlement of the conflict. What is more, there are those who maintain that it would be inexcusable to repudiate an agreement for peace which, though imperfect in itself and partial in its scope, was based on United Nations resolutions and represented a first step in the right direction. However, is that truly so?

73. Security Council resolution 242 (1967), and its second preambular paragraph in particular, emphasizes in clear terms the “inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war”. The Camp David agreements not only omit this principle but provide for a correction of borders under the pretext of ensuring Israel’s security. The Arab sector of Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, annexed by Israel in 1967, do not fall under any provisions of the Camp David agreements.

74. It has become starkly obvious that a lasting and just peace in the Middle East can be reached only with the complete withdrawal by Israel from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967, and through the solution of the Palestinian problem, in conformity with the relevant United Nations resolutions. The Camp David agreements do not solve the Palestinian problem, which, as is generally recognized, lies at the core of the Middle East conflict. The agreements do not limit themselves to refusing to recognize the true representatives of the Palestinian people—that is, the PLO. They deny the very existence of that people as a nation and make gratuitous differentiations, dealing only with the Palestinians living in the occupied territories. In that way the separatist agreements are in glaring contradiction with well-known resolutions of the United Nations and with world public opinion, which recognize the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, as well as the rights of that people to self-determination and the creation of an independent State of its own. Instead, the Palestinian people are offered so-called administrative autonomy in the territories occupied by Israel. Should this autonomy be adopted, it would mean legitimizing the continuing presence of Israeli armed forces and legalizing the Israeli colonial settlements, while completely renouncing the right of the Palestinian people to establish their own State.

75. From all that it can be inferred, logically, that the final aim of the parties to the Camp David agreements is not the establishment of peace in the region but, rather, a return to the times of military groupings and the creation of a new military alliance. That is corroborated by the fact that Israel carries on with its aggressive acts against Lebanon and the Palestinian people.

76. The Government of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria sincerely desires the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, and warmly embraces such a prospect. However, we consider that such a peace can be achieved only if all parties concerned understand clearly that this goal rests on the unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967, and the realization of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to self-determination and the establishment of a State of their own, through the guaranteeing of the independent existence and the security of all countries in the region. For only such a solution can be just and lasting. Achieving this aim requires the collective efforts of all interested parties, including the PLO on an equal footing, as the sole legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine.

77. The sooner that truth is comprehended by all, the nearer the prospect of peace will be—a peace which the people of the Middle East, having suffered so much,

expect with great hope and of which they are fully worthy.

78. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The General Assembly is discussing the situation in the Middle East at a time when that sensitive part of the world is going through an extremely important phase. It is certainly no exaggeration to say that international peace and security are organically linked to the situation in the Middle East. Our part of the world was the cradle of three revealed religions: Islam, Christianity and Judaism. It could once again have a spiritual influence on the entire world. The peoples of the region want peace to reign so that they may enjoy security in their own country. Leading those people are the Palestinian people, who for more than 30 years have been deprived of their most elementary rights, in particular their right to self-determination. Today that right has been consecrated and it is recognized that all the peoples of the world must be allowed to exercise it.

79. The Secretary-General was not exaggerating either when, in his annual report on the work of the Organization, he stated that:

“A just and lasting peace in the Middle East can ultimately only be achieved through a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the question, including in particular the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Evidently, all parties concerned must be involved.” [*Ibid.*]

80. Egypt is in full agreement with the Secretary-General. A comprehensive peace based on justice must prevail in that area so that all peoples, in particular the Palestinian people, may exercise their legitimate rights. The policies of Egypt and all its initiatives, both within the United Nations and outside it, tend in that direction, but a lasting comprehensive peace cannot be achieved under occupation. Throughout its long ancient and modern history Egypt has always as a matter of principle opposed foreign occupation and manifestations of settler colonialism. My country’s struggle is a just and continuing struggle to remove all forms of injustice. Like many other countries of the third world, we too have suffered from the attacks of domination and imperialism, which we have opposed for many years. The war of 1967 was the culmination of the imperialist attack against Egypt, when Egypt was trying to ensure a better future for the Arab peoples, the African continent and the peoples of the third world.

81. As we stated a few days ago in the debate on the question of Palestine [79th meeting], no people in the Middle East has suffered as much as the peoples of Egypt and Palestine. Egypt’s struggle has been clear and obvious both in war and in peace. Egypt accepted Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and co-operated with Mr. Jarring, the then Special Representative of the Secretary-General to implement that resolution, while exercising its natural right to defend its territory. In both cases Egypt has been sincere in its peace efforts.

82. It was not for tactical reasons or to achieve provisional propagandistic gain that it took part in the peace initiatives. Egypt has been guided by its deep faith in the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, for example, the preservation of future generations from the scourge of war and the obligation of Member

States to settle their disputes by peaceful means. Similarly, we did not wage war for the sake of waging war; we thought thereby to break the deadlock that it was being attempted to impose so as to entrench the occupation. That is why the President of Egypt, when the Egyptian army destroyed the Bar Lev line and crossed the Suez Canal, advocated the holding of an international peace conference with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the representatives of the Palestinian people, in the hope that everyone would work for a just and lasting peace in the area.

83. Egypt's position on these matters has been clear. We have never been two-faced about it. Never have we made any public statements that we have then denied or rejected in private. Egypt's policies have been based on its clear response to Mr. Jarring on 15 February 1971. We stated at the time that Egypt was prepared to conclude a peace agreement with Israel, in 1971, with the proviso that Israel promise to fulfil all its obligations under Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and withdraw to Egypt's international boundaries. I am sure the Assembly is aware that Israel rejected that categorically in its reply to Mr. Jarring in 1971.⁶

84. The General Assembly, at the time, expressed clear and unequivocal support for Egypt when in paragraph 4 of its resolution 2799 (XXVI) of 13 December 1971, it expressed its full support for all the efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967). In the same resolution the General Assembly expressed appreciation for Egypt's positive reply to the representative of the Secretary-General regarding a just and lasting peace in the Middle East and invited Israel to respond positively to the peace initiative of Mr. Gunnar Jarring. The General Assembly reaffirmed that position in resolution 2949 (XXVII) of 8 December 1972.

85. Considering Egypt's invariable position since 1971, a position supported by the General Assembly in 1971 and 1972 and by all peace-loving forces, and bearing in mind Egypt's legitimate acts to recover its occupied territories, Israel agreed to what it had earlier rejected—that is, the withdrawal of its forces to Egypt's international boundaries. The recognition of that principle was a matter of vital importance to us, for it indicated a just interpretation of resolution 242 (1967). The basis accepted by Egypt at Camp David was full implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and of the principles of the Charter and of international law.

86. As the Egyptian Foreign Minister stated a few weeks ago, this situation paves the way to an over-all settlement which would enable each of the parties to recover its rights: Egypt would recover its territory; Syria would do likewise; Lebanon would regain its territorial integrity; most importantly, the Palestinian people would regain their right to self-determination and to return to their land; and Israel, in turn, would obtain security within a framework of a system of mutual security rather than by means of acquiring territory through the use of force.

87. On that basis the Treaty of March 1979 concluded

⁶ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1971*, document S/10070/Add. 2.

between Egypt and Israel should be seen here as only a first step towards a comprehensive peace in the area and towards the settlement of all aspects of the conflict in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

88. Egypt is well aware of the fact that the framework agreed upon at Camp David did not represent a final settlement. It did, in the first place undeniably put an end to the stalemate in the question of Palestine and secondly, it extracted real commitments from Israel regarding the Palestinian people. For the first time, Israel recognized the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and the need to settle all aspects of the Palestinian problem. Thirdly, that agreement was the first constructive step towards a settlement of the Palestinian question and the dispute between the Arab countries and Israel in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

89. At the same time, Egypt vigorously condemns the measures taken by Israel in occupied Arab and Palestinian territories—specifically the creation of Israeli settlements, the expropriation of private lands belonging to Arab inhabitants, the permission given to Israelis to buy Arab lands, and the recent measure adopted to arrest and expel certain representatives of the Palestinian people, such as Mr. Bassam Shaka'a, the Mayor of Nablus. All these illegal measures clearly hinder any peaceful progress towards a just and comprehensive settlement.

90. A comprehensive peace calls for two essential conditions: first, the withdrawal of Israel from all Arab and Palestinian territories occupied in 1967, including the Arab City of Jerusalem; secondly, recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and, in particular, their right to self-determination.

91. Egypt supports whatever constructive steps may be taken to enable the Palestinians to exercise their legitimate rights. The idea of mutual recognition between Israel and the PLO is a logical starting-point in the process of enabling the Palestinian people to exercise their legitimate rights. In this regard, the delegation of Egypt would like to express its appreciation to the Chancellor of Austria, Mr. Bruno Kreisky, for the constructive efforts that he has made. We note that the Chancellor's efforts have taken the practical form of the submission of an important document to the General Assembly under the symbol A/34/760. We appreciate the efforts of Chancellor Kreisky and wish him every success in his efforts for the rapprochement of the views of the parties concerned.

92. In the light of these considerations, which were mentioned by the Permanent Representative of Austria this morning in the General Assembly [85th meeting], the Egyptian delegation would like to express the hope that the important proposal put forward by Austria will become a resolution as soon as possible and be supported by the great majority in the General Assembly.

93. As stated by President Sadat in his message on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People,⁷ Egypt feels that this verbal solidarity should be turned into effective solidarity. As President Sadat stated two days ago, we cannot abandon the

⁷ See document A/AC.183/SR.35, para. 23.

slightest principle or right, because we want peace to be based on justice. We must not seek a partial peace, which would ignore Arab or Palestinian rights, for peace must be comprehensive.

94. That will continue to be Egypt's position until all the peoples in the area, led by the Palestinian people, exercise their rights and see their security guaranteed.

95. Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary): A little more than two years ago, the Soviet Union and the United States issued a joint statement of commitment to seeking a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East crisis on a reasonable basis. It then appeared possible that, after a series of abortive attempts, tension would be reduced in that focal point of crisis. Still later, following a memorable visit, two concerned countries of the region committed themselves to taking the path of separate deals instead of seeking a comprehensive settlement. One of the signatories to the joint statement then found itself at a crossroads, facing the dilemma of opting either for a comprehensive solution on the basis of the principles of the joint statement, which would allow for a lasting and over-all settlement and would rule out the possibility of obtaining unilateral advantages in the region, or for a self-serving peace arrangement designed to secure unilateral strategic, economic and political gains.

96. After the framework agreements had been reached at Camp David, the two parties involved signed a separate Peace Treaty under the tutelage of one of the signatories to the aforementioned statement. The last-named party's change of mind is all too obvious.

97. The question that now arises is whether the separate Peace Treaty has taken us any closer to a genuine settlement or has made one still harder to achieve. What is the tangible result of the separate Peace Treaty? The answer is not too difficult. One of the signatories to the Peace Treaty is to regain its sovereignty over nearly two thirds of its occupied territories before the end of this year, but the remaining territories cannot be evacuated until 1982. The result achieved is that much and nothing more.

98. On the other hand, the period since the signing of the Treaty indicates that what is sought by the separate deal is to move further away from an over-all settlement rather than to bring it any closer. In our view, it is more appropriate to make even small steps on the right road than to go along the wrong path, because the latter takes us further away from a comprehensive settlement.

99. That most important contradiction of the separate peace is amply demonstrated by the fact that the solution produced does not enjoy the support of even those Arab States which are linked by close political, economic and military bonds to one of the signatories of the said Treaty. What is more, those States are more outspoken today than ever before in their criticism of the Middle East policy of the great Power which assisted in bringing about the separate peace. Thus the Treaty signatories and the third party which assisted in setting up the Treaty have found themselves confronting the united front of the Arab countries, their closest allies, and the overwhelming majority of the States Members of our Organization. To put it another way, they have become isolated in the community of nations.

100. Recognizing this situation, the aforementioned troika felt compelled to seek some way of creating a make-believe possibility of finding a solution to the question of Palestine within the Camp David agreements, in spite of the increasingly clear evidence of later developments to the effect that the agreements and the separate peace have carried them further away from a just solution of the problem of Palestine, the pivotal element of the crisis. The said instruments and attempts to date make it clear that the magic word "autonomy", as interpreted by the troika, does not apply to the territory in which the Palestinian people live but only to the inhabitants of the territory—which is tantamount to the rapid annexation of the occupied territories, the establishment of Israeli settlements in them and the transformation of their demographic composition. That integrationist policy is unacceptable to my delegation, and a similar view is taken by the majority of the States Members of the United Nations. In giving such an appraisal of the elements of the problem on the agenda, we should like to express our conviction that the united action of our Organization would result in speeding up the process towards a just settlement.

101. The Government of my country has clearly stated its long-standing view on the Middle East situation. We hold that the situation in the Middle East is still unsettled and raises potential dangers for the peace of that region and of the whole world. The separate peace between Egypt and Israel fails to promote the search for a just peace, the path to which lies in: first, discontinuance of the Israeli aggression, including that against Lebanon; secondly, return of Israeli-occupied territories to the Arab peoples; thirdly, recognition of and exercise by the Palestinian people of their legitimate rights, including the right to an independent State under the leadership of the PLO, their sole legitimate representative; and, fourthly, guarantees of the security and peace of all the States and peoples of the region, including Israel.

102. It is our conviction that peace in the Middle East cannot be just and durable unless it is established with the involvement and participation of all the parties concerned.

103. Mr. NISIBORI (Japan): Japan is profoundly aware that the stability and development of the Middle East are closely tied to that of the rest of the world, since Japan seeks its own stability and prosperity within the general framework of the peace and development of the international community as a whole. In recent years, through political and economic relations as well as cultural exchanges, the interdependence of Japan and the countries of the Middle East has deepened. Japan's Middle East policy has its own independent character deriving from its historical background. It is also characterized by continuity in its efforts to co-operate with the Middle East countries in their development endeavours.

104. My country's fundamental and steadfast position regarding the Middle East is based on the belief that peace must be achieved in the region as quickly as possible and that such a peace must be founded on the following principles.

105. First, the peace achieved in the Middle East should be just, lasting and comprehensive. Although the gradual withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Sinai

Peninsula, in accordance with the Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty, is being effected more quickly than originally planned and relations between the two countries are being normalized, we believe that that Peace Treaty should be only a first step towards a comprehensive peace.

106. Secondly, a comprehensive peace should be achieved through the early and complete implementation of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and recognition of and respect for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination, under the United Nations Charter.

107. Thirdly, each and every path towards the realization of such a peace must be explored, with careful consideration being given to the legitimate security requirements of the countries in the region and to the aspirations of all the peoples of the region, including the Palestinians.

108. In accordance with these fundamental principles, Japan is firmly convinced that in order to achieve an early peace, it is first essential that Israel withdraw from all the occupied territories, and Japan believes that the course of negotiations now under way between Egypt and Israel on the question of the autonomy of the West Bank and Gaza will have a serious influence on whether or not a comprehensive peace will be achieved through the current process.

109. In that connexion we strongly hope that Israel and the PLO will recognize each other's position, so that the participation of the PLO in the peace process can be ensured, and moreover that all the parties concerned will strictly refrain from acting in any way that could be detrimental to the atmosphere of the negotiations. Therefore we deplore the fact that Israel continues to establish settlements in the occupied territories, thereby violating the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. We believe that due consideration should be given to guaranteeing the human rights of the Palestinians living in the occupied territories.

110. Further, we recognize that peace and stability in Lebanon are essential for the realization of peace in the Middle East. We deplore Israel's repeated attacks on southern Lebanon, which inflict loss of life and destruction of property not only on the Palestinian refugees living there but also on other innocent residents of that area. We also feel compelled to call attention to the fact that the attacks by Israel on southern Lebanon result in an increasing number of refugees, and that places an even greater burden on the already financially strained programme of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. For purely humanitarian reasons as well, we strongly urge Israel to refrain from making further incursions into southern Lebanon. At the same time we urge the Palestinians to exercise restraint as regards taking action that would only complicate and worsen the situation.

111. My delegation supports the statement made by a United Nations spokesman on 20 November concerning a programme of action on the consolidation of the cease-fire in southern Lebanon.⁸ We highly value the various activities of the United Nations in the Middle East, including the work of UNIFIL.

112. Japan strongly urges all parties concerned to continue their efforts with steadfast perseverance, a courageous and flexible attitude and a renewed commitment to the search for a solution that is satisfactory to all. It is my country's earnest desire that a just and lasting peace be established without delay.

113. In closing I should like to reaffirm Japan's readiness to work for the common goal of peace in the Middle East by strengthening co-operation with the countries in the region.

114. Mr. FUTSCHER PEREIRA (Portugal): The situation in the Middle East continues to pose one of the most serious threats to peace and security currently facing the world. Given the political, social, religious and economic interests involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict, that menace concerns not only the peoples and countries of that area but indeed the whole international community. It endangers our endeavours to seek a more peaceful, more just and more prosperous life for our nations and for the coming generations.

115. It is therefore our duty to continue to search unceasingly for a peaceful solution to the Middle East problem. In that search we cannot exclude any paths that might lead to peace. Bearing in mind the complexity of the problem and the emotional values involved, we cannot expect to find any quick or easy solution. We believe that peace will be achieved only through a gradual process and if the parties show the spirit of conciliation needed to conduct a patient and persevering dialogue.

116. The Israeli-Egyptian Peace Treaty reached within the Camp David agreement framework is, in our view, a first step in that process. The withdrawal of Israel from a considerable part of the territory it occupied in the Sinai is probably the most positive development we have witnessed in the Middle East in the last 30 years.

117. We are aware that the Israeli-Egyptian Peace Treaty and the ongoing negotiations fall short of being the over-all settlement which, we believe, is needed in order to bring peace to the area. But we cannot but put our hopes in peaceful negotiations because we know of no other alternative to war. Peace between Egypt and Israel, however, is far from a solution to all the problems of the Middle East.

118. We should like to reiterate that we consider that a just and lasting peace in the area can be achieved only through a comprehensive settlement based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

119. Such a settlement should, in the first place, take into account the legitimate and inalienable national political rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination. Last week, when my delegation addressed this Assembly on the question of Palestine [81st meeting], we very clearly stated our views on that matter. We believe that the Palestinian question is central to a solution of the Middle East problem and that peace cannot be reached without the direct participation of the legitimate representatives of the Palestinian people.

120. Secondly, that settlement requires the total with-

⁸ See press release SG/SM/2833.

drawal of Israel from all the Palestinian and Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Arab Jerusalem. The acquisition of territory by the use of force is inadmissible. Israel must abide by the principles of international law, not only in recognizing that principle but also in respecting the relevant international conventions while still occupying those territories.

121. Finally, that settlement must respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area, including Israel, and their right to live in peace and security within recognized boundaries.

122. This framework we have just outlined has broad support among Members of the United Nations as being capable of leading to a peaceful settlement of the Middle East situation. However, that will happen only if a spirit of dialogue and conciliation is substituted for the spirit of mistrust that has predominated among the nations of the area. It can come about only if the guns are silenced, allowing the voices of all peoples of the area to be heard.

123. No peace in the Middle East can be achieved if blind violence continues to take innocent lives, thus perpetuating an atmosphere of revenge and hatred. All the parties must understand that no solution will be achieved by force. Only tolerance and an effort towards mutual understanding can bring peace to the area. The Israelis must recognize the just and legitimate aspirations of the Palestinians, and the Palestinians must recognize the right of Israel to exist and to live in peace.

124. I also wish to express the concern of my country about the situation prevailing in southern Lebanon. Much has been said in our Organization about the drama of the Lebanese people, whose problems have been compounded by the use of their country as a stage for struggles which are not their own. The sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon, as well as the freedom of its citizens to determine their future by themselves, must be respected. It is encouraging to see that, as the Secretary-General states in his report, the cessation of firing arranged on 26 August has so far been maintained [*see A/34/584-S/13578, para. 16*].

125. It is now time to look at the matter in a constructive manner and to search for a peaceful solution that will reinstate Lebanon's sovereignty over all its territory. We consider the pertinent Security Council resolutions, particularly resolution 450 (1979), to be an adequate point of departure and my delegation welcomes any initiatives that might lead to peace in that country.

126. The future of the Middle East is in the hands of all the peoples of the area. We can understand the anger of those who witness daily the suffering and death of their brothers. We can also understand the bitterness of those who suffer exile and who are denied an identity. But we believe that it is time to heal those wounds and not to open them further. We therefore appeal to all to put aside their weapons and their prejudices and to take the necessary steps that will lead to peace.

127. Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): The position of the Romanian Government on the overriding need for a peaceful settlement of

the Middle East conflict, on the fundamental principles and on ways and means to bring about a just and lasting peace in the vital interests of all the peoples in the area and in the interests of peace in general has been outlined on a number of occasions in this forum and in other international bodies. Our position was also made clear last week by the Romanian delegation in the debate on the question of Palestine [*79th meeting*].

128. It was reaffirmed, with all due clarity and authority, in the recent message to the President of the General Assembly and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations by the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Nicolae Ceaușescu, on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian people. In the message the President of Romania said:

“Romania is constantly working for a peaceful settlement, through negotiations, of the Middle East conflict, for the achievement of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace that would lead to the withdrawal of Israel from Arab territories occupied as a result of the war of 1967, to a solution to the problem of the Palestinian people, in accordance with their right to self-determination and to the creation of their own State, and to guarantees of independence, integrity and sovereignty for all the States in the area.”

129. Directly following the outbreak of the war of 1967, Romania clearly stated its deep conviction that an appropriate answer to the problems confronting the countries and peoples of the Middle East, problems which represent a constant danger to international peace and security, can be supplied only by a peaceful and just settlement in accordance with the principles of the Charter and the fundamental interests of the parties involved. The course of events in the Middle East in the last three decades proves convincingly that wars and the use of force, far from contributing to a solution of the disputes involved, only complicate matters, aggravate an already dangerous situation and lay the groundwork for further armed conflicts, which would be even more ruinous. Romania therefore has always considered that a political, negotiated settlement is the only way to establish a just and lasting peace, making it possible finally for all the peoples in the area to devote their efforts and resources to the strengthening of their national independence and economic and social development.

130. It is obvious that a future peace settlement in the Middle East, if it is to be lasting, must be just and equitable and must be backed by the principles of the Charter and of international law and must meet the legitimate interests and aspirations of every State and people in the area.

131. In the light of its position of principle, which is that occupation of foreign territories by force is inadmissible and contrary to all standards of law, legality and international morality, Romania has always called for Israel's withdrawal from Arab territories occupied following the 1967 war.

132. By the same token, for a peace settlement to be truly viable it is indispensable, as we have always stated, that it should include the exercise of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination and to an independent State of their own. In keeping with this unshakable

conviction, Romania, within the United Nations and elsewhere has always actively supported in its many international efforts any attempt to bring about a just settlement of the problem of the Palestinian people and any attempt to ensure the participation of the PLO, as the legitimate and authentic representative of the Palestinians, in negotiations the aim of which has been to bring about a comprehensive settlement of the problem of the Middle East. As we stated from this rostrum last week [*ibid.*], the Romanian Government is convinced that without an appropriate solution to the Palestinian problem, there can be no climate of peace, tranquillity and security in the Middle East.

133. Finally, we have always felt that a basic requirement for any peace settlement in the Middle East lies in having guarantees of the inalienable right of each country and area to an independent sovereign existence. We have always felt that the true security of each State in the area can be ensured only by establishing and developing relations of peaceful co-operation, trust and mutual respect for all neighbouring countries.

134. As we have constantly stressed, Romania strongly favours prohibiting the use of force in international relations and settling any disputes among States by peaceful means, by negotiations among the parties concerned. The Middle East conflict cannot be an exception in view of the sad history of the area, which fully proves that military means are totally ineffective in settling disputes among States and in establishing a lasting peace and security.

135. The position of Romania has been one of active support for negotiations among all parties to the Middle East conflict and for the participation in such negotiations of the PLO, as the legitimate authentic representative of the Palestinian people. Any peace arrangement, in order to be viable and durable, must without doubt have the consent and support of all the peoples and countries concerned, including the Palestinian people. It is clear, however, that such support can be won only with the participation of all the parties concerned, without any exception, in negotiations and in the drafting of commitments and obligations pertaining to a future peace settlement in the Middle East.

136. In the light of these considerations, it appears to us undeniable that the proposal by the delegation of Austria, issued as an official document of the General Assembly under agenda item 25 [A/34/760], a proposal that stresses that a general settlement can be achieved only by direct negotiations among all the parties concerned, including the PLO, deserves the most careful consideration.

137. As a country in the general vicinity of the Middle East, Romania is deeply disturbed over the dangerous situation that persists there. We feel that the present situation in the Middle East requires that the United Nations assume a more active and effective role in the settlement of the conflict and act with increased vigour to achieve this objective which is of paramount importance for the cause of peace, understanding and international co-operation.

138. As the President of Romania stated in his message to the President of the General Assembly and to the Secretary-General, my country considers that it is now more necessary than ever before to redouble ef-

forts and to act with increased vigour to find ways and means to make it possible for all the countries and parties concerned to participate in a settlement of the problems of the region.

139. To this end it would be particularly important to organize, under the auspices of and with the active participation of the United Nations, an international meeting—either by reconvening the Geneva Peace Conference or in some other form—with the participation of all the countries and parties concerned, including the PLO as the legitimate, authentic and recognized representative of the Palestinian people, the two Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East, that is the Soviet Union and the United States, and, if necessary, other countries.

140. To our way of thinking, to establish peace in the Middle East firmer action is required to put an end to the disturbing situation existing in Lebanon to ensure the integrity and independence of that country.

141. There can be no doubt that a settlement of the Middle East problems would have a profoundly positive influence on the international atmosphere as a whole and would make an outstanding contribution to the strengthening of confidence among peoples, stability, détente and world peace.

142. As in the past, Romania will endeavour to support and encourage any initiative aimed at contributing to a just, comprehensive, lasting settlement of the problems of the Middle East, the establishment of real peace in the area and consequently the consolidation of peace, security and international co-operation.

143. Mr. SHIHABI (Saudi Arabia) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Once more we are discussing the situation in the Middle East, which is another aspect of the crimes committed by the Zionist movement. Those crimes include the violation of covenants and international practices, the usurpation of the territories of others, the displacement and replacement of nationals, the violation of the human, religious, material and moral rights of others and aggression against neighbouring countries.

144. All these problems combined have been created and called "Israel", and today we are dealing with one of its chapters, namely, the problem of the Middle East. Israel represents all these interrelated problems which fall within the competence of judicial bodies, of arbitration boards, Commission on Human Rights, of institutions concerned with political problems and councils concerned with security and peace keeping. No one aspect of its behaviour conforms to law. Even General Assembly resolution 181 (II), which called for its creation, was contrary to law and nature and does not stand the test of the United Nations Charter in terms of style or substance. And even that resolution was violated by Israel, which has used it to commit international scandals.

145. The Middle East item, which has been included in the agenda since 1967, emphasizes the aspect of the Israeli menace after the items on Palestine, refugees and human rights, because Israel, which is the real disease, has, with the support of powers of evil, extended its domination in 1967 beyond Palestine, so that

we have now to deal with several resultant problems, including that of the situation in the Middle East.

146. I cannot be optimistic in regard to the intentions of Israel, particularly if matters were left to its own good will. One has only to listen to statements by its leaders and its representatives at the United Nations—who constantly resort to falsehoods and distortions of the facts while ignoring the real forces at the core of the Palestinian problem, thereby misleading themselves and world Jewry and deceiving their few friends—to realize that they have made all fair and feasible solutions impossible of achievement, while they pursue their aggression, obstruction and oppression to a point where those responsible for the Palestinian rights will find it impossible to agree with them in later stages on solutions which today are still feasible. Then the Israelis will forfeit even the concessions which are incorporated in the United Nations resolutions which they are now violating and rejecting.

147. Let us consider the extent to which the international community is occupied with the crimes of the Zionist entity in Palestine through subsidiary bodies apart from the General Assembly, that is, through the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, the United Nations military forces which are stationed on the borders of territories occupied by Israel—from which Israel is able to threaten the security of the region—and the Security Council, which continues to meet throughout the year, hardly ending one meeting on Israeli crimes when it has to meet again to deal with the new acts of aggression threatening security. Furthermore, other national and international bodies have been created for the examination of this question. In one way or another, they were all established in response to Zionist Israeli aggression and they work tirelessly to contain that disease and to prevent it from spreading. Permit me to ask this question: Is this an entity which can continue?

148. Peace in the Middle East, which is a vast area of considerable importance on the world map, is subject to grave danger from Israel, which has been stockpiling the most modern arms and conspiring with South Africa and the forces of evil in the world in the development of nuclear weapons. It threatens the interests of the peoples of the Middle East as well as the world's interests in the region and the region's interests in the world.

149. No one should be misled into thinking that Israel will protect a single square metre of land in the area in anyone else's interests. All its efforts are aimed at securing its own protection from one moment to the next. I also wish to state that in the last resort Israel will not even be able to protect itself, because injustice and aggression cannot prevail. Israel spends sleepless nights, for it knows—and it knows that we know—that it can only destroy and cannot protect anything. We are the people of the Middle East, and we are the people who protect it.

150. Israel, which was created on the basis of injustice and aggression 32 years ago, has not so far acknowledged any international boundaries. I challenge it to inform the United Nations of the limits of the interna-

tional boundaries which it desires for itself. Israel states that it wishes to have secure borders, but the Zionist leaders know that security comes not from boundaries drawn on soil but from the protection of the legitimate rights of those who have such rights and from fair and sound positions. The Israeli entity was created on the basis of principles other than these, and as a matter of fact none of these principles is embodied in Israel.

151. At each session of the General Assembly we witness greater condemnation of Israel. Each day Israel steps up its aggression and oppression and its threat to security. Where and when will it stop?

152. At its thirty-third session, the General Assembly adopted resolution 33/28 A, in which it expressed its grave concern that no just solution to the problem of Palestine, the core of the Middle East conflict, had been achieved and that the situation in the area continued to deteriorate. That resolution reaffirmed that the Palestinian people must attain and exercise its inalienable rights and that the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, must participate in all efforts to resolve the problem.

153. In its resolution 33/29, the General Assembly condemned Israel's continued occupation of Palestinian and other Arab territories and declared that peace was indivisible and must be based on a comprehensive and just solution of the problem, including Israeli withdrawal from all the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories.

154. The Security Council has adopted resolution 446 (1979), in which it severely criticized Israel and confirmed that Israel's policy of establishing settlements in the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967 has no legal validity and constitutes a dangerous obstacle to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. It called upon the Israeli authorities to rescind their previous measures and to desist from taking any action which would result in changing the legal status and geographical nature of the area.

155. In its resolution 452 (1979), the Security Council called upon the Government and people of Israel to cease, on an urgent basis, the establishment, construction and planning of settlements in the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem.

156. These are but a few in the series of resolutions and other statements adopted or issued by the General Assembly, the Security Council and other international bodies, not to mention world public opinion, which has unanimously criticized and condemned the Israeli entity for its deviation from international law. However, Israel has only continued its violation of rights and its crime against humanity.

157. The latest dangerous turn in the Middle East situation has been the partial peace agreement signed by Israel. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has declared its rejection of what was done at Camp David and of the partial peace agreement, because that agreement violates the rights of the Palestinian Arabs, makes more remote the prospects of peace, violates United Nations resolutions and has broadened the area of conflict.

158. The Palestinian Arab people, in its quest for full national rights, has the complete support of the Arab and Islamic nations and of all nations which cherish justice, fairness and peace. Israel and others are in error if they think it is possible to eliminate a people through a partial agreement which ignores the rights of that people. They also err in their belief that by driving a wedge between one Arab State and the rest of the Arab world they will gain a legitimacy based on lies. The Arabs are one nation and truth has but one face.

159. We also hear bizarre stories about bargaining on self-rule for the Palestinian people in their absence and at their expense. Israel has stated that Jerusalem, the Arab Islamic capital, is to be its own capital in perpetuity and it considers that the establishment of a Palestinian State would be a threat to its security. Israel considers the land as belonging to it and grants to the Palestinian Arabs—the true owners of that land—only the right to walk on it. This is all evidence against the legitimacy of the existence of Israel as a State. If the Israeli authorities consider that the Zionist military occupation of Jerusalem of a few years ago constitutes sufficient justification of its claim, their pursuit of that policy will one day lead them in the other direction and will be an argument against them.

160. If a Palestinian State would be a threat to the security of Israel, and because of that should not exist, the fact that Israel constitutes a threat to all the countries of the area means that it should not exist. Palestine is the country of the Palestinians, not an international playground which may be allocated by the Zionist authorities to whomsoever they wish. The territory of Palestine belongs to its own people, which has authorized no one to enter into any bargains with regard to that territory.

161. I should like to say a word to those who are bargaining with the rights of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples in the region. The rights of the Arabs in their countries are absolute; they cannot be the subject of any negotiations, concessions or deals.

162. There will be no peace in the region until justice prevails. As the Secretary-General states in his annual report on the work of the Organization, just submitted to the General Assembly:

“A just and lasting peace in the Middle East can ultimately only be achieved through a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the question, including in particular the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Evidently, all parties concerned must be involved.” [See A/34/1, sect. III.]

163. The question of Palestine is the essence of the conflict in the Middle East. It constitutes the path to the establishment of peace in the region. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia calls for the urgent implementation of United Nations resolutions on the Middle East, for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories, for measures to prevent Israel from pursuing its present attacks against Lebanon and to ensure that it is held responsible for the damages resulting from the crimes it has committed in Palestinian and other Arab territories.

164. Saudi Arabia also calls for the application by the

international Organization of the provisions of the Charter, as well as the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly and subsidiary international bodies. It rejects every agreement on Palestine and the Middle East that is concluded without the participation of all the parties concerned, particularly the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, and that does not guarantee all the national rights of the Arab people. This tragicomedy must cease. Those who have rights must be permitted to exercise them.

165. Mr. FAKHOURI (Lebanon) (*interpretation from Arabic*): We now have before us a detailed report by the Secretary-General on the question of the Middle East.

166. Before stating its views on the subject, my delegation would like to express its great appreciation to the Secretary-General for the efforts he has made to re-establish peace in that part of the world, to deal with the dangers existing there and to ease the suffering of the people. We wish to express our thanks also to the Secretary-General and his associates and to UNIFIL, and the countries participating in it, for the efforts being made in southern Lebanon.

167. The crisis that has afflicted the Middle East for several decades now, and for which responsibility must be borne by the international community, has developed with the passing of time and has given rise to a series of events that require radical and speedy solutions if we do not wish the region and the world to explode suddenly because of neglect and lack of the attention that it deserved.

168. That responsibility does not detract in any way from Israel's major and direct responsibility, flowing from its usurpation, by sword and by fire, of the territory of a people and the international community's attempt to camouflage this spoliation under the cover of an unjust international resolution, which it is today trying to correct.

169. At that time the conscience of the world forgot—or pretended to forget—that the land of Palestine had deep roots in the hearts of the Arab people of Palestine—roots so deep that that people yearns for that land and is determined to return to it, giving the world lessons of sacrifice and abnegation for many years now. But the sacrifices that the Palestinian people have borne and continue to bear are insignificant when one thinks of the nobility and sacrosanct nature of the objective.

170. I shall not dwell here on the wars that have afflicted the region nor on the tragedy that has been caused by continued Israeli aggression against the peaceful Palestinian people, both within and outside their country—although we Lebanese are in the best position to speak of such things, for, like our Palestinian brothers, we continue to pay with our blood and the destruction in the southern part of our battered country.

171. How long will the international will remain paralysed, when the conscience of the world is awakening more and more each day? How long will Israel continue its aggression and defiance?

172. The question of the Middle East is not insoluble. For our part, we are for peace—a comprehensive, just and lasting peace. The elements of such a peace are there; the General Assembly and the Security Council have incorporated them in many successive resolutions that complement each other. Among the most important elements are the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by the use of force, the necessity for Israel's withdrawal from all the territories occupied during the 1967 war, and the exercise by the Palestinian people of its right to self-determination and to return to its homeland.

173. We are convinced that another element must be added to the ones I have just mentioned—an element resulting from a free decision by the Palestinians to establish an independent State on their territory.

174. Any settlement must be based on those elements, and on the Charter and the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, and must have the participation of the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

175. Peace in the region must be a Palestinian peace, because the very essence of the problem is the Palestinian question. In southern Lebanon many years ago Israel contrived to bring about a new problem, and that is why peace must have a twofold aspect: it must be a Palestinian peace and a Lebanese peace. That is why it is necessary to restore peace in both parts of the area.

176. To paralyse the will of the international community is doubly dangerous, because the international community may find itself confronted with a new problem, like the one in southern Lebanon, which could disrupt the entire region and endanger international peace and security.

177. The elements of peace in southern Lebanon may be found in Security Council resolutions 425 (1978) and 450 (1979). The question of southern Lebanon was introduced clearly and frankly by the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lebanon in his statement to the General Assembly on 4 October 1979 [21st meeting]. That is why there is no need for me to go into detail on this question. I shall confine myself to the statement that the primary element in a settlement of the problem is the need to restore full Lebanese sovereignty over southern Lebanon up to the international boundaries.

178. This cannot be achieved unless Israel's continuing attacks upon Lebanon are stopped, the role of the United Nations Forces in the south is strengthened and the major Powers support the United Nations in an effort to secure the implementation of its resolutions and initiatives.

179. Lebanon is well aware of its responsibilities and does not intend to shirk them. It knows that the international community and the major Powers can ill afford not to discharge fully all their responsibilities. Lebanon is also well aware of the fact that support for the Lebanese Government from the international community and the major Powers is necessary, just as is collective support given by the Arab countries at the Tenth Arab Summit Conference, held at Tunis from 20 to 22 November.⁹ The Secretary-General of the League of

Arab States, in his address to the General Assembly last week [84th meeting], made reference to that Summit Conference.

180. The Arab Summit Conference at Tunis proclaimed support for the Lebanese Government in all areas of international affairs and laid special stress on full Lebanese sovereignty over its entire territory and on the need to preserve its independence and national unity and to restore the sovereignty of the State of Lebanon in the southern area. That Conference expressed support for the Lebanese Government's efforts to deploy the Lebanese army throughout the southern part of the country in an effort to discharge its national responsibility, and it appealed to all countries to facilitate that task.

181. The Arab Summit Conference at Tunis also reaffirmed its opposition to any attempt to extend in any manner hegemony in southern Lebanon. It also appealed to the PLO to refrain from any military action on Lebanese territory or from Lebanon on the occupied territories.

182. Thus it was that the way was paved for a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement to the problem of the Middle East and Lebanon. Those elements are accepted by the overwhelming majority of the peoples of the world. But is there truly a desire to restore peace—because the elements of such a peace exist—or will United Nations resolutions remain dead letters for one more year, while the blood of innocent victims continues to flow in southern Lebanon and in Palestine?

183. Mr. SUWONDO (Indonesia): Once again the General Assembly is engaged in a debate on the situation in the Middle East in our continuing efforts to find a peaceful solution. It has long been recognized that the situation in that region is of universal concern, and the United Nations involvement in the conflict for more than three decades has been directed towards achieving such a solution. The conflict hinges on denial of the Palestinian people's inalienable national rights and the need to recognize their legitimate representative, the PLO, without whose participation on an equal footing in any negotiations there can be no meaningful progress. Acceptance of those fundamental factors could lead expeditiously to a peaceful settlement.

184. In our view there are three basic requirements for a just and durable peace settlement in the Middle East: first, unconditional Israeli withdrawal from all territories occupied since 1967; secondly, recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to establish a national State; and, thirdly, recognition of the right of all the peoples and States of the region to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

185. Yet another aspect concerns the question of the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem, which must be restored to Arab custody.

186. The reasons behind what the Secretary-General has, in his report on this issue, called the unstable situation in the Middle East can only be attributed to Israel's persistent settlements policy, its refusal to withdraw from occupied territories and its failure to recognize the rights of the Palestinians. Its decision to permit Israelis to purchase privately owned Arab lands

⁹ For the Final Declaration see document A/34/763, annex.

underscores Arab apprehension concerning Israel's intention to opt for territorial ambition and not for peace. This policy is self-defeating, and Israel's acquisition of territory is a rejection of peace efforts. Such tactics not only violate international law but are also inconsistent with the efforts to achieve a comprehensive and durable peace.

187. Indonesia has therefore condemned the continued occupation of Arab territories and the expansionist nature of such occupation. I cannot help believing that even Israel does not harbour any illusions about the possibility of achieving a just and lasting peace in the area as long as its forces are still occupying Arab territories.

188. However, short-sighted perceptions about secure and recognized boundaries apparently prevail above sense, reason and long-term interests. No geographical borders are really secure given the level of sophistication armaments have reached. Really secure borders can in the long run be guaranteed not primarily by force of arms but by peace and goodwill. Only the return of all occupied Arab territories to their rightful owners will pave the way for such a situation, as a result of which peace will be ensured.

Mr. Mavrommatis (Cyprus), Vice-President, took the Chair.

189. Those who can clearly see facts as they are must be able to recognize that time is running out, that a peaceful and comprehensive solution of the Middle East problem must be found and, further, that the people of Palestine cannot wait forever for the United Nations to redress the injustice so long inflicted upon them. Peace in the Middle East is certainly in the interest of all parties concerned, and not least of Israel. If peaceful measures were to be exhausted, there would then inevitably be more determined efforts to redress injustice and humiliation. Israel would do well to heed the warning of the growing opposition of the Palestinian population to occupation. That was fully demonstrated by the resignation *en masse* of Arab mayors over the extraordinary action of ordering the deportation of an elected Arab mayor from his own community because of some words he used when questioned by the commander of an occupying force. That unprecedented act of solidarity has left the entire area deprived of municipal leaders and is bound to result in confrontation.

190. We earnestly hope that the leaders of Israel realize their grave responsibility and understand that time is working against them. Unfortunately, we must recognize the fact that far too many lost opportunities are now beginning to be counted. My delegation hopes that Israel will not let this opportunity pass and that it will take such decisions as would permit the initiation of a new era in the Middle East, an era marked by genuine and lasting peace. The peace process must therefore address itself to the central problem of the Palestinians and must lead to the liberation of the occupied lands. It is through this peace process that the peace and security of all the States in the region can be achieved.

191. We reaffirm that the question of Palestine is the core of the Middle East problem and that the solution of one without the other is not viable. The only realistic peace process is one that would take into consideration the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people, including the establishment of an independent State.

192. As the sole representative of the Palestinian people, the PLO cannot be expected to accept a negotiating framework that does not offer a just and comprehensive solution. Unless and until Israel implements the relevant United Nations resolutions, in particular those concerning withdrawal from occupied territories and the return of Jerusalem to Arab sovereignty, the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people will remain unfulfilled. The consequences for peace resulting from Israel's continued refusal to implement those resolutions must be clear to all.

193. In conclusion, we consider that there should be a further intensification of efforts on the part of our Organization to promote a speedy solution in order to establish just and lasting peace in a realistic and pragmatic manner. In our view there can be no just solution, unless it is based on the principles laid down in various resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

194. Mr. FERNANDO (Sri Lanka): Once more the debate on the situation in the Middle East is being resumed in the General Assembly. The temptation must be resisted of becoming cynical or apathetic about this exercise or of treating it as a routine matter. On the contrary, the very fact that the situation remains basically unchanged in its essential aspects—thereby posing the major impediment to the peaceful development and security of States in the region as well as a constant threat to international peace and security—should impel us to make a renewed endeavour towards a settlement. All efforts should be made within the United Nations and in particular in the Security Council to implement the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly.

195. Notwithstanding the shifting developments in the region, the root causes underlying the explosive situation remain basically unchanged. Everything stems primarily from the occupation by force of arms of Palestinian and Arab lands by Israel, its calculated refusal to recognize the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, and its deliberate strategy of denying and submerging those rights.

196. Even at the expense of being repetitive, Sri Lanka wishes to reaffirm briefly its position on the situation in the Middle East which we have consistently and unflinchingly upheld at all times.

197. First, we believe that the question of Palestine is the crux of the problem of the Middle East and the fundamental cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Peace cannot come to the Middle East unless the question of Palestine is settled. Partial or piecemeal solutions or agreements outside the framework of the United Nations, which ignore or exclude the Palestinian people of their sole legitimate representatives, the PLO, cannot lead to a just and lasting solution. As the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana from 3 to 9 September 1979 affirmed, "Peace must be all-embracing, include all the parties, eliminate all the causes of the conflict and be just" [see A/34/542, annex, sect. I, para. 102 (b)].

198. The Secretary-General in his report on the work of the Organization stated the following:

"A just and lasting peace in the Middle East can ultimately only be achieved through a comprehen-

sive settlement covering all aspects of the question, including in particular the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Evidently, all parties concerned must be involved.” [See A/34/1, sect. III.]

199. Secondly, a settlement in the Middle East is quite impossible and an uneasy situation of “no war, no peace” remains dangerously illusory, unless we ensure the total and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all territory occupied by force and the restoration to the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights, including their right of return and the right to national independence and sovereignty in Palestine.

200. Finally, all unilateral illegal measures taken by Israel in occupied territories, including the planning, construction and establishment of settlements and colonies and all other modifications designed to effect legal, political, cultural, religious, geographical or demographic changes, should be condemned and considered as having no legal validity. All these activities serve to entrench Israeli occupation, increase tensions and render any eventual settlement more complicated.

201. Unless the principles and conditions I have briefly outlined are fulfilled, a settlement of the Middle East problem will be quite impossible.

202. As a member of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, Sri Lanka is well acquainted with the activities whereby Israel maintains its hold over the people of the occupied areas. The recent expulsion of the Mayor of Nablus, which has been universally condemned, is one recent example of Israel’s attitude.

203. Sri Lanka has shown its solidarity with the Arab cause in practical ways. I will therefore conclude by reiterating unequivocally the unswerving commitment of the Government and people of Sri Lanka to the legitimate cause of the Arab people in their struggle for a just, equitable and lasting settlement of this complex problem.

204. Mrs. AHMED (Bangladesh): Our common goal is a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement in the Middle East. However, today that goal remains circumscribed, impeded and frustrated, affecting the credibility and viability of the world community of nations. It is no more and no less than a fundamental challenge to international law and the principles enshrined in the Charter, be they humanitarian or legal. As the Secretary-General has stated, in his report on the work of this Organization, regarding the crisis in the Middle East:

“There can be no doubt that this question is central to the political, economic and military stability of the world. As long as uncertainty, discord, frustration and violence prevail in the Middle East, the world will continue to live with a profoundly destabilizing element in its affairs and with a grave and continuing risk of future disaster.” [Ibid.]

205. For over three decades the United Nations has grappled with the Middle East problem, seeking to cure what it has itself failed to prevent—the virtual imposition of an alien people on the Arab world. In the result-

ing turmoil, the search for peace has remained as elusive and ephemeral as a mirage in that part of the world.

206. It is now universally recognized that the central core of the problem, the cause and essence of the Middle East question, is the question of the legitimate rights and aspirations of the Palestinian people. The heart of the matter is simple: a people deprived of their birth-right, dispossessed of their lands, forcibly uprooted by aliens and the victims of Diaspora for over three decades demand the correction of a monumental injustice. In its essence it is a political problem—the struggle of people for their right to self-determination and the achievement of their inalienable national rights. However, this reality was deliberately obscured by treating the problem not on a political but on a humanitarian plane.

207. For 30 years that unrealistic approach was deliberately pursued, despite two important General Assembly resolutions: resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947, which contains the Partition Plan for Palestine, and resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948, which established the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine and recognized the right of the Palestinian refugees wishing to return to their homes and live in peace with their neighbours to do so, or to be justly compensated if they chose not to return. Since then the rights of the Palestinians have been ignored, their existence as an entity denied and their status as a people obliterated. They have been instead, in disregard of all norms of human rights, treated with the indignity of hapless refugees.

208. After 30 years of diffused piecemeal deliberations, the General Assembly in 1974 finally dealt with the question in its totality, encompassing all aspects, historical, political and juridical. Thus the Assembly, by its resolutions over six years, unambiguously spelled out the essential parameters for a just and equitable settlement of the Middle East problem, namely, recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty, and to return to their homes and property from which they had been forcibly uprooted; the integral right of the Palestinian people to present their own case and participate in any peace negotiations through their own legitimate representative, the PLO, which has already secured such specific recognition as full membership of among the 95 members of the non-aligned Conference, the Islamic Conference and the League of Arab States and, by General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX), the status of Permanent Observer to the United Nations.

209. The second basic imperative for a permanent peace settlement revolves around the question of the occupied Arab territories. Israel’s continued presence in those lands is untenable. It is essentially a *de facto* and illegal situation, based on the unacceptable premise of occupation by conquest. But the real danger has increased apace; it is the undisguised and deliberate attempt by Israel to secure in perpetuity the fruits of its aggression. This is the true content of Israel’s “homeland” doctrine, the true measure of the Zionist dream of *Eretz Israel*, and the goal of its insistence on so-called secure and defensible borders.

210. Apart from so-called security considerations and newly established claims of legitimacy derived from

ancient Biblical history, Israel has propounded a new mystical justification for its claims on Palestine. We are told in all solemnity that the Jewish people and the State of Israel have the right in principle, as well as in law and in terms of national security, to a permanent presence in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District. The inseparable bond between the Jewish people and its homeland, *Eretz Israel*, is an integral part of world history, inextricably entwined in the cultural heritage of mankind. No amount of distortion and fabrication at the United Nations could undo so central a fact of the political, spiritual, cultural and religious history of the world.

211. Such an assertion is a travesty of law and principles and a distortion of history. The Palestinian people have had an uninterrupted presence in those lands for over three millennia. They cannot be wished away or reduced to the limbo of non-people by the force of armed might and the so-called spiritual ties between the Jewish people and the land of Israel. Any recognition given to any of those premises would have serious consequences in international law. They constitute dangerous precedents, which would nullify the fundamental injunctions of the Charter prohibiting the aggressor from enjoying the fruits of aggression.

212. The measures now being taken by the occupying Power no longer appear to be even remotely relevant to security considerations; they are pointedly directed towards a larger premeditated design, a deliberate policy of encroachment, of annexation. Proof of that policy is the encouragement, sanction and urgency given to the establishment of settlements—the main vehicle for expansionism and latter-day colonialism.

213. Evidence of Israel's policy of creeping annexation is ample and well documented, even by world media sources sympathetic to Israel. More specifically, special committees established by the General Assembly in the past—and only this year the Security Council Commission established under its resolution 446 (1979)—have vindicated the truth and substance of Israel's aggrandizement. Today Israel cannot deny that it is engaged in a wilful, systematic and large-scale process of establishing settlements; that some of those settlements are on privately owned land, as amply demonstrated by the rulings of its own high courts; that they are not for security purposes only but also for gainful and permanent agricultural use; that there is a distinct correlation between the emplacement of Jewish settlers and the displacement of Arab populations. Nor can Israel deny that those aims are being secured at the direct cost of the indigenous inhabitants, by violating their basic human rights and depriving them of their natural resources, particularly the scarce water resources.

214. The conclusions of the Security Council Commission established under resolution 446 (1979) represent a telling indictment against Israel, scarcely diminished by Israel's adamant refusal to co-operate with the Commission. The Commission held that the pattern of the settlement policy was causing profound and irreversible changes of a geographical and demographic nature in those territories, including Jerusalem, and that those changes constituted a violation of the fourth Geneva Convention¹⁰ as well as of numerous resolutions of the United Nations. The adverse implications for a just and over-all peace in the region are also

inescapable. The Commission unequivocally reaffirmed the determination of the Security Council in its resolution 446 (1979), that:

“the policy and practices of Israel in establishing settlements in the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967 have no legal validity and constitute a serious obstruction to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East”.

215. The third intrinsic element for any comprehensive programme for peace is the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem. The Security Council itself has adopted several decisions and resolutions on that question since 1967. The Israeli contention that “Jerusalem, one undivided and indivisible, still remains forever the capital of Israel and the Jewish people” cannot obscure the military conquest of Jerusalem and the basic violation of international law. The Security Council has repeatedly laid down that all legislative and administrative measures taken by Israel, including expropriation of land and properties thereon and transfer of population, which tend to change the legal status of the city were invalid and could not change that status. It has urgently reiterated its call on Israel to rescind such measures and to desist forthwith from any further action which tended to change the status of Jerusalem. The Council further recognized that any act of profanation of the Holy Places and religious buildings and sites, or any encouragement of or connivance at such acts might endanger peace and security. Though the call of the Council has been unequivocal and unambiguous, Israel's response has been one of rejection and defiance.

216. Jerusalem symbolizes the most cherished sensibilities of three great religions around the globe. This is as much a religious as a political fact of crucial significance. Those Holy Places, their preservation from desecration and despoilment and their accessibility without hindrance to pilgrims from all over the globe constitute a fundamental charge in the evolution of a just settlement in the Middle East.

217. Bangladesh condemns the continuation of Israel's military occupation and systematic deprivation of the national rights of the Arab population. We reject Israeli measures to Judaize and absorb those Arab territories by insidious accretion. Israel's semantic duplicity has been exposed. Co-existence with Arabs is a recognized euphemism for Jewish domination. Armed subjugation cannot assume the mantle of a war of liberation, nor can so-called defence requirements be arbitrarily converted as justification for annexation.

218. The position of Bangladesh on the Middle East question is unequivocal. It is based not only on expediency or solidarity but on our firm commitment to the principles of the United Nations Charter and international law. It need hardly be reiterated that the essential components for a just and lasting peace remain that of a complete Israeli withdrawal from all Arab territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, occupied since 1967; the restoration of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to their own independent State; and the acceptance of the PLO as

¹⁰ Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949 (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973, p. 287).

the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. We believe that independent moves towards a so-called comprehensive settlement which circumvent the central issue of the Middle East conflict—the implementation of the national rights of the Palestinian people—are tantamount to inviting violence and condoning illegality.

219. In that regard we have noted that the Secretary-General himself has suggested more than once that an international conference, properly prepared, might well provide a way out of the present dangerous situation.

220. The Assembly must take action beyond mere reaffirmation of its past resolutions. It must move forward to the realization of the basic elements of a just and lasting peace. Bangladesh remains committed to peace, but to a peace that is just and enduring, in the interests of the peoples of the region and of the world as a whole.

221. Mr. SAHLOUL (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Once again we have to deal with a situation similar to the one which prevailed during the previous session in relation to the question of the Middle East, because that region is still required to cope with the same problems it has been suffering from since the establishment of the Zionist State in that region in 1948. The situation was dangerously aggravated after that State perpetrated its notorious aggression of 1967, in which it occupied extensive tracts of Palestinian land and the land of other Arab States, equivalent to four times the area it occupied at its creation.

222. The Middle East saw a bloody war in 1973, resulting from the continuation and intensification of the Israeli aggression in the region and the determination of Israel to expel the Arab inhabitants from the occupied Arab territories and to create settlements there to resettle Jews coming from the four corners of the world.

223. In view of that situation the region has always suffered from instability, and has always lived under the threat of conflagration and confrontation. That has caused the international community to increase the international security forces that have been mobilized in the Middle East as a means of separating Israel from the neighbouring Arab States. Of course the units that are most active there, in pursuance of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, are the units serving in southern Lebanon. Those forces have been in that region since the withdrawal of the Israeli troops from southern Lebanon in 1978. The purpose of the presence of those troops in southern Lebanon was to establish Lebanese legitimacy over Lebanese territory, but Israel did not submit to United Nations resolutions which stipulate the need for its total and complete withdrawal from the region. Israel on the contrary has resorted to replacing in the border region military entities which are taking their orders from Israel and those elements are trying to impose their domination over what is now called the border zone. The situation still persists and international troops were even on a number of occasions subjected to aggression by those armed bands supported by Israel; human and material losses have resulted.

224. The United Nations was unable, throughout the whole period, to remedy the situation so as to enable

the Lebanese forces to impose their total control over those territories taken as a result of those manoeuvres by Israel and its accomplices.

225. The situation in the Golan Heights in Syria has been unchanged since Israel occupied that region in the war of 1967. The United Nations has continued to conduct control and inspection activities in the areas separating Syrian troops and the Israeli aggression forces. Israel has exploited the stalemate in order to create a larger number of settlements in the area and to impose a fait accompli in this region which is considered essentially Syrian territory, thereby ignoring the elementary principles of international law.

226. The immoral practices of Israel in occupied Arab territories have continued since that time, despite numerous condemnations and denunciations by the international community. At its previous session, the Assembly reaffirmed in resolution 33/113 A that the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War applies to all Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. It also indicated in its resolution 33/113 B that all measures adopted by Israel to alter the physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure or status of occupied Arab territories are null and void and also contrary to law and universal custom. In contravention of numerous resolutions, Israel continues its senseless policy and continues to practise the most horrendous forms of oppression and inhuman treatment with respect to the inhabitants of the occupied territories.

227. The Commission on Human Rights has given special priority to the question of the violation of human rights of the populations of occupied Arab lands and has clearly denounced in its resolutions 1 A and B (XXXV)¹¹ the policy of Israel in this regard. The Assembly has also denounced that Israeli policy, as has the Security Council in its resolutions 446 (1979) and 452 (1979), stating that those policies are illegal and run counter to international law. Despite all this, the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories [A/34/631] draws attention to the extent of such practices against the inhabitants of these territories, and describes the poor living, and psychological, conditions in which they live under occupation.

228. Those inhuman conditions apply not only to inhabitants of occupied territories but to the Palestinian refugees who live in camps and who suffer the bombings and savage raids continually carried out by Israel. All this is part of the attempt by Israel to liquidate the Palestinians. The cause of the Palestinian refugees has acquired dangerous proportions as a result of Israel's refusal to repatriate these refugees and its unwillingness to give them their right to return to their homes.

229. We have stated, as have numerous others before us and, doubtless as will the majority of delegations, that the Palestinian problem is the core and essence of the Middle East problem. As long as this problem is unsolved, the Middle Eastern region and the world as a whole will be under the threat of war and conflagration at any moment. The international community has a

¹¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, 1979, Supplement No. 6 (E/1979/36-E/CN.4/1347)*, chap. XXIV.

duty to find a just and lasting solution to the problem of the Palestinian people—a solution which should guarantee to those people all their legitimate rights, including their right to return to their territory, which was unjustly snatched from them as a result of aggression. I also refer to their right to self-determination and to the establishment of an independent State on their own territory in whatever way they find appropriate. A just solution of the Palestinian problem can never be found without the participation of the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinians throughout the world.

230. Facts have proved, since the latest events in the Middle Eastern region, that any just and lasting solution to the Middle Eastern problem must be comprehensive and that the question cannot be fragmented. For this reason there is no justification whatever for concentrating efforts to solve the problem by means of partial and isolated solutions—particularly if those efforts do not go to the heart of the matter, namely the Palestinian cause, and if such efforts are limited to certain parties without the participation of all the other essential parties. Agreements based on partial solutions will not survive for long if the other problems in the Middle East remain unresolved. Collective Arab action is the sole means of imposing the will of the Arab nation. It is also an effective means of liberating all occupied Arab territories, so that no part of those territories will remain occupied and so that no national sovereignty will be infringed. The participation of the international community in these efforts could also put an end to the manoeuvres of Israel and of those who support it and who are trying to gain time in order to change the status of the occupied territories and to create settlements therein, thus presenting the international community with a fait accompli which would be playing into the hands of world Zionism.

231. On that basis the Sudan wishes to reaffirm its

commitment to the resolutions adopted at the successive Arab Summit Conferences, the last of which were adopted at Tunis. They clearly demonstrated true Arab unanimity by means of a comprehensive solution that would view the Palestinian question as the heart of the Middle Eastern problem. That being the case, the Sudan believes that no unilateral approach to the Middle Eastern problem, in particular, of the Arab-Zionist conflict, in general, will achieve these objectives; on the contrary, it would be an obstacle to the efforts of the international community and the concerned parties to isolate the Zionist State and induce it to comply with the will of the international community for a just and comprehensive solution.

232. The recent events in southern Lebanon and Israel's persistence in creating new settlements in the occupied Arab territories and its raids on Palestine refugee camps serve to confirm that Israel has exploited the occupation and the military situation in the area to do as it pleases, to serve its own interests and to block any effort at the present time within the framework of the United Nations, and any future efforts, in order to gain time, knowing full well that those efforts will not have the whole-hearted support of certain parties who could effectively influence the situation in the area while resorting to partial and separate solutions.

233. That is why we believe that it is time to resort to collective Arab action to establish a just and comprehensive solution in the region within the framework of the United Nations and with the participation of all the parties concerned, including first of all the PLO as the sole authentic representative of the Palestinian people in occupied Palestinian territory and elsewhere. We hope that that will be the belief of the majority of the members of the Assembly.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.