



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 25: The situation in the Middle East: report of the Secretary- General (continued)	1595

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. AMINI (Comoros): For two weeks now the General Assembly has been considering two very important issues concerning world peace and security, which for the last 30 years have been discussed in this Organization in one form or another. The question of Palestine and the question of the Middle East are interwoven; they form an integral whole, and neither can be settled in isolation from the other.

2. Four great wars between the Arabs and the Zionist entity in Palestine have been fought since 1948. Four times in 31 years world peace and security have been threatened in the Middle East, and unfortunately that part of the world is still far from enjoying peaceful coexistence. Only God and Israel know when the people of that region will be able to live in peace and security. I say that because the only party to this conflict which is still adamant in keeping the region explosive is Israel.

3. Since the six-day war of June 1967 the Arabs have shown their willingness to see peaceful coexistence with the Zionist entity in Palestine, within its 1948 boundaries, by tacitly recognizing the existence of the Israeli State, which they had categorically denied earlier on. Proof of that is given by the tacit acceptance of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) by those Arab countries which are directly involved in the conflict.

4. This positive attitude shown by the Arabs, which could have led to a just settlement of the Middle East problem but for the persistently unreasonable and negative attitude of the Zionists in Palestine, was and is very much appreciated internationally by the peace-loving people.

5. The world has welcomed and shown its appreciation of the positive Arab attitude concerning the establishment of a lasting peace in the Middle East, and condemned Israel's negative attitude in 1973 before and after the 6 October war by the wide-scale breaking off of diplomatic relations with the Zionist entity in Palestine. Another solid proof of that appreciation is also given by the fact that at this session of the General Assembly we notice ever-increasing sympathy for the Arab cause, and in particular for the Palestinian people, and great

disapprobation of the stubborn, uncompromising attitude of Israel. This was again borne out by various statements made by practically all the speakers in the general debate at this session and by those who took part in last week's debate on the question of Palestine.

6. Before the 1967 war it would have been impossible for all States Members of this Organization to have declared clearly in their statements the necessity for the creation of a Palestinian State, but this year, to my delegation's great pleasure, we have observed the recognition by all States, even those very close to Israel, of the rights of the Palestinian people, and particularly of its right to a State of its own in Palestine. The only delegation which has a contrary view on the subject is of course the Israeli delegation. Israel, with its imperialist and expansionist aims, is determined to thwart and undermine the efforts of the Palestinian people to exercise its inalienable rights, calling its liberation movement, the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO], an organization of terrorists and trying vainly to arouse international opinion against it.

7. Is it not paradoxical that the representative of Israel in his statement on the question of Palestine [78th meeting] should tell us that the Zionist movement, which in 1947 was harassing and killing innocent Arab landowners in Palestine, was a movement of national liberation, and that the heroic Palestinian liberation movement, which is struggling to recover its land occupied by force, is a terrorist organization? What bluff that is!

8. Let the representative of Israel bear in mind that making that type of statement is a useless and futile exercise, because the world has come to realize that the PLO is not a terrorist organization, and that is why the world supports it in its courageous struggle.

9. My delegation was very much shocked by the audacity demonstrated by the Israeli representative when he explained his vote on resolutions 34/65 A and B on the question of Palestine [83rd meeting, paras. 51-56]. To insinuate that representatives in this Assembly have been bought by Arab petro dollars and that they vote unconditionally with the Arabs is unpardonable. We must logically conclude that the worthy representative of Israel is therefore suggesting that in 1948 the representatives who were present in the Assembly then were bought by Zionist money when they voted in favour of Israel's admission into this great Organization, which sanctioned the existence of a Zionist Israeli State in Palestine, notwithstanding the wishes of the Arab owners of that land.

10. The delegation of the Federal and Islamic Republic of the Comoros supports the Palestinians and will continue to support them as long as they are struggling for their inalienable rights; further, we condemn and shall continue to condemn Israel as long as it strives to

oppose and suppress the Palestinians and prevent them from exercising their rights.

11. Let it be clear to Begin's Government of Israel that the cause of the 1948, 1967 and 1973 wars in the Middle East between the Arabs and the Israelis was nothing but the need to find a just solution to the Palestinian problem, which is and has been the core of the Middle East problem. There can be no peace in the region, and no peace for Israel, as long as the question of Palestine is not settled to the satisfaction of the Palestinian people.

12. My delegation is convinced that a solution to the Middle East problem can only be found if Israel can be forced to comply with the United Nations resolutions concerning the Palestinian problem; we further believe that the just, lasting and comprehensive settlement to the achievement of which we are all committed must be based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and on the following principles. First, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, which means the complete withdrawal by Israel from all the Palestinian and other Arab territories—without exception—occupied after the war of 6 June 1967, and includes the return of Jerusalem to its Arab owners. My delegation will not accept any fallacious historical arguments presented by the Zionists in their aim to annex the Holy City of Arab Jerusalem by force. Secondly, the recognition by Israel of the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, those rights being: the right to self-determination, to establish an independent State in Palestine in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX); the right to return to its homeland and property, which implies that all measures adopted by Israel in the Palestinian and other Arab territories since their occupation, including the establishment of colonies or settlements in those territories—the immediate dismantlement of which is a prerequisite for the solution of the problem—are illegal, null and void; and the right to play its full part in the negotiation of a comprehensive settlement through its representative, the PLO.

13. In conclusion, the delegation of the Federal and Islamic Republic of the Comoros would like to express its great anxiety at what Zionist Israel is doing to Lebanon, a sister State. My delegation, on behalf of our head of State, President Ahmed Abdallah, wishes to affirm its support for Lebanon and its people, its independence and its sovereignty, and strongly to condemn Israel for its raids and its continued aggression against southern Lebanon.

14. Mrs. HEANEY (Ireland): The nine member States of the European Community, on whose behalf I speak today, give high priority to consideration of the urgent and complex problems of the Middle East, a region with which Europe has always had close ties.

15. The Secretary-General's report [A/34/584-S/13578] indicates the range of those problems. The nine members state their position in detail on specific aspects under the appropriate agenda items and have, for example, most recently focused on the question of Palestine [81st meeting, paras. 209-220]. Since that problem is inseparable from other aspects of the situation in the Middle East, what we said on 28 November is also relevant in the present context.

16. In his speech this year in the general debate [8th meeting, paras. 1-72], Mr. Michael O'Kennedy, the Foreign Minister of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the nine member States of the European Community, devoted particular attention to the Middle East. He spoke then of the continuing hope of the Community countries that it will be possible to achieve in the Middle East the just, lasting and comprehensive settlement to which this Assembly is committed. The nine members continue to believe that such a settlement must be based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), applied in all their parts and on all fronts. It should also be based on the principles set out by the nine members in their Declaration of 29 June 1977¹ and on several occasions subsequently, most recently last week in the course of our statement on the question of Palestine.

17. Among major developments this year was the signature in March of agreements between Egypt and Israel.² In their declaration of 26 March 1979 the nine Governments stated their position on those agreements.³ Since the signing of those agreements, which the nine European countries see as a correct application of the principles of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) as far as Egyptian-Israeli relations are concerned, there has been progress towards improved relations between Egypt and Israel and there have been withdrawals of Israeli forces from the Sinai. The nine countries note those recent developments and recall that one of the basic requirements of a comprehensive settlement is an end to the territorial occupation which Israel has maintained since the conflict of 1967.

18. The nine members of the European Community view with the greatest regret any action or statement which aggravates the present situation or places an obstacle in the way of a peace settlement. Accordingly, they strongly deplore acts of violence or provocation by any of those involved.

19. The nine members are also opposed to the Israeli Government's policy of establishing settlements in occupied territories in contravention of international law; and they cannot accept claims by Israel to sovereignty over occupied territories, since this would be incompatible with Security Council resolution 242 (1967). The security of Israel, which the nine members consider essential, can be guaranteed, and the legitimate rights of the Palestinians given effect, within the framework of a comprehensive settlement.

20. The nine members are fully aware, too, of the importance of the question of Jerusalem to all parties. They know that an acceptable solution to this problem will be vital to an over-all settlement on the basis I have indicated. They consider, in particular, that any agreement on the future status of Jerusalem should guarantee free access by all to the Holy Places; and they do not accept any unilateral moves which claim to change the status of the city.

21. The situation in Lebanon clearly forms part of the

¹ Declaration on the Middle East, adopted by the Heads of State or Government of the European Communities at the meeting of the European Council in London. See *European Parliament Bulletin*, No. 22/77 (15 July 1977), pp. 3-4.

² Peace Treaty between the Arab Republic of Egypt and the State of Israel, signed at Washington on 26 March 1979.

³ See *Bulletin of the European Communities*, March 1979, point 2.2.74.

wider problem of the Middle East. Once more, the Community countries reaffirm their statement made at Dublin on 11 September 1979⁴ in which they expressed their support for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon. In this context, we commend the courageous efforts of the Government of Lebanon in promoting the restoration of its authority over its entire territory. However, despite these efforts by the Lebanese Government, violence has continued to plague Lebanon, and particularly the southern part of the country. The nine countries recognize that there has been some improvement in the situation, particularly in the south. None the less, incidents continue to occur, with the attendant risk of aggravated and extended hostilities.

22. The nine members fully support UNIFIL in its difficult role in that area. Indeed, many members of the European Community have contributed to UNIFIL, both in terms of troops and in terms of logistic and other support. We are particularly concerned by the constant harassment of UNIFIL and by difficulties placed in its way as it attempts to fulfil its mandate. This situation is reflected in paragraph 16 of the Secretary-General's report [A/34/584-S/13578]. The countries of the European Community are disturbed about the military and financial aid provided from outside Lebanon to unauthorized forces. We find it unacceptable that certain parties have consistently failed to give full support to UNIFIL and to the decisions of the Security Council.

23. We take this opportunity to renew our solemn and urgent appeal to all countries and parties concerned to refrain from all acts likely to infringe on the integrity of Lebanon and the authority of its Government, to respect the decisions of the Security Council and to give full support to UNIFIL. The nine European countries are ready to support any action or initiative aimed at ensuring a return to peace and stability in Lebanon, since that remains an essential factor for the equilibrium of the region.

24. On behalf of the nine member States of the European Community, I express our appreciation for the Secretary-General's report and note with satisfaction that he is maintaining his contacts with all concerned on all matters relating to the Middle East.

25. In conclusion, I assure the General Assembly that the nine Community members will continue to follow the situation closely and will seek in every way they can to advance the aim of a comprehensive and lasting peace settlement involving all parties and dealing with all the fundamental issues. Equally, we appreciate any attempt to play a constructive role in the search for an over-all settlement and hope that the debate on the Middle East will have a positive outcome.

26. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Last week the General Assembly debated at length the Arab-Israel conflict under a different agenda item. It is common knowledge that attempts have been made in the past, and were again made this year, to combine these two items for the sake of rationalization and efficiency. But certain Arab States resisted this long overdue change in the Assembly's agenda. The reason for their refusal is patently obvious. Bent on inflating the Arab-Israel conflict out of all proportion, they have encumbered it and the Assem-

bly with an excessive number of perennial resolutions, special reports, special missions, special committees, special units, not to mention UNRWA, a special agency set up in 1950 specially to deal with part of the conflict, and a series of United Nations peace-keeping forces which have had to be created in the wake of repeated Arab aggression against Israel as well as Arab refusal to negotiate peace with Israel.

27. The agenda item before us today, "The situation in the Middle East", is being misused by Israel's adversaries simply as yet another opportunity to wage their relentless political warfare against Israel. It is a fact that "The situation in the Middle East", in the proper sense of the term, is indeed worthy of the Assembly's attention. The Middle East is inherently volatile. The region is riddled, racked and rent with a series of conflicts.

28. Some of these conflicts began as purely internal affairs of one Arab State and then were rapidly exploited as pretexts for foreign intervention by other Arab States. Some conflicts are inter-Arab in character, where one Arab State is pitted against another. Still others involve Arab States and their African and western Asian neighbours. Ethnic, religious and social conflicts erupt with worrisome frequency throughout the region with potentially serious regional, and even global, repercussions. Very rarely do these issues find an echo in the United Nations. Instead, the Arab States prefer in public to paper over their divisions in a questionable display of unity and with diversionary intent. When holy places are attacked by what the Government of the country concerned has identified as local elements, the howl is raised grotesquely of a "Zionist plot".

29. There is little, if any, correlation between the realities in the Middle East and the way they are presented here. The internal problems of certain Arab States and the inter-Arab rivalries for leadership roles in the area cause one Arab State to try to outdo the next in the degree of their extremism. This process sets up a vicious and spiralling circle, whose only effect is to inflame, and to inflate the intensity of, the Arab-Israel conflict.

30. It certainly goes nowhere to solve the other manifold problems of the region. Although the United Nations churns out year after year an endless series of resolutions on the Palestinian Arabs, at the same time it turns a blind eye to the fate of hundreds of millions of persecuted and oppressed people in Africa, Asia and elsewhere in the world. But since we are required to discuss here again the Arab-Israel conflict, rather than the situation in the Middle East as a whole, it would be unpardonable to leave it to the rejectionist Arab bloc and their ilk, to allow their oratory to go unchallenged or to give them free rein to blur the basic truths of the situation.

31. As is well known, the roots of the Arab-Israel conflict are embedded in the refusal of the Arab world to come to terms with the restoration of the independence and sovereignty of the Jewish people in its homeland. The refusal of the Arab world to countenance a Jewish presence on any part of the territory of the former Palestine Mandate preceded the establishment of the State of Israel by many decades. These extremist and exclusivist attitudes took hold long before there

⁴ *Ibid.*, September 1979, point 2.2.55.

was a single Palestinian Arab refugee, and before territorial questions arose between Israel and its neighbours. Indeed, those questions arose as a result of four wars of aggression unleashed by the Arab States during the last 30 years in an attempt first to prevent the re-establishment of the State of Israel and then to destroy it once it was established.

32. However, not everything is entirely dark on the Middle East horizon. Over the past year, we have witnessed the historic breakthrough of the first ever Israel-Arab peace treaty. Egypt and Israel are now well embarked on the road towards fully normalizing their relationships and to establishing peace and co-operation. The conclusion of a peace treaty between Israel and Egypt is the first major step towards bringing an over-all settlement to our troubled region. We are, moreover, convinced that the example set by our two countries will be followed by other nations.

33. The road to peace, however, is not an easy one. There are Arab States, especially those which have never directly borne the brunt of the military confrontation with Israel, as well as terrorist groups operating in the service of those States, which consider that the continuation—or, rather, the perpetuation—of the war against Israel serves them better when vying for positions in the inter-Arab arena. Besides that, they fear that, in the absence of war, all justification for their policies and sometimes even for their very existence or for the benefits that they reap from the conflict will evaporate and be lost. Consequently, as peace draws closer, the warmongers can be expected to pursue their activities with even greater fervour and zeal.

34. Had the United Nations encouraged the Arab States concerned to live up to their obligations under the Charter, this conflict could have been resolved peacefully long ago through dialogue and negotiation. However, as regards the Arab-Israel conflict, this Organization is dominated today by a group of rejectionist Arab States and their allies beyond the Arab world determined to oppose by all means any move towards peace with Israel. The rejectionists are bent on encouraging strife instead of accord, intransigence instead of compromise, extremism instead of accommodation, and conflict instead of concord. The rejectionist Arab States in effect declared war on peace in the Middle East on 29 May of this year. On that day, the then Chairman of the Arab group sent a letter to the Secretary-General stating that they were opposed

“ . . . to any direct or indirect action which any principal or subsidiary organ of the United Nations, including the Security Council, may take which would either confer any legitimacy whatsoever or be interpreted to grant recognition, express or implied, to the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty.” [See A/34/284-S/13354.]

That document has been circulated *inter alia* under the present agenda item. The bloc of Arab States concerned has buttressed that bellicose document with a series of others in similar vein and, as became evident during the earlier part of this session, they mean precisely what they say.

35. Only last week a resolution was adopted by this Assembly, resolution 34/65 B, which is yet another crude attempt to hamper the progress of the only constructive, practical and ongoing process that has taken

place in the Arab-Israel conflict for over three decades. While paying lip-service to the language of the United Nations Charter, it conspires, in essence, to turn the United Nations against its very *raison d'être*—prevention of war and promotion of peace. In other words, that resolution is in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and all it stands for. The resolution also completely contradicts the provisions of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) which, for reasons that are readily understandable, it refrains from mentioning. We have duly taken note of the fact that the majority of the Assembly determined that that resolution was not an important one, and we shall treat it accordingly.

36. In this Assembly, the rejectionist Arab States and their supporters beyond the Arab world are aided in the prolongation of the conflict by the arithmetical majority ever ready to endorse increasingly extreme resolutions dictated by militant Arab Governments and organizations. The policies of the rejectionist camp are implemented in a variety of ways, diplomatic, economic and military, but they are all part of one integral campaign.

37. The States concerned seek to undermine the peace process between Israel and Egypt by threatening to use oil as a weapon of “diplomatic” persuasion. The economic and diplomatic boycott to which the Arab States have attempted to subject Israel for the last 30 years has been extended to third parties and countries which trade with Israel or maintain diplomatic relations with it. Moreover, those States indulge in crude forms of blackmail and propaganda here in the United Nations.

38. Let me demonstrate how the policies of the rejectionist States and their tool, the terrorist PLO, translate themselves into concrete terms on the ground. There is perhaps no better example of this process than what has happened in Lebanon.

39. In Arab eyes, the situation there is apparently as follows. Everything in Lebanon north of the Litani River is blissful. Peace and quiet, sweetness and light reign everywhere. The Syrians and their army of occupation have long gone home to tend their fields and orchards. The PLO has restored Beirut to its rightful owners. Lebanese authority is fully re-established and honoured by all. In Beirut the barricades have long come down, the gutted streets have been rebuilt and the luxury hotels reopened. Even the casinos are back in full swing. By contrast, the situation in the marginal area south of the Litani River is radically different. Here, and only here, the scene is one of constant violence and bloodshed. The *dramatis personae* are presented as follows. On the one side there is the PLO—peace-loving, pastoral and innocent. Facing it, on the other side, are the “right-wing Christian militias”—“right-wing”, “Christian”, “militias”—in short, evil from top to bottom. Supporting those “right-wing Christian militias” are the biggest villains of them all: the Israelis—ever scheming, ever plotting, ever destructive, ever involved.

40. Frightful as this situation may be, it does, none the less, providentially lend itself to a quick and neat solution. Dismantle the “right-wing Christian militias” and stop the support from their Israeli allies, and the blissful tranquillity up north would automatically be extended to embrace the tormented south: it is as simple as that.

41. Our times may well be troubled and our age is perhaps the age of distorted truths and twisted facts. None the less, this version of the Lebanese crisis and its possible solution must surely be too much for most people to accept.

42. Ever since Lebanon achieved independence in 1946, the various régimes which have seized power in Damascus have not only refrained from extending diplomatic recognition to Lebanon, but have scarcely concealed their desire to swallow up that country into a "Greater Syria". In recent years that ambition has received renewed impetus because of Syria's desire to flank the Golan Heights and to gravitate towards Lebanon's border with Israel in order to acquire greater flexibility of operation for its armed forces in future attacks on Israel within the framework of the "eastern front" created by the rejectionist camp. These manoeuvres by Syria and the terrorist PLO were endorsed at the recent Tenth Arab Summit Conference, held at Tunis from 20 to 22 November 1979, where frantic Lebanese appeals for a modicum of respect for Lebanese sovereignty and territorial integrity in the south were trampled underfoot.

43. Indeed, perhaps the most ominous threat to peace in the Middle East is the rejectionists' "eastern front", combining the armed forces of Jordan, Syria, Iraq and Saudi Arabia. The vast quantities of the latest and most sophisticated weapons in the possession of these States will undoubtedly be augmented in time of war from the enormous arsenals available to them among the remaining rejectionist Arab States.

44. The Arab States today have 500,000 more men under arms than has the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] and three times the artillery of the combined NATO forces. They also have 3,000 more tanks and several hundred more combat aircraft than NATO. The "eastern front" alone—Syria, Iraq, Jordan and Saudi Arabia—is currently equivalent to NATO in manpower and tanks and already has twice as much artillery. In terms of air power, the Arab States by 1980 will equal the combined Warsaw Pact forces and will be double those of NATO or three times those of the People's Republic of China. In terms of ground forces, the Arab States today have almost as many tanks as and more artillery than the United States.

45. In fact, according to the 1979 *Yearbook* of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, Iraq has become the greatest importer of arms in the third world,⁵ having embarked since 1973 on the road of arms acquisition on a scale affordable only by countries which can barter oil for arms. The volume of *Military Balance 1978-1979*, published by the International Institute for Strategic Studies, records a 25 per cent increase in Iraq's military budget.⁶ A report in the *New York Times* of 4 March 1979 notes that Iraq has doubled its ground forces and air force. On top of all this, the ground-to-ground SCUD and FROG missiles in position in Iraq are capable of striking civilian centres in Israel from afar.

46. The arms build-up in Syria and Jordan has not lagged behind. Syria, for example, according to the

⁵ See *World Armaments and Disarmament, SIPRI Yearbook 1979* (London, Taylor & Francis Ltd, 1979), p. 182.

⁶ See *The Military Balance 1979-1980* (London, The International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1979), p. 97.

New York Times of 29 August 1979, has acquired 70 of the most advanced T-72 tanks from the Soviet Union. These tanks have not yet been supplied even to all the Warsaw Pact countries. Jordan, too, has doubled the number of its combat planes and expanded its armoured and mechanized forces.

47. The massive build-up of arms on the "eastern front" has been accompanied by a diplomatic offensive here at the United Nations to secure Judaea and Samaria as a forward base from which the rejectionist States and the PLO might be able to realize their dream, a war of annihilation against Israel.

48. In the light of past experience and present realities, Israel has no grounds for underestimating the real intentions of the rejectionist front or, what would be more foolhardy, for ignoring them. The threat to peace and to Israel's security is palpably real. The rejectionists make no secret of their intentions in repeated public statements and hostile manoeuvres. Despite this, some States which sit on the sidelines ask of Israel what no self-respecting sovereign State would ask of itself, namely, to expose its major centres of population to the immediate military threat of an implacable foe; to place, for example, its main international airport within easy reach of the simplest anti-aircraft missiles in the possession of hostile forces: in sum, to put at risk its own existence.

49. Israel cannot be expected to adopt such an ostrich-like approach to crisis situations involving its very existence. Because of that, Israel has opted for the more serious approach, reflected in the Camp David frameworks.⁷ These frameworks have proved themselves to be the only constructive way towards the achievement of peace in our region to have emerged in over 30 years.

50. The Israel-Egypt peace treaty is steadily being translated into facts on the ground. Israel has just completed the fifth successive redeployment of its troops in Sinai. Recently we turned Mount Sinai over to Egypt well ahead of the agreed schedule, as well as the valuable oil fields in the Gulf of Suez. Prime Minister Begin and President El-Sadat continue to meet on a regular basis. Undeterred by the rejectionists, the process of normalization between our two countries is also moving forward.

51. Moreover, while Arab States are engaged in verbal polemics here at the United Nations, Israeli and Egyptian committees are engaged in negotiations on the principle of full autonomy for a transitional period of five years for the Palestinian Arabs in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza district, to be exercised through a self-governing administrative council.

52. In parallel, the Camp David framework envisages a withdrawal of the Israeli military government and its civilian administration, to be followed by a redeployment of the remaining Israeli forces into specified security locations. It also envisages reaching an agreement on the final status of Judaea, Samaria and Gaza and the conclusion of a peace treaty between Israel and Jordan, in which the delimitation of boundaries between the two countries will be agreed. We

⁷ 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.

have every confidence that these negotiations will be concluded successfully, in accordance with the timetable laid down in the Camp David framework.

53. The Camp David framework for peace in the Middle East is based on and anchored in Security Council resolution 242 (1967). As that fundamental fact is often lost sight of, let me quote from the first paragraph of the framework. It states:

“The agreed basis for a peaceful settlement of the conflict between Israel and its neighbours is United Nations Security Council Resolution 242, in all its parts.”

It must be understood that any tampering with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) can only jeopardize the ongoing peace process. Any General Assembly document which makes partial and selective reference to Security Council resolution 242 (1967) is incompatible with the letter and spirit of that resolution. Similarly, any General Assembly resolution which ignores the rights of Israel while persistently favouring and serving the interests of its adversaries will be totally unproductive. For that is essentially the approach of the rejectionist Arabs who still deny the inalienable rights of the Jewish people to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty in its homeland.

54. The rejectionists have gradually harnessed the General Assembly to their aims and objectives. Thus, so many belligerent and one-sided resolutions have been adopted that they now constitute one of the major manifestations of opposition to a peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

55. By contrast, when President El-Sadat responded to the invitation extended to him by Prime Minister Begin to come to Jerusalem, things fell quickly into place and, despite a background of three decades of hostility, a framework for a comprehensive peace treaty in the Middle East was signed within 10 months and the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt was signed within 16 months, on 26 March of this year. By the yardstick of any major international conflict, these accomplishments have been achieved in a very short period of time.

56. The hysterical reaction of the rejectionist Arab States to the Egypt-Israel peace negotiations, to the Camp David framework and to the Israel-Egypt peace treaty that ensued therefrom, provides added proof, if such were needed, of what is the crux of the problem. It is no more and no less than the inability or unwillingness of the part of the rejectionists to come to terms with the existence of a Jewish State, irrespective of the territorial aspect of the question. Consequently they cannot bring themselves to acquiesce in the fact that an Arab State which was at war with Israel for three decades has now concluded a peace treaty with Israel and at the same time undertaken with Israel to work towards a comprehensive solution of other aspects of the Arab-Israel conflict.

57. By all precepts of international law and criteria of progress, the conclusion of a peace treaty and a determination to continue the peace process surely represent not only a legitimate but also a desirable and commendable position for two sovereign States to take. No third party or parties have the legal or moral authority

to question, let alone deny, the validity of the accords attained.

58. With regard to other regions and other international issues, the General Assembly has welcomed many other initial steps, primary agreements or partial progress, whether in the social, economic, political or security fields. Why is it that the historic breakthrough to peace embodied in the Camp David frameworks and the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty encounter so much hostility, prejudice and ill will?

59. The answer is clear. These agreements are incompatible with the avowed desire of the rejectionist Arab States and of their instrument, the terrorist PLO, to destroy Israel if not at one stroke, then by stages. They disrupt the belligerent schemes of the rejectionists. They do not suit the interests of their allies, some close and some more distant, who are eager to continue to profit by fishing in the troubled waters of the Middle East.

60. The draft resolutions that will be introduced on this item, like those that have been rolled off in recent years in what resembles more an assembly line than a General Assembly, divert us from discussing the true centres of unrest in the Middle East and also from pursuing the path of peace. They serve a purpose which can only be described as antithetical to the positive and practical way to peace on which Egypt and Israel have embarked. If this Assembly continues to give encouragement to the Arab rejectionist States and their pliant tool, the terrorist PLO, as well as to their supporters beyond the Middle East, the United Nations will regrettably go down in the annals of history as having performed a great disservice to the cause of peace.

61. The primary function of the United Nations is to promote peace in the international community. If the United Nations cannot do that in the present case, it should at least refrain from adopting resolutions that are against the peace.

62. Together with the Arab Republic of Egypt and the United States of America, we have set out along the high road that will lead us eventually to peace and normal relations between Israel and all its neighbours. After four wars in the span of 30 years, the people of Israel more than ever yearn for the attainment of peace and its blessings. They welcome the progress being made towards a new era of dialogue and reconciliation in the Middle East. Efforts to block that movement are doomed to failure, and the cause of peace will triumph.

63. Mr. HANDL (Czechoslovakia): At this session of the General Assembly the Middle East conflict again looms as a complicated set of unresolved problems. Their just and peaceful settlement is not only one of the most demanding tasks of current international politics but also a very important prerequisite of success with regard to the main objective of this Organization—that is, the safeguarding of durable peace and stability throughout the world.

64. The past year has reaffirmed the experience of many previous years that real progress in the elimination of the dangerous hotbed of tension in the Middle East can be achieved only on the basis of a comprehensive settlement, with the participation of all the parties concerned and respect for their vital interests.

65. In this period there has been a deadlock in the attempt to resolve the conflict by means of separate negotiations against the will of the Arab nations and outside the framework of the United Nations.

66. We have always been of the view that such separate negotiations on the Middle East, wherever they are held—whether in a tent on the 101-kilometre line, at Jerusalem, at Cairo or at Camp David—are at variance with the vital interests of the Arab nations. Since they have never tackled the issue comprehensively, especially with regard to the legitimate demands of the Arab Palestinian people, they can never lead to peace but only to continued instability.

Mr. Makeka (Lesotho), Vice-President, took the Chair.

67. Thus, the events of the past year have fully confirmed our position, expressed so many times from this rostrum. In fact, under the cloak of negotiations on the "peaceful process", and currently also on so-called administrative autonomy, the Israeli ruling circles have been stepping up their aggressive attacks against Lebanon, continuing their efforts to create conditions for the permanent annexation of the occupied Arab territories, and, from the point of view of our Organization, persisting in their refusal to observe the decisions and resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

68. Thus, Israeli policies themselves have clearly demonstrated that the separate agreements not only have not brought peace closer but, on the contrary, have made the situation even more complicated. It is useful to realize, in this connexion, that today we are further from a peaceful settlement in the Middle East than we were at the time of the well-known Soviet-American joint declaration of 1 October 1977.⁸

69. The Arab nations, and notably the Arab Palestinian people, recognized the real purpose of the tripartite talks and were able to form a joint platform rejecting the separate agreements. Czechoslovakia fully supports that position of the Arab countries and, together with them, speaks out unambiguously against any attempts to use the framework of the United Nations for the implementation of the Camp David objectives.

70. The time has come when world public opinion is becoming more and more aware of the essence of the conflict and of the necessity of finding a just solution to it. There is a growing number of delegations that are no longer willing to sit back and observe the false manoeuvres year after year, but are speaking out for a just and equitable solution of the Middle East issue and for the exertion of such pressure on the aggressor as would eventually force him to respect and observe the United Nations resolutions. In particular, the past months have been marked by the growth of international recognition of the PLO and by an increasing understanding of the necessity of implementing the inalienable rights of the Arab Palestinian people. World public opinion is tired of watching ever new diplomatic tricks by the Israeli ruling circles and their protectors. The debate at

this session of the General Assembly, as well as the activities of the Security Council throughout the year, bear out this development unequivocally.

71. The positions of the majority of the States Members of the United Nations have, after all, been clearly expressed also in the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the question of Palestine. Czechoslovakia has given its full support to these resolutions, in which the Assembly reaffirms that a just peace in the Middle East cannot be secured unless the key issue—the question of Palestine—is resolved, and rejects partial agreements and separate treaties that are in contravention of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. It has also been reaffirmed that lasting peace cannot be achieved without the participation of all the parties concerned, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Arab Palestinian people.

72. This wide international consensus includes also positions adopted in important international forums, such as the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana from 3 to 9 September 1979 [see A/34/542, annex].

73. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has always been on the side of the just struggle of the Arab nations. Our position is a consistent one; it is embedded in our anti-imperialist alliance—already traditional—with the national liberation movement of the Arab nations. We hold that in the interests of restoring peaceful conditions in the Middle East, our Organization must now adopt decisions that will fully reflect the real situation and will clear the way for collective efforts which alone can bring about a solution of the Middle East crisis.

74. Today, therefore, as was emphasized by the Czechoslovak Foreign Minister, Bohuslav Chnoupek, in his recent statement before the Federal Assembly of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, we have the duty to stress once again our position of principle that only a comprehensive solution to the consequences of aggression—that is, a solution including, first, the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967; secondly, respect for the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination, including the establishment of their own State; and, thirdly, the guaranteeing of the right of all States and peoples of the region to a peaceful and safe existence—I repeat, such a comprehensive solution, with the participation of all interested parties, including the PLO, offers the only way towards a real, just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

75. It is towards the achievement of those objectives that the Czechoslovak foreign policy will continue to work.

76. Mr. BHATT (Nepal): The Middle East has remained one of the unsolved problems before the United Nations for the past 30 years. There have been many serious efforts to find a solution to this issue both inside and outside the United Nations. During this period, four wars have been fought and they have only served to prove the futility of the use of force as a means of solving the problem. Each war has, in fact, left a legacy of more bitterness and added complexities to an already difficult problem. We are convinced that only a peaceful solution, based on the recognition of the rights of each

⁸ Joint statement on the Middle East issued on 1 October 1977 by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Secretary of State of the United States of America in their capacities as Co-Chairmen of the Peace Conference on the Middle East.

party to the conflict, can lead to durable peace in that region.

77. To achieve such a peaceful solution, the present atmosphere of suspicion and hostility has to be replaced by determination on the part of each party to work resolutely to seek ways and means for a peaceful settlement of all outstanding issues. We believe that a basic framework for peace has already been provided in various United Nations resolutions, especially in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). The resolutions have clearly defined the basic elements of the problem of the Middle East. These are: the withdrawal of forces from occupied Arab territories, recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to their homeland and the right of every State in the region to exist within secure and recognized boundaries. Any serious peace initiative which aims at finding a durable and just solution of the problem must take into account those vital elements. Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) have sought to present a balanced approach to the question of the Middle East. Nepal has all along supported the peace initiatives seeking to implement those resolutions.

78. The United Nations continues to provide the best forum to the concerned parties to come to an understanding and thus create an atmosphere of trust and confidence which is essential for a lasting peace in the region.

79. We are aware that the core of the problem lies in finding a just way to realize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. We believe that they have the right to a homeland of their own. No solution which ignores that element can survive for long.

80. We have always held the view that the three basic elements of the Security Council resolutions form part of a package. For a just and durable peace the package has to be implemented in its entirety. We have welcomed the Camp David agreements and the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel, following those agreements. In our view, they constitute the first step towards comprehensive peace and the final settlement of the problem. That goal, as I said earlier, necessitates negotiations with the participation of all parties to the conflict. We have always supported the peace-keeping initiatives of the United Nations. We are contributing our troops to UNIFIL and note with satisfaction the work it is doing. These measures are important, but they are temporary expedients. Only the will of the parties concerned can lead to the final solution. Therefore, we call upon all concerned to do their utmost within the framework of the United Nations Charter and its relevant resolutions, so that all the people in the region may live in peace and security.

81. Mr. ROSEN (United States of America): This debate offers an occasion for all of us to take stock of the events of the past year in the Middle East and to review what we have done, and what we have left undone, in the cause of the comprehensive peace which is our common goal.

82. The members of this body are agreed, with few exceptions, that the basis for peace is to be found in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). Those resolutions flow directly from the principles of the Charter, which require the peaceful settlement of

disputes and that all Member States refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. But if we agree on these principles as the basis for peace, it is apparent that there is wide disagreement among us about the way to reach that goal.

83. I should be less than candid if I did not say at the outset that my delegation has often been disappointed at the statements which have been made here by speakers in this debate and the debate which preceded it on the question of Palestine. When all has been said and done here, we shall still be left with the question: have our debate and the resolutions adopted here served the cause of peace? Let us never lose sight of the fact that our objective is not to add a phrase or clause to a resolution, still less to score rhetorical points at each other's expense. Our objective must be to promote the cause of justice and to bring about negotiations between adversaries of long standing.

84. The impression given by many of the statements that we have heard is that no progress has been made in the search for a comprehensive peace. It may be helpful, therefore, for me to review briefly some of the relevant facts of the matter.

85. On 26 March of this year, a treaty of peace was signed between Egypt and Israel. The treaty calls for complete Israeli withdrawal from all Egyptian territory occupied by Israel in 1967. One month later, negotiations began between Egyptian and Israeli representatives with the objective, to which both Governments are committed, of establishing full autonomy for the Palestinians of the occupied territories as a first step in the process of securing the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and addressing the Palestinian question in all its aspects. Jordanian and Palestinian representatives are invited to participate in those negotiations. The target date for the completion of the talks is 25 May 1980. My Government, together with the Governments of Egypt and Israel, continues to hope that it will be possible for Palestinian representatives to take part in these talks along with representatives of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

86. These talks form the only viable framework available to us for the negotiation of difficult and complex issues which must ultimately be resolved. For our part, we remain open to all constructive suggestions which could lead us close to a settlement. We remain fully committed to the just resolution of the Palestinian question in all its aspects and to the achievement of legitimate Palestinian rights. We believe strongly that that is crucial to the comprehensive settlement that we seek and that it can only come through the process of negotiation among the parties directly concerned.

87. It is obvious to all of us that much remains to be done. The people of the occupied territories are not yet able to exercise control over basic decisions affecting their daily lives and their political future. The process we have begun must continue until this is a reality. In the meantime, let us not lose sight of the progress which has been made and let us approach with realism as well as determination the task of how we can best make further progress to build on what has already been accomplished.

88. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria) (*interpretation*

from French): Once again, the question of the Middle East is the focus of debate in the General Assembly. Through the recurrence and, the constant presence of this item on our agenda, we can see the deep concern of the international community regarding a conflict which bears the seeds of catastrophes.

89. The crisis in the Middle East stems from the establishment at the heart of the Arab world of a foreign entity which is, moreover, aggressive and expansionist, in the place of the Palestinian people that has since then been doomed to the hardships of wandering and exile. The cyclical acts of aggression of the Zionist entity against the Arab countries that border on occupied Palestine have added a new dimension to the original tragedy.

90. The question of Palestine is therefore the central element in what is called the Middle East crisis. Any confusion between cause and effects, any approach which focuses on the effects and disregards the root cause, would distort the fundamental facts of the conflict and would thus hamper the search for a solution.

91. That is why, through its participation in this debate, Algeria would like, on the one hand, to express from the outset its solidarity and its commitment to working side by side with the fraternal countries whose territories remain occupied by the Zionist aggressors and, on the other hand, to express its deep conviction that that restoration of the national rights of the Palestinian people has been and remains the *sine qua non* condition for any final settlement. We have even better grounds for reiterating this position since recent attempts have deliberately lost sight of the crux of the issue to focus on secondary aspects, thus raising false hopes of partial solutions for the achievement of which the victim is paradoxically called upon to make extra sacrifices and to demonstrate good will by a *de jure* recognition of its aggressor. That aggressor would thus receive the benefit of a *fait accompli*, the vindication of its occupation of territories by force and an incentive to intransigence. The resulting situation is not peace and could not be peace.

92. As mystified as it may have been, the international community today refuses to endorse this new situation in the Middle East, a situation condemned by the irreversible course of history as a mere ephemeral aberration of a régime against which the determination of the Arab peoples, including the fraternal people of Egypt, will without fail prevail.

93. At the present time, when attempts at applying the Camp David agreements and the Washington Treaty have clearly established the partial and false nature of the solution advocated by the protagonists, one must certainly make an effort not to be terrorized by the violence done to justice through proceedings whose juridical guise was intended, from all the evidence, merely in the first place to lull the vigilance of the international community and of the Arab countries and to disguise political *diktat* based on a military *fait accompli* as the fulfilment of innocent and beneficial treaty commitments which would promote global peace in the region.

94. The serious doubts to which a first reading of the documents signed on 17 and 22 September 1978 and on 26 March 1979 gave rise and the condemnation which

followed once their iniquitous nature had been seen, stem from the universally held conviction that the key to the settlement of the Middle East crisis is the recognition of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people.

95. Capitulation is not peace. While any State has the sovereign right to conclude a treaty, there are natural limits which, if disregarded, render a treaty inoperative.

96. At this stage some clarification should be provided in a discussion in which some have an interest in leaving certain issues unclear. To justify the action of the Egyptian régime, it has been said that any State has the sovereign right to conclude a treaty, thus recalling an elementary principle of international law. No one can deny the validity of that principle; but, on the other hand, no one can disregard the natural limits of that principle. A State is indeed free to conclude any treaty, except if that treaty is incompatible with imperative norms of law which cannot be derogated or transgressed, such as the right of peoples to self-determination. The Camp David agreements and the Washington Treaty violate the national rights of the Palestinian people. The Egyptian régime has thus concluded treaties that are contrary to international law.

97. The United Nations, which has always energetically affirmed the national unassailable and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people is faced with treaties and agreements which directly clash with those rights. Were it not to condemn them, it would be untrue to itself.

98. The unequal struggle of the Palestinian people against an overarmed enemy, which works with impunity and enjoys unlimited material support, commands respect and admiration. Hence it is strange, to say the least, that some have seen fit to appoint themselves as guardians of its present and its future. Increasingly well defended, receiving ever more recognition, the cause of the Palestinian people, in the present stage of its development, is a driving force in the liberating trend in the Arab world in opposition to the manoeuvres of imperialism and zionism to strengthen their hold on the region, whose economic potential and strategic position of crossroads of three continents encourage their greed and sharpen their appetite.

99. The Camp David agreements and the Washington Treaty attempt to liquidate Palestinian resistance, a factor of progress and change in the region. The Camp David agreements and the Washington Treaty strengthen and sanction Israel as policeman and bridgehead of imperialism in the Middle East.

100. Following the fall of the feudal régime of the Shah of Iran and the emergence of the Iranian revolution, the substitution for the Teheran-Tel Aviv axis of a Tel Aviv-Cairo axis is aimed at bending the policies of the Arab countries to the interests of imperialism in the region.

101. The Camp David agreements and the Washington Treaty are the culmination of the attempted "*pax Americana*". They are attended by a strengthening of the policy of blocs through deepening the penetration of

a super-Power in the Middle East, and a weakening of the independence of nations.

102. The United States, both judge and party, through a shameful treaty is militarily committed, as guarantor of the end of the state of war between the Egyptian régime and the Zionist entity, while a bilateral Israeli-American agreement of military intervention, concluded on 26 March 1979 as an extension of this separate peace, strengthens Israel's interventionist position against its other Arab neighbours.

103. The role thus assumed by the United States of America promises a future fraught with danger for the security of the region. The PLO and Lebanon are, from experience, well aware of this. Far from waning, the aggressive nature of the Zionist entity, aided by a vast war machine, is daily demonstrated in acts against the political sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon, a peaceful State if there ever was one, whose natural solidarity with the Palestinian people and resolve to be on the side of justice and law have cost it severe losses in human life and destruction of all sorts while the international community has, sad to say, remained unmoved.

104. It is in its Lebanese adventure that Israel has fully demonstrated its arrogance and defiance of our Organization by continuing with diabolic perseverance its implacable war for the extermination of the civilian population of southern Lebanon, whose unforgivable crime, in the sectarian logic of the Zionist leaders, is that it has given generous fraternal hospitality to Palestinian refugees.

105. The Zionist acts of aggression against Lebanon, crucified Lebanon, the pace and magnitude of which clearly demonstrate Israel's will to destroy the militant solidarity of the Palestinian people and Lebanon, on the contrary only strengthen it, through hardship and bloodshed, providing a magnificent example of martyrdom endured so that law may triumph.

106. Use of the repressive machinery of Zionism, true to its nature and its terrorist tradition, aimed at doing away with the leaders of Palestinian resistance in foreign lands, stems from that concept of peace built on the mortal remains of the Palestinian people that has been endorsed and supported by the Egyptian régime. Article 3, paragraph 2, of the Washington Treaty is clearly designed to organize Egyptian-Israeli collaboration with a view to counteracting the action of the national liberation movement of the Palestinian people everywhere and by all means, even outside Egyptian territory.

107. Thus, the developments following the conclusion of the fatal Camp David agreements and the Washington Treaty, far from leading to peace and harmony, have engendered greater tension owing to Israel's constant expansionist thrusts.

108. This grim episode in the history of the emancipation of peoples, namely the defection of the Egyptian régime in the confrontation with the Zionist entity, has the merit, albeit at too high a price, of putting an end to the legend of Israel as the "bastion of civilization" in an aggressive environment. Once the situation is freed of the emotional charge maintained by skilfully or-

chestrated propaganda, the persistent acts of territorial expansion, the annexation of the City of Jerusalem, the establishment of settlements in the Arab lands occupied since the June 1967 aggression and the modification of the geographical characteristics and demographic composition of the Arab territories clearly reveal Israel's true nature, inspired by the racist and chauvinistic ideology of Zionism.

109. With the constant motivation of war and domination, Israel seeks to obtain the weapon of the holocaust and increase its capacity for destruction even though its propaganda strains to profess faith in peace. It finds in South Africa, that other bastion of racism and aggression, whose doctrine, objectives and methods it shares, a sure ally in repressing Arab-African aspirations to freedom, dignity and progress.

110. The crisis in the Middle East, whether its manifestations be overt or covert, is a constant threat to international peace and security and bears within it the seeds of general conflagration the nature and seriousness of which must not be underestimated.

111. The elements of a definitive, just and lasting peace are well known and have been understood by the General Assembly for many years. The resolutions adopted by it just a few days ago on the question of Palestine [*resolutions 34/65 A and B*] are a new step taken by the General Assembly. Only when the international community, on the basis of the truth that international peace and security are indivisible and cannot be separated from justice, devotes all its efforts to restoring the national rights of the Palestinian people in its homeland and returning to the Arab countries the occupied lands, will the Middle East, the cradle of flourishing civilizations, be able to pursue its age-old vocation of bringing peoples together, thus engendering peace and tolerance.

112. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The question of the Middle East is a crucial issue for the whole world. It is all the more important since the tensions at present affecting the international community are being dangerously accentuated. As we are speaking in the United Nations, an Organization set up for the maintenance of peace and not to worsen situations or to promote any confrontation, we believe that our duty is to support any step that can contribute to the peaceful settlement of disputes.

113. My country, Ecuador, has cordial relations with the Arab countries and with Israel. We believe, and have repeatedly said, that in defence of the principle that occupation by force does not give any rights, the occupied territories should be returned to their traditional inhabitants by virtue of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people. We have also supported the urgent need for progress in negotiations that should be inspired by absolute respect for the Charter of the United Nations and that aim, of course, at a just and lasting settlement recognizing the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination, sovereignty and independence and to a specific geographical location.

114. Among all the concerned parties that must take part in the negotiation of questions affecting their destiny, the PLO must of course be included, as the representative of its people and on an equal footing. At the same time, the other Arab countries concerned must

fully recognize the existence of Israel and its right to a peaceful existence within secure and recognized borders.

115. Therefore my delegation will be in favour of any negotiation aimed at promoting a peaceful settlement of the dispute. Thus it welcomed as an encouraging step the peaceful negotiations which, in the case of the Camp David agreements, made possible the return by Israel to Egypt of some territory and oil-producing centres. This type of understanding and concrete results should be encouraged and extended to all interested parties in order to improve the situation in the Middle East.

116. It is clear that, as is stated by resolution 33/28 A of the General Assembly, the main element of the Middle East conflict continues to be the problem of Palestine. Of course, we fervently hope that all the peoples of the region will succeed in returning to peaceful coexistence. Therefore co-operation with the United Nations peace-keeping forces and observer forces is of primary importance for the maintenance of peace. But, above all, the search for a peaceful settlement should be the constant aim if we are to attain the just and lasting peace in the Middle East which we desire for our brother peoples living in the region and for the entire international community.

117. Mr. KOCHUBEY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Middle East continues to be one of the sources of tension that are fraught with the potential danger of new armed conflicts and consequently represents a serious threat to universal peace and the security of nations.

118. The Israeli aggressors, inspired by the separate Camp David deal and the support of their overseas protectors, are continuing their policy of expansion and aggression against the Arab countries and peoples, first and foremost against Lebanon and the Arab people of Palestine. Repression is being stepped up against the Arab population in the occupied territories and in Israel itself, and this is eloquently borne out by the persecution of the Mayor of Nablus. Various pretexts are being used to continue the illegal expropriation of lands belonging to the Arabs and to create military and colonial outposts on them—Israeli settlements, which are an integral part of a far-reaching plan by the Zionist expansionists to present the world with one further fait accompli.

119. There has been universal condemnation from world public opinion, including UNESCO, for the policy pursued by the Government of Israel of flouting the economic, social and cultural rights of the Arab people of Palestine and also for the illegal steps which that Government has taken in an attempt to change the historical profile of Jerusalem.

120. It causes some alarm to observe also the aggressive actions of the Israeli military against Lebanon. Systematically flouting the moral principles and the elementary standards of international law, Israel has turned that country into a testing-ground for trying out F-15 planes, pellet, fragmentation and cluster bombs, napalm and other forms of weaponry. The victims of those barbaric tests, as the Assembly knows, have been the defenceless peaceful inhabitants of Lebanon and of the Palestinian refugee camps. At the same time, Israel

grossly intervenes in the internal affairs of Lebanon and attempts to provoke the partition of that State.

121. The United Nations, in the opinion of the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR, can and should bring about the cessation of Israel's aggressive actions against Lebanon. That would substantially contribute to bringing the situation in Lebanon back to normal, on the basis of respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of that Member State of our Organization. The Ukrainian SSR supports the Lebanese people in their struggle to guarantee the sovereignty and national independence of their country and to preserve their territorial integrity.

122. Under the camouflage of the Camp David separate agreements and the treaty which was concluded between Egypt and Israel, the imperialist forces which back those countries are trying to expand their own military and political presence in the Middle East in order to hold captive the countries of that region, who have risen up to defend their own legitimate interests, including their inalienable right to control their own national and natural wealth. Once again, this time in the Middle East, the "big stick" is looming, in the form of the so-called "rapid reaction corps" about which so much is being written in the United States press.

123. It is obvious that the separate Egypt-Israeli treaty concluded contrary to the will of the Arab countries and peoples must be regarded essentially as an attempt to hinder the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to create their own State, and to consolidate Israel's occupation of the territories it has seized, including the Palestinian lands.

124. This treaty, concluded in circumvention of the United Nations, runs counter to the purpose of achieving a genuine settlement in the Middle East and is at variance with the relevant fundamental decisions of the United Nations in this matter and, above all, resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) of the Security Council. Therefore, we are firmly against any attempt, whatever form it may take, to involve the United Nations in the implementation of that deal.

125. It is obvious that Israel's short-sighted policy is doomed. After all, the overwhelming majority of States throughout the world, as has been demonstrated particularly in this discussion, consider that the Palestinian issue is an integral part of a just and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East and that, unless a cardinal solution is found to this problem, we cannot even conceive of a durable peace being established in that explosive region of our planet. There can be no doubt either that the fate of the Arab people in Palestine in present circumstances cannot be settled behind the backs of those people and without the full participation of their sole legitimate representative, the PLO, which, as early as 1974, put forward a constructive programme for resolving the Palestinian issue on the basis of the creation of a sovereign State.

126. The report of the Secretary-General refers to the fact that, during the separate talks, the question of the fate of the Palestinian lands was raised, in particular that of the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip [see A/34/584-S/13578, para. 47]. It may be wondered who authorized the parties to the talks to decide the fate

of the Arab people of Palestine and to conduct talks about presenting the inhabitants of that territory with so-called "administrative autonomy".

127. Such "administrative autonomy" would be essentially a negation of the sovereignty of the people of Palestine and of its right to create its own independent State. It can only be regarded as an attempt completely to eliminate the Palestinian problem. It is not surprising that the Arab people of Palestine have firmly rejected such a decision and are demanding that the miscarriage of justice be corrected and their inalienable right to self-determination as proclaimed in the Charter of this Organization, restored.

128. The Ukrainian SSR believes that a just and comprehensive settlement should be achieved in the Middle East in accordance with the fundamental resolutions of the United Nations, on the basis of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, the complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967, recognition of the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine, including their right to self-determination and to establish their own independent State, and the guaranteeing of the right of all States in the Middle East to a secure and independent existence and development.

129. We are convinced that a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East should embrace all aspects of the Middle East conflict and should involve all interested parties, including, of course, the PLO, which is the sole legitimate representative of the people of Palestine and has been recognized as such by the United Nations and other international organizations.

130. The destruction of the roots of the conflict in the Middle East by means of a just settlement on the basis of the principles to which I have just referred would not only lead to the elimination of one further source of military danger, but would also contribute greatly to furthering the process of international détente, help to reduce the arms race and establish peace and tranquillity in that part of the world.

131. Mr. FILLIE-FABOE (Sierra Leone): We share the view expressed by the Secretary-General in his report on the work of the Organization [*see A/34/1, sect. III*] that the Middle East continues to be the most important and complex political problem for which the United Nations has specific responsibility, that this question is central to the political, economic and military stability of the world and that, 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 grave and continuing risk of future disaster.

132. Over the years, the Middle East question has become more complex, with no solution in sight. The situation has also led to the presence of different committees, commissions and agencies dealing with one or other aspect of the situation. The situation has led to the presence of four peace-keeping units—UNEF, UNDOF, UNIFIL and UNTSO. Each year the reports of all these bodies give rise to resolutions and decisions by the General Assembly and the Security Council, very few, if any, of which have been implemented.

133. We are pleased to note that, after discharging the

duties entrusted to it, UNEF had its mandate terminated at midnight, on 24 July this year. We wish to reiterate our gratitude to those countries that provided contingents to serve in UNEF. We express the hope of a peaceful and orderly withdrawal from the Sinai and a useful redeployment. With respect to the peace-keeping operations generally in the area, we note that the Secretary-General reiterated in his report [A/34/584-S/13578] the view that, although the areas of operations of UNIFIL and UNDOF were quiet, the situation in the Middle East as a whole was unstable and would remain so unless and until a comprehensive settlement, covering all aspects of the Middle East problem, could be reached.

134. The situation in the occupied territories continues to be a matter of great concern. The catalogue of Israeli inhuman practices in the occupied territories continues to shock the international community and, although several condemnatory resolutions have been passed, Israel continues to violate human rights conventions and particularly the fourth Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949.⁹ Israel has also continued, in defiance of world public opinion, to appropriate land belonging to Palestinians in the occupied territories, putting up new settlements and implanting Jewish civilians in the area. By these actions Israel has continued to change the legal status, geographical nature, and demographic, social, cultural and economic composition of the occupied territories. We consider this to be an affront to the decisions of this Organization and the ideals of the civilized world.

135. The Palestinian refugee problem has not been relieved with time. Thousands of refugees have continued to live in tents; thousands of them have been removed from their camps, and those camps have been demolished by the Israeli military authorities. Displaced persons have been denied their rights to return to their homes or former places of residence in the territories occupied by Israel since 1967.

136. We vehemently condemn the inhuman treatment by Israel of the refugees and the Palestinians in the occupied territories and again call upon Israel to respect and adhere to the resolutions, decisions and conventions adopted by the international community in respect of refugees and the peoples in the occupied territories.

137. We note with great concern the serious financial situation in which UNRWA finds itself. We should like to appeal to members of this Organization for generous financial support for yet another refugee area of the world. We should like to join in the plea for generous contributions for educational grants and scholarships for Palestine refugees and for Palestinian universities set up in the occupied territories.

138. In this connexion, we wish to join in the appeal to UNDP and other bodies within the United Nations system to intensify their efforts to implement the relevant United Nations resolutions in order to improve the economic and social conditions of the Palestinian people by establishing concrete projects and providing adequate funds for that purpose.

⁹ Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973, p. 287.

139. The situation in the Middle East, as we all know, has spilled over into Lebanon, and the sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of that country have been plunged into chaos. There has been escalation of violence in the area in recent months, resulting in heavy civilian casualties, damage to property and the flight of many inhabitants. Lebanon again is one of the complex facets of the Middle East situation.

140. As we have mentioned before, the core of the problem of the Middle East is the Palestinian issue, and until that important question is settled there can be no true and lasting peace in the region in particular and in the world in general. Israel must be made to recognize the right of the Palestinians to return to their homeland, to have a country of their own and to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. All the peoples in the region must recognize each other's right to live in peace within secure boundaries. Any meaningful peace settlement in the Middle East must involve all concerned, particularly the Palestinian people, under the leadership of the PLO, their sole and authentic representative.

141. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan): The situation in the Middle East continues to pose the most serious threat to world peace and stability. The need for a just and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict has become more imperative and urgent, particularly in view of the disturbing portents which characterize the Middle East situation today and which could become the prelude to an unparalleled crisis unless earnest and determined efforts are made to ensure tranquillity and peace in the area.

142. The Palestinian question is at the heart of the Middle East conflict. For more than three decades the Palestinian people have been suffering the pain of exile and oppression. An entire generation has grown up experiencing that continued agony of Palestine. It is agitating the minds of youths throughout the world, especially in the Muslim and Arab lands. The sense of outrage at the injustices committed against the Palestinian people is evident in the increasing restiveness spreading throughout the Middle East, which has grave implications far beyond the region.

143. The basic elements of a just and lasting settlement are well known; they have been acclaimed by the great majority of the international community and are embodied in the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. Pakistan has consistently highlighted those elements in its position on the Middle East question. We believe that durable peace cannot return to the Middle East unless the Israeli occupation of the Arab territories is brought to an end and the inalienable national rights of the people of Palestine, including their right to a sovereign State in their homeland, are respected. No peace initiative can succeed in resolving the Middle East conflict if it is not aimed at the fulfilment of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, whose sole and legitimate representative is the PLO.

144. In our view, the Camp David agreements do not fully take into account the basic realities of the Palestinian question. First, no other party but the PLO has the right to negotiate on behalf of the Palestinian people. Secondly, those agreements do not recognize explicitly the right of self-determination of the Palestinian people, which is indeed their right to establish an independent

sovereign State in their homeland. This fundamental right cannot be set aside by promises of autonomy or partial freedom.

145. It must be acknowledged that a comprehensive and realistic approach is required for the settlement of the Middle East conflict. Strategies which are one-sided or contemplate partial remedies will be of no help. Instead these would generate mistrust, cause polarization and add to the gravity of the situation. The great majority of the world community appreciates the imperative need for a comprehensive approach. That basic consideration is borne out by the rejection of partial measures, as embodied in the Camp David agreements, by the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Havana last September and by the Tenth Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, held at Fez in May this year.

146. The Secretary-General has also underlined the need for a comprehensive settlement. He said, in his report on the work of the Organization:

“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.]

147. It is clear that an unqualified recognition of the PLO as a principal party to the Middle East conflict is indispensable for a realistic and viable peace initiative.

148. Let me reiterate Pakistan's firm position on the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem. The Holy City cannot be made the spoils of war. The world community, through the relevant United Nations resolutions, has given a clear verdict to the effect that the Holy City of Jerusalem is an integral part of the occupied Arab territories. It must be returned unconditionally to Arab sovereignty. The people of Pakistan, as well as the people throughout the Muslim world, have watched with profound indignation and deep anguish the persistent Israeli attempts to Judaize Jerusalem and obliterate and desecrate its historical Islamic and Christian character. We are confident that the universal condemnation of such intentions will dissuade Israel from its sacrilegious and dangerous undertaking.

149. Another facet of the Palestinian issue, which is a matter of grave concern, is the proliferation of Israeli settlements, particularly on the West Bank. These settlements are the manifestation of a cynical policy pursued by Israel to lend permanency to its occupation of the West Bank. Obviously, Israel's intention is to alter the demographic pattern in this land, which has remained the cradle of the unique Palestinian culture and civilization for countless centuries. The Israeli plans to change the character of this ancient land are not only a flagrant violation of the internationally accepted principle of the non-acquisition of territory by force, but an affront to the sense of justice of the international community.

150. Following their illegal occupation of the Arab territories by military force, the Israeli authorities are further compounding their aggression by pursuing a relentless policy of persecuting Palestinians who, after being driven away from their homeland, have found temporary

refuge in southern Lebanon. The murderous attacks on the Palestinian camps in southern Lebanon have resulted in the deaths of hundreds of innocent men, women and children. We condemn such wanton acts of aggression, which are a part of a deliberate and calculated scheme.

151. The Middle East conflict casts a bleak shadow on the prospects for international peace and the progress of mankind. The world cannot afford to let an intransigent State continue the deadlock and defiantly reject a just and lasting settlement whose basic elements are well known. The United Nations, which represents the aspirations of the international community to peace and progress, must respond to the challenge of the Middle East situation and take constructive initiatives that could lead to an early resolution of the conflict in that region. The recent developments in the Middle East, as I said earlier, have underlined the urgency of seizing the opportunity to ensure peace; otherwise, the situation could degenerate into a major catastrophe.

152. My delegation, therefore, deeply appreciates the efforts of the Security Council to secure an early resolution of the Middle East conflict on the basis of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. Should the Security Council fail in carrying out its primary responsibility on the Middle East question, Pakistan would support the call for an emergency special session of the General Assembly to consider this question.

153. Finally, my Government also welcomes the Secretary-General's proposal for an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations [*ibid.*] to negotiate a comprehensive and just settlement of the Middle East conflict. We hope that the conference would facilitate such a settlement by making it possible for all parties concerned to adopt a realistic and positive approach.

154. Mr. ROA KOURI (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The situation in the Middle East is undoubtedly one of the cardinal issues of our day. On one hand, we have Israel's aggressive and expansionist policies of colonization in the occupied Arab territories, carried out with the unreserved support of the United States, policies which are a serious threat to international peace and security; on the other hand, we have the rights of the Arab nation and the unyielding struggle of the Palestinian people for the exercise of its inalienable rights and the creation of its own State in its usurped homeland of Palestine.

155. In the view of Cuba, as we recently stated during the consideration of the item "Question of Palestine" in this General Assembly [79th meeting], this is the core of the Middle East problem. This was stated by Comrade Fidel Castro in his historic message of 12 October this year, made in his capacity as Chairman of the non-aligned movement: "Both questions form an integral whole and neither can be settled separately." [31st meeting, para. 22.]

156. Whatever the rhetorical juggling of Israel and its supporters, the fact is that there can be no partial solution nor any settlement in which only some of the parties to the conflict participate, just as there can be no separate peace. Peace—as the Secretary-General concludes in his report on the work of the Organization—in order to be just and lasting, must be achieved

ing 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.]

157. The Final Declaration of the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries was equally unequivocal, when it reaffirmed that

"No just peace can be established in the region unless it is based on total and unconditional withdrawal by Israel from all the occupied Palestinian and other Arab occupied territories, and the recovery by the Palestinian people of all its inalienable national rights, including its right to return to its homeland, to self-determination and to the establishment of an independent State in Palestine, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX)" [A/34/542, annex, sect. I, para. 102 (c)].

158. In an arrogant statement, which revealed the typically d'Annunzian turn of mind of its author, there has been an attempt to mystify—and even to deny—the historic reality of Palestine and the right of the Palestinian Arab people to live in its own ancestral homeland. Such a pathological adulteration of history belongs only to the annals of common fascism and deserves the determined condemnation of the international community.

159. The truth is that the Zionist Government of Israel is not only illegally occupying Arab and Palestinian territories, but also systematically developing a policy aimed at transforming the political, cultural, religious, physical, geographic and demographic characteristics of those territories. It has also taken over the City of Jerusalem, the spiritual and religious centre that belongs to all mankind and is an integral part of occupied Palestine.

160. The establishment of settlements in Palestinian territories and other Arab territories occupied in 1967 clearly demonstrates the true expansionist designs of Israel and contradicts the empty words of Israel's spokesmen. Such a policy is illegal, and its results should be considered null and void, since it represents an obstacle to peace. The General Assembly should demand that the settlements be dismantled immediately and that no further colonies be established.

161. Everybody knows that the Israeli expansionist designs are given sustenance by the unconditional support Israel receives from the United States. Nor is it any secret that that policy involves, first and foremost, a strategic commitment of Yankee imperialism to its Zionist allies, aimed at the domination of oil sources in the Middle East and the control of supply channels. Israel is also in collusion with racist South Africa, a spearhead for great monopolistic interests, aimed against liberation movements and independent African States.

162. It is not without reason that the United States Government has taken up a position against the Palestinian people and its inalienable rights and is playing a fundamental role in preventing the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the region.

163. The Havana Final Declaration states:

" . . . through a comprehensive settlement cover-

“Far from working for peace, the United States is trying instead to obtain partial solutions that are favourable to Zionist aims and underwrite the gains of Israeli aggression at the expense of the Palestinian Arab people and entire Arab nation.” [*Ibid.*, para. 103.]

164. We must reaffirm in this Assembly that in the view of Cuba, the PLO is the only legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. No agreement whatsoever can aspire to resolve the situation in the Middle East without the PLO's direct and full participation.

165. That is precisely why the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries energetically condemned any partial agreement or separate treaty violating the rights of the Arab nation and the Palestinian people or signed without the participation of its legitimate representative [*ibid.*, sect. VIA, resolution No. 2]. The resolutions of the United Nations, as well as the principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations and in that of the Organization of African Unity are categorical in this connexion.

166. The so-called “Camp David agreements”, signed by Egypt and Israel under the aegis of the United States, are null and void in so far as they claim to resolve the situation of the Palestinian people while they leave the PLO, its only legitimate representative, on the side-lines.

167. It is now time for the Security Council to adopt enforcement measures against Israel, especially those embodied in Chapter VII of the Charter. There should be condemnation of military and all other co-operation by the Government of the United States with the Israeli expansionists who are the close collaborators of the odious régime of *apartheid*, the occupiers of Palestine, those responsible for innumerable acts of aggression against the peaceful people of Lebanon and, finally, the violators of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations.

168. What is more, Israel's attempt to consolidate the

the occupation of parts of southern Lebanon through its agents in order to destroy the unity of that non-aligned country and its people and its sovereignty over its entire territory, is extremely dangerous. An end must be put to Israel's use of sophisticated aircraft and weapons supplied by the United States to attack the peaceful people and villages of southern Lebanon, causing the death of thousands of innocent persons.

169. The Assembly must categorically condemn the measures adopted by several imperialist States, and in particular by the United States Government, to increase and strengthen their military presence in the region.

170. My delegation will support any resolution that clearly establishes the principles set out by many previous speakers and, in particular, condemns the continued occupation of Arab and Palestinian territory by Israel; any resolution that declares once more that peace is indivisible and that any just and lasting peace must be based upon a comprehensive solution, under the auspices of the United Nations, with the full participation of the PLO; any resolution that condemns any partial agreement or separate treaty that violates the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people; and any resolution that provides for the convening, as soon as possible, of a peace conference on the Middle East, under the auspices of the United Nations and the chairmanship of the Soviet Union and the United States, with the participation on an equal footing of all the parties involved in the conflict.

171. Only thus shall we be able to guarantee the just and lasting peace that is desired by all the peoples of the region.

172. At this time of upheaval, as the death-rattle of the old world blends with the first cries of a new world for all mankind, the United Nations has an opportunity to contribute positively to the redress of one of the greatest injustices of our present day. The time has come to act decisively for justice and for peace.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.