



CONTENTS

Agenda item 26:

	<i>Page</i>
The situation in the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General (<i>continued</i>)	1483

President: Mr. Rüdiger von WECHMAR
(Federal Republic of Germany).

In the absence of the President, Mr. Ramphul (Mauritius), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 26

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

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like to remind delegations that wish to submit draft resolutions on this item to do so without delay.
2. I call first on the representative of Luxembourg, who will speak on behalf of the nine members of the European Community.
3. Mr. PETERS (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): Throughout the work of this thirty-fifth session, the nine Member States of the European Community have had the occasion to set forth in detail their views on the various specific questions of the Middle East, a region with which Europe has close ties.
4. Because the present debate cannot be separated from the other aspects of the situation in the Middle East, it goes without saying that the views we have already expressed, in particular on 1 December in the debate on the question of Palestine [*76th meeting*], remain valid in the present context.
5. The Declaration issued on 13 June 1980 by the Heads of State and Government and the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the nine member States of the European Community, meeting at Venice as the European Council—to which the Foreign Minister of Luxembourg, Mr. Gaston Thorn, speaking on behalf of the European Community, referred in the general debate [*6th meeting*—gives the fundamental principles governing any comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East, namely, the right to existence and security of all the States of the area, including Israel, and justice for all peoples, which implies recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people [*see A/35/299-S/14009*].
6. In this sense, the European Community continues to feel that a just, lasting and comprehensive

settlement must be based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), all the elements of which must be applied to all the parties, and on the principles that they have so often proclaimed.

7. All else logically flows from two realities: the State of Israel and the Palestinian people. Above all, as the Venice Declaration says, all the countries of the area have the right to live in peace within secure, recognized and guaranteed boundaries.

8. The guarantees of a peace settlement must be provided by the United Nations on decision of the Security Council, and, if appropriate, on the basis of other mutually agreed procedures. The European Community members declare that they are prepared to participate, within the context of a comprehensive settlement, in a system of specific and binding international guarantees, including participation in the region.

9. Furthermore, a just solution must be found to the Palestinian problem, which is not simply a refugee problem. The Palestinian people, which has a very definite sense of its own identity, must be enabled, according to an appropriate procedure laid down within the framework of a comprehensive peace settlement, to exercise fully the right to self-determination.

10. Recognition and implementation of the right of Israel to existence and security and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination must be the basis of negotiations leading to a comprehensive peace settlement. Such a settlement obviously presupposes the acceptance and co-operation of all the parties concerned, including the Palestinian people and the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO], which must be associated in the negotiations.

11. The results of the contact mission that Mr. Gaston Thorn carried out on behalf of the European Community in the Middle East confirm that the principles of the Venice Declaration contain the elements necessary for the negotiation of such a settlement between the parties concerned. They strengthen the determination of the Community to make their contribution.

12. It is in that spirit that the European Council has just approved the decision of the Foreign Ministers to consider the problems of evacuation, self-determination, Middle East security and Jerusalem with the aim of clarifying the Venice principles and making them more specific.

13. The European Council has noted that different formulations may be used to give effect to some of these principles, in particular those concerning the length of the transitional period before the process of self-determination, the definition of the provisional authority over the evacuated territories, the condi-

tions and procedure for self-determination, security guarantees and Jerusalem.

14. With a view to a more thorough consideration of these formulations and with the aim of promoting a climate more favourable to negotiations, the European Council felt it necessary for new contacts to take place between the current President and the parties concerned, simultaneously with internal consideration of the problem.

15. Following the signing of the Camp David agreements,¹ the European Community noted with satisfaction the progress made in the improvement of relations between Egypt and Israel. So far those agreements—the great merits of which regarding relations between Egypt and Israel we recognize, in particular because they have made possible the evacuation of the greater part of Sinai, in implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967)—have not had the expected results as regards the promotion of a comprehensive, just, and lasting peace settlement.

16. In this connexion, the European Community would like to remind the Assembly that one of the fundamental conditions of a comprehensive settlement is the ending of the territorial occupation maintained by Israel since the 1967 conflict. Community members deeply regret any action that aggravates the present situation and thus impedes a peaceful settlement. We believe that only the renunciation by all the parties of the use or threat of use of force can promote in the area the climate of confidence that is fundamental to a comprehensive settlement of the conflict in the Middle East.

17. The European Community also opposed to the settlement policies of the Israeli Government, which throughout the year has maintained and developed existing Israeli settlements and even established new settlements.

18. We cannot accept Israel's claims to the territories it has occupied since 1967. Those settlements are a serious obstacle to the peace process. The Community wishes to reiterate their position that those settlements, together with demographic and housing modifications in the occupied Arab territories, are illegal under international law.

19. The law recently adopted by the Israeli Knesset on the status of Jerusalem brought about a further aggravation of the situation in the occupied territories. European Community members wish to recall that they cannot accept any unilateral initiatives to change the status of that city. We feel that any agreement on the status of Jerusalem must, in particular, guarantee free access to all the Holy Places.

20. We are also concerned about the information that legislation affecting the character and the status of the Golan Heights is about to be considered by the Knesset.

21. With respect to the expulsion measure which has been taken against the mayors of Hebron and Halhoul, the Community members wish to make another urgent

appeal to the Government of Israel to reverse its decision.

22. The European Community is concerned about the crisis threatening UNRWA. We hope that the Member States of the United Nations, including those that are among the most committed to the Palestinian cause, will respond to the cry of distress from the Agency and will help it to the best of their ability to overcome the present financial difficulties.

23. Recent events in Lebanon continue to give rise to serious concern among the European countries. In their statement issued at Luxembourg on 2 December [see A/35/712-S/14285], they reaffirmed that unity, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity must be fully respected. Here the Community wishes to make a new appeal for respect for the integrity of the boundaries of Lebanon as well as for the security of its inhabitants.

24. Respect for the international boundaries of Lebanon remains one of the essential elements of security and stability in the Middle East. Lebanon belongs to the Lebanese, and they alone are responsible for deciding on the rules to govern their coexistence with other countries.

25. We hope that UNIFIL, to which many countries among the European Community make an important contribution, will be enabled to fulfil the mandate conferred upon it by the Security Council. We are particularly concerned by the harassment to which UNIFIL continues to be subjected. In addition, we find it unacceptable that certain parties have constantly refused to support UNIFIL and the decisions of the Security Council.

26. The European Community is concerned about the situation that has arisen between Jordan and Syria, two States with which we have maintained close relations for a long time. We appeal to the Governments concerned to exercise the greatest restraint and to endeavour to settle any disagreement between them by peaceful means.

27. In conclusion, I should like to assure the General Assembly that the European Community will continue to follow the situation in the Middle East very closely and will try by all means available to them to promote a comprehensive, just and lasting peace settlement, involving all the parties and taking into account all the fundamental problems. We also welcome all constructive initiatives aimed at bringing about peace in that part of the world.

28. We note with satisfaction that the Secretary-General maintains contact with all the parties concerned on questions related to the Middle East, and we assure him of our full support and co-operation.

29. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The problem of settling the conflict in the Middle East an establishing a just and durable peace in that region is among the most acute and complex international problems which require immediate and fundamental solution. The dangerous state of tension which is maintained in that area is a constant threat not only to its peoples but also to universal peace and international security.

30. The reasons for the situation in the Middle East remaining unsettled are to be found first and foremost

¹ 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.

in the expansionist policy of the ruling circles of Israel and their stubborn refusal to withdraw their troops from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967 and to put an end to their active opposition to a just solution of the Palestinian question. Naturally, Israel could not have pursued such a policy without the support of certain external forces, and I am referring to the United States of America, which long ago chose Israel as a channel for its own interests in the Middle East.

31. However, the desirability of extending international détente and ensuring universal peace and security, and the vital interests of the peoples in the Middle East, demand that a fundamental comprehensive settlement be quickly achieved and that a just and durable peace be established in that area.

32. The Soviet Union has firmly and consistently favoured a political settlement on the basis of the relevant decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly on matters relating to the situation in the Middle East and the Palestinian problem. Efforts to reach a just Middle East settlement are an organic part of the efforts which are being made by the Soviet Union to avert the threat of war, to extend international détente and to render assistance to those peoples that are defending their national independence, freedom and sovereignty. It was not by chance that the removal of the source of tension in the Middle East was an important and integral part of the programme put forward at the twenty-fifth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union concerning further efforts to bring about peace, international co-operation and the freedom and independence of peoples, a goal which has been constantly pursued by the Soviet Union.

33. We are profoundly convinced that a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East should embrace all the parties involved in the conflict and should resolve all issues connected with that conflict. It should be sought on the basis of collective efforts on the part of all parties concerned, naturally including the PLO, which is the sole legal representative of the Palestinian people.

34. The position of the Soviet Union on the question of a Middle East settlement is quite well known and is one which we have consistently upheld for many years now. It envisages the need to implement three inter-related elements. First, it is essential that there be a complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, including the eastern part of Jerusalem. Secondly, the Arab people of Palestine must be able to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and to establish their own independent State. Thirdly, the right of all States in the area involved in the conflict to an independent existence and to security, with the necessary international guarantees, must be ensured. No other foundation for a settlement of the Middle East conflict would be just or, therefore, lasting.

35. This approach to Middle East affairs also determines our attitude to the policy of separate deals, including and above all, the separate Egyptian-Israeli treaty which was concluded with the active participation of the United States. The Camp David agreements, which were drawn up by the United States,

Egypt and Israel, and the attempts which have been undertaken on that basis to impose separate deals with the aggressor on the Arabs and to replace a just solution of the Palestinian problem by an alleged autonomy, have nothing in common with the task of establishing a genuine and durable peace in the Middle East. Furthermore, they run directly counter to the national interests of the peoples of that region and to the interests of universal peace and security. They seriously undermine any prospect of a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem.

36. It has long been clear to everyone, apart, that is, from those who deliberately close their eyes to reality, that the actual purpose of the tripartite collusion is to form a military-political alliance between Israel and Egypt which would be subordinated to the United States, an alliance which would have clearly expressed anti-Arab trends and which would be intended to strengthen and expand the United States economic, political and military presence in the Middle and Near East.

37. Since the overthrow of the Shah's régime in Iran the United States has considerably stepped up its military preparations in the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf and the Middle East. Region after region has been declared the sphere of "vital American interests" and American "vital space". Thus, the network of United States military and naval bases has been strengthened and extended. Regularly squadrons of United States military vessels are drawn up there, including aircraft carriers with dozens of aircraft on board. This armada is prepared with the most sophisticated weaponry to deal a death blow at any time to any portion of Arab territory. At the same time so-called rapid deployment forces have been set up. All this is done for one ultimate purpose: the interests of the oil monopolies.

38. However, here in the United Nations the United States is putting up a smokescreen. For more than 13 years now Israel's illegal occupation of Arab territories has been going on, the rights of an entire people, that is the Arab people of Palestine, have been trampled underfoot. However, the United States, while expatiating on the inadmissibility of the use of force or violence, is preparing every condition necessary for Israel forcibly—I stress, forcibly—to annex the Arab territories occupied in 1967. It was precisely just after the Camp David deal had been signed that the Israeli Cabinet decided to allow Israelis to acquire lands in the occupied territories on the West Bank of the Jordan and in the Gaza Strip. There immediately followed the adoption by the Israeli Knesset of the so-called "basic law", which legalized the annexation of the eastern part of Jerusalem. The network of Israeli settlements is being extended. Plans are being hatched for Israel to annex the Golan Heights. But in Washington they preach as usual about human rights and the inadmissibility of force. We can only guess whether it is hypocrisy or impudence that is more prevalent in those sermons.

39. It can be said quite clearly that Israel has become a support State for the United States, a State which is a base for it in the Middle East, the significance of which in recent times has been increasing considerably within the framework of the new United States

strategy. Unfortunately, an Arab country also is now involved in those plans, namely, Egypt.

40. At present feverish efforts are being made to revive the Egyptian-Israeli talks regarding so-called administrative autonomy for the Palestinians. Attempts are being made at least to create the semblance of an effort to find a solution to breathe life into the Camp David deal. However, that reminds us of attempts to bring back to life an Egyptian mummy from the times of the Pharaohs. All the deadlines that have been established by the parties to that collusion for reaching some agreement on "autonomy" have already passed. And what have been the results? They have amounted to a further deterioration in the situation of the Palestinians on the West Bank of the Jordan; the expulsion of Arab mayors by the Israeli authorities, mayors who were chosen by the population; and a considerable increase in terrorist activities against the Palestinians and their representatives. The aggressive and expansionist nature of Israel's policy has become even more obvious.

41. That is shown by the growing frequency of aggressive provocations by Israel against Lebanon which have become ever more overt and challenging in nature. It is also shown by the forced construction of new Israeli settlements in the occupied Arab territories. It is indicated by the increased repression practised against the population of the occupied West Bank of the Jordan River and the Gaza Strip. Finally, it is attested to by a new challenge of the occupiers: the adoption by the Israeli Knesset of a law to annex the eastern Arab part of Jerusalem and to proclaim all of Jerusalem as the "united and indivisible" capital of Israel.

42. The talks about so-called autonomy for Palestinians are simply a screen behind which desperate efforts are being undertaken to consolidate Israel's occupation of Palestinian lands and to prevent the Arab people of Palestine from enjoying their legitimate national rights, primarily their right to establish their own independent State. Quite obviously, such talks have nothing whatever in common with a solution of the Palestinian problem and are decisively rejected—as is the entire Camp David scheme—by the Arab people of Palestine and the peoples of other Arab countries.

43. Thus there is every reason to assert that it is precisely the policies of the United States and its allies in the Middle East and their attempts to enter into separate deals that are the main factor producing instability in that already explosive part of the world.

44. The Arab peoples' clear understanding of the essentially anti-Arab, and primarily anti-Palestinian, nature of the agreements concluded between the United States, Egypt and Israel is clearly indicated by the unanimous decisions adopted by all the pan-Arab meetings of recent times which have been aimed at counteracting the policy of capitulation of the Egyptian leadership and the policy of separate deals.

45. The Soviet Union supports the position which has been taken by the majority of Arab countries in connexion with the Camp David collusion, because this position is in harmony not only with the legitimate interests of the Arabs but also with the interests of the struggle for a comprehensive settlement in the Middle

East and, consequently, with the strengthening of universal peace.

46. The Soviet Union, which firmly upholds the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, believes that Israeli troops should be withdrawn from all Arab territories occupied in 1967; this is equally true of the eastern part of Jerusalem. It is precisely in this connexion that the Soviet Union supported Security Council resolution 478 (1980), which condemns Israel's annexation of the eastern sector of Jerusalem and affirms that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by the Israeli authorities to change the character and status of the city of Jerusalem are invalid.

47. The Soviet Union has constantly supported the just struggle of the Arab people of Palestine for its inalienable national rights, which it has pursued under the leadership of the PLO. It is our belief that a just solution to the Palestinian problem can be achieved only in the context of an over-all Middle East settlement, which should be based on the well-known decisions of the United Nations.

48. The Soviet Union has consistently favoured a just and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem through the efforts of all parties concerned. We are prepared to promote the achievement of these ends in co-operation with all those who are genuinely desirous of a true and lasting peace being restored to the Middle East.

49. One further point. The ruling circles of Israel, learning on support of every kind from the United States, are today delighted with the fruits of their occupational régime, but the people of Israel cannot be so short-sighted. There is every possibility, even today, for establishing a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, and if this prospect of a peaceful settlement is totally blocked, then responsibility for all consequences flowing from this will be borne by those who for selfish purposes are trying to undermine the possibility of the bringing about of a just and lasting peace for the peoples and countries of the Middle East.

50. As was emphasized by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, L. I. Brezhnev, when he spoke in connexion with the ratification of the Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation between the Soviet Union and the Syrian Arab Republic of 14 November of this year:

"The Soviet Union is consistently and firmly on the side of the forces of progress, democracy and national liberation, and supports the struggle of the Arab peoples against Israeli aggression and the inroads of imperialism, and favours a lasting and just peace in the Middle East."

51. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with General Assembly resolution 477 (V) of 1 November 1950, I now call on the Observer of the League of Arab States.

52. Mr. OMRAN (League of Arab States) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like first to convey to Mr. von Wechmar the congratulations of the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States on his election to the presidency of the General Assembly, and for the competence and experience he has demonstrated in conducting the meetings of the Assembly.

I wish also to convey our thanks to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Kurt Waldheim. Because of unforeseeable circumstances, Mr. Chedli Klibi, the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States, is not able to attend these important meetings.

53. The General Assembly is now discussing the most important issue to appear on its agenda since the founding of the Organization. This issue is in essence a test for the international community to establish whether it will allow force to prevail over right and justice and whether the policy of occupation and aggression will defeat the will of the peoples.

54. The Middle East crisis is one of the results of the Palestinian problem. Achievement of a just peace in the Middle East, which is the ultimate goal of all Arab nations, depends on the solution of both issues. The international community is responsible for resolving this crisis, because if it does not it will pay a high price for the absence of a just solution. The international community carries this responsibility through the continued effort of all peace-loving nations to reaffirm the resolutions that would bring about a just peace in the Middle East, give the peoples of the region an opportunity to devote their efforts to the development of their societies, and divert the resources and means now devoted to armament and tools of destruction to measures that would help to fight ignorance and disease and bring happiness to the hearts of young and old who have long been suffering from the evils of war.

55. Despite these international positions supporting the establishment of peace based upon justice—that peace which the great majority of the States of the world believe in and which, they have reaffirmed, can be based only on the termination of Israeli occupation of all Arab territories, enabling the Palestinian people to exercise its national rights like any other people and to establish its independent State in its homeland, in order to contribute fully to the development of human civilization—and despite the resolutions which obtained an almost universal consensus, Israel continues to disregard those resolutions and to defy the international will. The fact that at this session we have resumed discussion of this problem and have come up with the same resolutions shows clearly that the crisis is not only in the Middle East but is a profound danger which threatens the very existence of the international Organization.

56. It is our right and our responsibility to ask ourselves whether the United Nations today faces the same crisis that led to the collapse of its related organization, the League of Nations, during the 1930's. The League of Nations collapsed because it was impotent in the face of fascism in Europe, which defied the League, its principles and its Charter. Facism carried out one aggression after another, claiming that expansion was necessary for reasons of security, and thus swept the whole world into a destructive war. Are not Israel's attitude and logic in regard to peace and to secure and acknowledged frontiers a literal translation of Goebbels' declarations and of German Nazi logic in the 1930's?

57. Why have Israel and zionism been able to exercise their policy of aggression and to continue to ignore completely the international will? And why has Israel

been able to exercise *de facto* its veto over all United Nations resolutions aimed at establishing peace and removing the causes that could push the world towards a new world war? Why has Israel been able to make its defiance of United Nations resolutions into a continuous and basic policy? Why has Israel been able to continue its daily aggressions against peaceful villages and their innocent inhabitants in southern Lebanon?

58. Why has Israel, which has been denounced in every committee and international conference for its racism and aggression, been able to distort those denunciations in order to show its readiness to defy the United Nations and its Members?

59. Israel would not have been able to adopt the role of the outlaw, the role of one who disregards the rights of the innocent, the role of one who is dedicated to expansion and occupation, the role of one who is capable of uprooting residents from their homes, their fields and their towns and giving those occupied lands to foreigners, the role of the murderer who practices the liquidation of the legitimate representatives of the Arab people in the occupied territories, the role of one who disregards the Holy Places and the doctrines of the Christian and the Moslem world—Israel would not have been able to adopt those positions had it not been for its belief that it had a special right that put it above the Organization, its Charter and its resolutions and even above all principles of international law, and had it not been for the total support it receives from a super-Power in the Organization, namely the United States of America, with all its available political, military and economic resources and facilities.

60. I am not required to support my statement with evidence, for the evidence is available in the documents of the United Nations, as well as in the official declarations of the White House, the Congress and at times the State Department itself. The Organization witnessed in the recent past the mockery of political commentators, when the highest level of the American Administration apologized to Israel over what it called a "wrong vote". It explained that mistake, in this age of space technology, by a malfunction of telecommunications between Washington and New York. That led political commentators to state that the American Administration was implying that it could not continue without the support of zionism and Israel.

61. The history of all peoples, since the beginning of recorded time, does not furnish a similar situation in which the will of a super-Power like the United States depends on the will of an aggressive Power like Israel and in which the interests of a great people like the American people depend on the whims of the governing coalition in Israel. The American veto, which is at the disposal of Israel, is contrary to the interests of the American people and threatens those interests in a dangerous fashion. As the facts demonstrate, the American veto, which is placed at the disposal of Israel, is contrary to the interests of the Western nations that have allied themselves with the United States and endangers their interests. The American veto, which is placed at the disposal of Israel, is contrary to the interests of all peace-loving nations that work towards ending the aggression and occupation and alleviating international tension. The American veto, which is placed at the disposal of Israel, is con-

trary to the international Organization and its Charter and may dangerously threaten its very existence.

62. The Camp David agreements were signed as an alternative to peace. The American Administration believes those agreements serve Israel's goals through the subjugation of an Arab régime to American Zionist influence. Those agreements fail to conform to the most basic legal principles and violate the most basic principle of international law, namely the right to representation. The parties to those agreements have taken upon themselves the right to represent the Palestinian people as Balfour, the Minister of British colonies, took upon himself the right to sell Palestine. Those agreements have done nothing but succumb to Israel's demands.

63. Israel has achieved what it wants at present. It gave the American Administration what that Administration thought to be a public relations tool or a propaganda tool, which could attract Zionist votes in the elections. All that was achieved at the expense of peace and at the expense of the interests of the Palestinian people and the Arab countries. The role of the Egyptian régime in those agreements was that of a satellite which followed instructions and did what was expected of it. The Egyptian régime was thus used as a tool against its own brethren, against the interests of the Palestinian people and the Arab countries and even against the interests of the Egyptian Arab people itself.

64. An important matter we find ourselves faced with during the discussion of these problems is the position of the new American Administration. Will American policy continue to be based on total acquiescence to Zionist influence and to Israel or will logic prevail so that we can witness a new American policy that is more objective, less partial and that thus would contribute to efforts to attain peace in the Middle East and save not only the Middle East but perhaps the entire world from a possible war?

65. When faced with this question, the Arab countries are torn between two different feelings. The first is complete despair and the absence of any hope that Washington will practise an objective and responsible policy based upon principles regarding the Middle East crisis. That feeling is based upon the history of American policy since the beginnings of the crisis in 1948. The second feeling is one of limited optimism. That optimism is based on the history of the American people who struggled, as the Palestinians are doing today, for their rights and independence; who, more than two centuries ago, adopted the great and lofty principles of freedom, equality, independence and sovereignty toward which the leaders and intellectuals, such as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin and others, showed the way. Those principles and values, from which all liberation movements have drawn inspiration in their struggle against colonialism and domination, today inspire the Arab Palestinian people in its just struggle for its land, freedom and sovereignty.

66. The Palestinian people find in the principles of George Washington an ally against the policies of the Carter Administration and find in the principles of Jefferson and Franklin support in their struggle against the partial policies conceived by the governing powers

in Washington under the domination of zionism. The PLO is today more dedicated to the principles of the American Declaration of Independence than those groups that claim to guard and defend those principles.

67. The second reason for optimism about the possibility of a change in the American stand is the interests that the Arab countries and the United States have in common. Those mutual interests should orient future relations, when one bears in mind that what the Arabs are asking of the United States is part of the duties and responsibilities of that super-Power, which are to put an end to the Zionist Israeli aggression and to permit the international Organization and all peace-loving peoples to call a halt to this dangerous decline towards a destructive war.

68. It is important to state that, as the Arab countries have stressed in their conferences, Arab-American relations are bound to be affected to a dangerous degree if the United States continues to collaborate with Israel and to support Israel's aggressive policy. In fact, the words "collaborate" and "support" are understatement, as is shown by figures and statistics concerning the size of American military and economic assistance to Israel, which so far amounts to tens of billions of dollars. Billions more are diverted at the expense of American taxpayers, by questionable means, for the benefit of the Israeli defence budget and of some private accounts of Zionist financiers, thereby exploiting American laws which regard donations to Israel as humane acts and, therefore, tax exempt. Donations for aircraft that attack Palestinian and Lebanese children in their villages, towns, fields, schools and even hospitals are regarded as humane acts, just like donations for day-care centres in Georgia or senior-citizens homes in Texas or Florida.

69. The Arab nations have constantly affirmed their determination to pursue their efforts to achieve a just peace. Most recently they reaffirmed that at the Eleventh Arab Summit Conference, held at Amman from 25 to 27 November.

70. The bases for the establishment of peace in the Middle East are clear and supported by the resolutions of the Organization, which have gained the support of the majority of the States of the world.

71. In order to achieve peace it is necessary first to face the established fact that the Palestinian people is at the centre of the issue and has the sole responsibility for its own future. It is imperative that that people, like all other peoples of the world, exercise self-determination, and that includes the right to establish its independent State in occupied Palestine. The PLO is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. That right of representation can be neither granted nor acquired: it is dictated by law and logic. The PLO has that right not only because of its wide international recognition but also because it enjoys the confidence and support of the Arabs particularly the Palestinians, including those living under occupation, whether in Acre, Haifa, Jaffa, Jerusalem, Nablus, Nazareth, Tiberius, Ramallah or Bethlehem. The right of representation of the PLO is a fact having the force of law; it forms the solid basis for the recognition of the PLO as the sole representative of the Palestinian people, whether or not that is to the liking of the Israeli authorities and despite the hesita-

tion of the responsible officials in Washington about recognizing that fact. It is perhaps useful to note that the leaders of the American war of independence did not need—and indeed did not wait for—the recognition of the British occupying authorities.

72. The only Powers that do not recognize the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people are the United States, South Africa and Israel, while the majority of Western European States—if not all of them—have established normal working relations with representatives of the organization.

73. The reasons for the failure of the United States to recognize the PLO so far are clear. They are well known to us, but they cannot be dealt with until the American will in Washington is free to show itself and until the American decision is based only on the interests of the American people.

74. Similarly, the reasons for South Africa's failure to recognize the PLO are obvious. But who needs such recognition? For the racist régime in South Africa constitutes in itself a unique fact; it will collapse when the African continent achieves total control over its own destiny.

75. Israel's accusation—made here a few days ago by the representative of Menachem Begin—that the PLO is a terrorist organization encourages sarcasm. Is it not ridiculous that the representative of Menachem Begin—and none other than the representative of Menachem Begin—accuses the PLO of terrorism? Is it not ridiculous that such attacks come from a representative of Menachem Begin, who earned decorations by committing the following acts: first, a medal for killing defenceless children, women and old people and accomplishing unique heroic feats in the massacres at Deir Yassin and Kfar Kassem; secondly, a medal for the assassination of the international peace mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte, in accordance with a well-thought-out plan which was carried out with unequalled competence; thirdly, a medal for the premeditated killing of British soldiers and the displaying of their bodies, which won Begin the death sentence for terrorism from the British courts; and fourthly, a medal for killing hundreds of innocent persons in the King David Hotel, where a bomb had been planted, thus establishing Begin's expertise in the field. Is it not truly sad that the contempt of Menachem Begin's representative reaches the extent of accusing the PLO of being a terrorist organization?

76. The second indispensable basis for the establishment of peace in the Middle East, as affirmed by the Arab Summit Conference at Amman, is Israel's withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories. Since Security Council resolution 242 (1967), as that Conference reaffirmed, is not in conformity with Arab rights and does not form a solid basis for the resolution of the Middle East crisis, it is necessary to implement the resolutions of the General Assembly regarding the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

77. A few days ago the Israeli representative presented to the General Assembly a number of falsehoods based on the distortion of facts which showed the extent of that representative's ignorance of history, or his disregard for it.

78. The representative of Israel—that is to say, the representative of Menachem Begin—spoke with apparent pleasure about what he called the conflicts in the Middle East and the disagreements between some of the nations of the region. Differences of opinion regarding political issues, especially the important ones, are natural and can be expected among different parties in the same country, or within the same political party. However, we should like to note that these differences which bring joy to Israel are only temporary and do not affect the basic position of the Arab nations and their desire to establish a just peace in accordance with the principles we have already mentioned. We realize that the Israeli authorities, with their blood-stained record, could only be overjoyed about disputes and the shedding of blood in the Middle East. Israel achieves continued success in the shedding of blood through its criminal raids on innocent children in southern Lebanon, carried out by what it calls the Israeli Defence Force.

79. It is also saddening to find that the Israeli representative would go so far as to alter the recent history of Palestine and to characterize the situation of the Palestinian people before the Mandate or immediately following it as that of a people living in east Jordan. Before the establishment of the aggressive Zionist entity and before the beginning of the Palestinian crisis, only the Jordanian people lived in Jordan. How is it, then, that either the imagination or the ignorance of the Israeli representative allows him to see in Jordan a homeland for the Palestinian people? The reasoning of the Israeli representative is that both Palestine and Jordan were under British occupation and that the colonial official in London, Mr. Balfour, sold to a political merchant, Mr. Weizmann, land which was not owned by the seller and which the purchaser had no right to buy. From the reasoning used by the Israeli representative it follows that the true place for the discussion of the Palestinian issue should from the beginning have been the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It would have been natural to deal with the problem of the Zionist presence in Palestine in the same manner in which the colonial presence in Africa and Asia was dealt with and to arrive at the same results, namely the liberation of the peoples of those two continents from colonialism and its effects.

80. The Israeli representative alleged that the Palestinian issue had been used to increase the price of oil. A quick review of the increases in the prices of all basic commodities during the past few years, including the increases in the prices of foodstuffs, clearly indicates the extent to which the Israeli representative ignores the most basic economic principles or to what extent he distorts the facts. He also said that socialist countries have used the Middle East crisis to increase their presence in the region at the expense of the United States. The representative of Menachem Begin would not admit that the continued Israeli aggression and the continued American support of that aggression have weakened the American presence in the Middle East. He could not admit to this because in reality he would be admitting thereby that Israel is a great burden to the United States and to the interests of the American people in the Middle East.

81. The Israeli representative criticized the number of meetings in the United Nations on the Middle East and the numerous condemnations of Israel and its aggressive policies. That Israeli criticism reminds us all of an important fact, that is, to denounce Israel is no longer sufficient and that the time has come to implement the principles of the Charter against Israel, to impose sanctions on it and ultimately to expel it from the international Organization.

82. The Middle East crisis and Israel's continued occupation of Arab territories, its disregard for the rights of the Palestinian people and its defiance of the international will pose a dangerous and continuing threat to peace and security in the Middle East. It is the duty of the Organization to adopt effective and direct measures before it becomes too late. It is the international responsibility of all peace-loving countries to act in order to prevent a regional war from developing into a world war. They must adopt measures to forestall the further deterioration of the situation in the region. Israel's disrespect for the Organization—and this is more evident now than in the past—may cost each Member State dearly. To check Israel is not a luxury but an inevitable necessity, in order to protect the future and the destiny of all peoples.

83. The Arab demands for the resolution of the crisis and the establishment of a just peace are just and well-founded demands. Furthermore, they are no longer merely Arab demands but international demands supported by all the nations of the world, with the exception of one super-Power, namely the United States, the will of which is controlled by an authority which scorns all the principles of international law—Israel.

84. The Arab leaders, during the Arab Summit Conference at Amman, reaffirmed the Arab nations' dedication to a just and lasting peace and their continued belief in that principle. Yet that peace should never be achieved at the expense of Arab rights, for the rights of the Palestinian people to a homeland and an independent State are absolute and not open to negotiation. The withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories is also an absolute, indisputable right. The peace sought by all Arab nations is not a peace entailing a surrender of rights but a peace based on the principles of justice and the restoration of rights. The Arabs have therefore rejected the Camp David agreements, since they entailed the surrender of rights and acquiescence to aggression.

85. Indications have recently been given of the adoption by the new United States Administration of the outgoing Administration's Middle East policy—the policy of Camp David, which has proved a failure. While recognizing the reasons for which those agreements were negotiated, which reflect the influence that the Zionists exert on both outgoing and incoming Administrations, the Arab countries, during the most recent Summit Conference, in Amman, expressed their unanimous hope that the American Administration would be able to liberate itself from Zionist influence and formulate an objective American policy which would not be totally partial to Israel. The threat to peace today is more serious than at any previous time. The Arab countries, in order to protect the just peace and, consequently, to defend their legitimate rights, will not spare any effort or hesitate to adopt any legitimate nationalist policy to defend Arab rights.

The Arab countries, as reaffirmed at the Amman Summit Conference, will not accept any solution achieved at the expense of the Palestinian people or any solution which bypasses the PLO. Similarly, the Arab countries will not accept any friendly relations or ties which are not based upon the just Arab demands.

86. While the Arab countries have expressed their sincere desire for a positive change in American policy on the Palestinian question and the Middle East crisis, at the Summit Conference at Amman they also expressed a desire that the countries of the European Community would continue to recognize and understand Arab rights and the national rights of the Palestinians.

87. I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to express the genuine appreciation of the Arab States, already voiced at Amman, to all the nations of the world that have expressed an understanding of the justice of the Arab demands and supported the Palestinian people and the PLO. That support constitutes a serious, important and positive contribution to the efforts towards that peace to which our countries aspire.

88. The Arab nations' belief in the United Nations is a belief that will not be affected at all by the obstacles placed in the way of the implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations. The Arab nations' belief in the Organization is an expression of the belief of all Arabs in the principles of the Charter and in the necessity for supporting those principles. Support for these principles is in the interest of all peace-loving nations and peoples that are determined to struggle for freedom and independence.

89. Freedom is not a gift to be expected at Christmas but the sacred right of all peoples. This right can be achieved only through continued struggle and sacrifice. It is in recognition of this right that the Palestinian people and the whole Arab nation have put their faith.

90. Mr. MANSOURI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The General Assembly considered the question of Palestine a few days ago, and today we are considering the situation in the Middle East. These two questions arise from one problem which has occupied the United Nations since Israel was created in the Middle East as part of a Zionist, colonialist, imperialist plot based on an expansionist Zionist policy of establishing settlements in Palestinian Arab lands.

91. Successive summit conferences of the non-aligned countries, the Islamic States and the Organization of African Unity [OAU], as well as the United Nations in its various bodies and institutions, have reaffirmed in more than one resolution that the Palestinian problem is at the core of the Middle East problem and that it is thus part and parcel of the Middle East problem. That is why there can be no solution of the Middle East problem without a resolution of the main cause of the problem, which is none other than the Palestinian people and its right to self-determination and to establish its own independent State.

92. Today the Assembly is considering the report of the Secretary-General [A/35/563-S/14234], which reviews the situation in the Middle East in all its aspects. We should like, first of all, to express to the

Secretary-General our appreciation of his thorough report and of the efforts he has made to bring about a lasting peace in the Middle East. The most important paragraphs of the report concern the situation in the occupied Arab territories, the problem of Palestinian refugees and the question of the rights of the Palestinian people, questions which have the same origin, that is, the creation of the State of Israel in the Palestinian territories and the colonialist expansionist settlement policy which that State continues to practice, thanks to the world Zionist movement and to the racist Zionist organizations supported by the United States of America.

93. We should like to cite in this regard an article which appeared in the Zionist daily *Ma'ariv* on 15 August 1975. In that article, the Jewish Agency and the settlement movements defined the minimal conditions to be met for the creation of each settlement in the territories occupied since 1967. Those conditions are conditions of security, for the settlements should be established near the army's posts and near water sources and cultivable lands or lands already under cultivation. These conditions, as well as the Zionist settlements, have no other purpose than to make it possible for sovereignty over the Arab territories to be declared subsequently. To achieve that purpose, those responsible for the settlements of the Zionist entity have devoted considerable sums of money to the furtherance of settlements.

94. We also note in this connexion, in the framework of Israeli expansionist policy, the efforts undertaken recently by the Israeli Knesset—which some of the press agencies have taken note of—to consider a law aimed at the annexation of the Syrian Arab Golan Heights, and the subject has been dealt with as practically a *fait accompli*. On 17 January 1980, the Israeli newspaper *Ha'aretz* stated that 750,000 Israeli citizens, including 71 members of the Knesset and six Ministers, had signed a petition requesting the extension of Israeli sovereignty to the Syrian Golan Heights. Begin himself said that "the Golan is an integral and indivisible part of Israel".

95. This is obviously very dangerous and a flagrant violation of the Charter and of the principles of international law, as well as the various United Nations resolutions which call upon Israel to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories. There is no question but that the Golan Heights is an integral and indivisible part of those occupied territories.

96. The Government of the Syrian Arab Republic has alerted the international community to the dangers of this problem. The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Syria, Mr. Khaddam, has sent a letter to the Secretary-General [A/35/571-S/14239]. That letter was intended to draw the attention of the international community—the General Assembly and Security Council in particular—to the extremely dangerous implications for peace in the region and in the world as a whole of the Israeli plan. The letter also calls on the international community to take practical steps finally to put an end to the aggressive expansionist Israeli practices.

97. The Organization and its various organs, committees and agencies have always known that Israel takes no notice of United Nations resolutions and

refuses to implement even the mildest provision even of those resolutions which gave birth to Israel or made possible its acceptance into the membership of the United Nations. On more than one occasion and in various reports, the Secretary-General has noted Israel's rejection of, for example, Security Council resolution 478 (1980) condemning the "basic law" relating to the declaration of Jerusalem as the Israeli capital. Israel even rejected Security Council resolution 465 (1980), adopted unanimously, in which the Council determined that all measures taken by Israel to change the physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure or the status of the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, had no legal validity and that Israel's policy and practices of settling new immigrants in those territories constituted a flagrant violation of the fourth Geneva Convention.² It called on Israel to put an end to the establishment of settlements in the occupied Arab territories.

98. The Secretary-General, in his report on the question of Palestine [A/35/618-S/14250], notes Israel's refusal to accept the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its seventh emergency special session, devoted to the question of Palestine. That refusal is maintained. Israel's intransigence and arrogance prompt us to ask what is the basis of Israel's defiance of the international community. Israel unquestionably bases that defiance on United States support. The United States gives it direct financial, military and economic support and also provides political support in the United Nations, particularly in the Security Council, even when the United States must go against the majority of the Security Council membership in supporting Israel's refusal to grant the Palestinian people its right to self-determination. That is done in order to satisfy Israel, despite the fact that the United States is in the vanguard of the countries that claim to defend the principle of freedom and the right of oppressed peoples to self-determination.

99. We note that Israel stands side by side with the racist South African régime in its defiance of the international community and its jeering at the various resolutions adopted by the United Nations on the subject.

100. My delegation believes that it is high time for the General Assembly to face up to its responsibilities, to apply the power conferred on it by the Charter in order to force Israel to accept the General Assembly's resolutions, bearing in mind that the United States has so far succeeded in preventing the Security Council from adopting a firm resolution imposing sanctions on Israel by threatening to use its right of veto, thus defying the majority of the international community.

101. The Syrian Arab Republic aspires to peace, and we are working for peace, but we demand peace based on justice, for these two elements are inseparable. We believe that a comprehensive and just settlement, which could bring peace to our area, must be based on the following principles. First, the Palestinian cause is the essence of the problem of the

² Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949. United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973, p. 287.

Middle East and the main reason for the Israeli-Arab conflict. Secondly, the Palestinian cause and the problem of the Middle East represent an indivisible whole, and that is why there is no room for partial solutions that involve some of the parties only. It is impossible to have an isolated peace. It must be just and comprehensive; it must encompass all the parties concerned, including the PLO; and it must put an end to all the causes of conflict. Thirdly, the establishment of a just peace in the Middle East is possible only if that peace is based on Israel's complete and unconditional withdrawal from all Palestinian and other occupied Arab territories and the restoration of all the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, especially its right to return to its homeland, the right to self-determination and the right to found an independent Palestinian State. Fourthly, the city of Jerusalem is an integral part of the occupied Palestinian territories, which must be evacuated and must revert unconditionally to Arab sovereignty. Fifthly, the PLO is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arab people, and a solution can be comprehensive, acceptable and just only if the PLO participates as a sovereign entity on an equal footing with the other parties. Sixthly, all Israeli acts in occupied Arab territory aimed at changing the demographic, housing, cultural, political and religious nature of the territory are null and void. Seventhly, all existing settlements, or those established in the future, are contrary to international conventions and customs. Therefore it is necessary to put a stop to the creation of new settlements and to remove those created by Israel, which continues its settlements work in defiance of the opinion of the world community, thus flagrantly violating all the United Nations resolutions on the subject.

102. That, as we see it, is the only framework which could lead to a just and comprehensive solution to the problem if we want peace to see the light of day and to put an end to this tragedy.

103. In this context we state once again what we have already pointed out, namely, that all agreements concluded outside the framework of the United Nations and behind its back, notably the Camp David agreements, which supposedly have brought about a transitory peace in the Middle East, are void and are rejected by the Palestinians in their occupied land and in exile. These agreements have also been rejected by the Arab States and peoples, who are working to put an end to them and eradicate their effects.

104. In resolution 34/65 B, the General Assembly notes with concern that the Camp David accords were concluded outside the framework of the United Nations and without the participation of the PLO, and rejects those provisions of the accords which ignore, infringe, violate or deny the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right of return, the right of self-determination and the right to national independence and sovereignty in Palestine in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. In that resolution, the General Assembly declares that the Camp David accords and other agreements have no validity in so far as they purport to determine the future of the Palestinian people.

105. Finally we should like to recall something that the Secretary-General has said in several of his reports to the Security Council in connexion with the activities

of UNDOF in the Golan Heights. In his report,³ the Secretary-General stated that despite the present quiet, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continued potentially dangerous and was likely to remain so until an over-all settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem could be reached.

106. The Security Council has endorsed that opinion unanimously on more than one occasion, which strengthens our belief that it is the duty of the General Assembly to take decisive and effective action without delay to force Israel to respect and implement the various General Assembly resolutions which have defined the bases and principles of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

107. Mr. NISIBORI (Japan): Since the last time this item was discussed by the General Assembly, tensions in the Middle East have heightened and peace and security in the area have become more remote. Because Japan seeks its own stability and prosperity in the context of international peace and development, the situation in the Middle East continues to be a source of deep concern to the Government of Japan.

108. Since the various conflicts and political confrontations in the Middle East, including the Arab-Israeli conflict, have deep historical, national or religious roots, they are especially difficult to resolve. It is essential to recognize, however, that a threat to peace and security in the Middle East could have grave repercussions on the security and prosperity of the entire international community. At the same time, we should be mindful of the nature of modern warfare, which results in the loss of many lives and in the massive destruction of property.

109. The Government of Japan is concerned about a recent tendency whereby political confrontations in the Middle East influence and are influenced by other conflicts in the area. We therefore wish on this occasion to appeal to the countries concerned to show restraint by respecting the principle of the non-use of force. We strongly hope that all countries will seek peaceful settlements in solving any conflicts, in accordance with the Charter.

110. As to the Arab-Israeli conflict, we note various fluid factors affecting the achievement of peace. My country has been exerting its utmost efforts in accordance with the following principles, which have been expressed on various occasions. First, the peace that is achieved in the Middle East should be just, lasting and comprehensive. Secondly, such a peace should be achieved through the early and complete implementation of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and through recognition of and respect for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination, under the Charter. Thirdly, each and every path towards the attainment of such a peace must be explored, with careful consideration being given to the legitimate security requirements of the countries in the region and to the aspirations of all the peoples in the region, including the Palestinian people.

111. In accordance with the aforementioned fundamental principles, Japan is firmly convinced that in

³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1980*, document S/14263.

order to achieve an early peace it is first essential that Israel withdraw from all the occupied territories and that Israel and the PLO reciprocally recognize each other's position, so that the participation of the PLO in the peace process can be ensured. We therefore deplore the fact that Israel is ignoring the appeal of the international community by establishing settlements in the occupied territories and by annexing East Jerusalem, thereby violating the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

112. Further, we recognize that peace and stability in Lebanon are essential to the attainment of peace throughout the Middle East. We deplore Israel's repeated attacks against southern Lebanon, which result in loss of life and destruction of property, not only among the Palestinian refugees living there but also among other innocent residents in the area. We strongly urge Israel to refrain from making further military incursions into southern Lebanon. At the same time, in accordance with the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes, we urge the Palestinian people to exercise restraint concerning actions that would only complicate and worsen the situation.

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

114. In closing, I should like to reaffirm Japan's readiness to work for the common goal of peace in the Middle East by pursuing its independent policy in co-operation with the countries concerned.

115. Mr. ALLAGANY (Saudi Arabia) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Once again we return to the question of the Middle East and the basic problem that the international community realizes to be the major obstacle impeding the establishment of peace and security in that region, where tension increases from day to day every year. Israel has once again resorted to distorting facts and blaming Arab States and the Palestinians and has adopted the same technique that it has used since its creation.

116. Israel opposes the United Nations and its resolutions. Israel records the history of the Palestinian problem from the point of view of its expansionist and aggressive policy, with no regard for the opinion of the international community or the social, economic and political interests of States or for the simplest rules of justice and humanity. The painful element in this whole situation is that Israel sees logic only through the eyes of its own imperialistic interests. It does not even pay regard to the interests of those States that have supported it through domestic political pressures and through the techniques of blackmail that have been practised and mastered by world Zionism.

117. At its thirty-fourth session the General Assembly adopted resolution 34/70, in which it condemned Israel's continued occupation of Palestinian and other Arab territories in violation of the provisions of the Charter. In that resolution the Assembly declared in unequivocal terms that peace is indivisible and that the settlement of the Middle East conflict must be based on a solution worked out under the auspices of the United Nations and which takes into account all

aspects of the Arab-Israeli conflict, in particular, the recovery by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights, as well as Israeli withdrawal from all the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem. That resolution recalled resolution 34/65, adopted at the same session, in part A of which the General Assembly called for the invitation of the PLO, the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, to participate on the basis of Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX) in all discussions on an equal footing with other parties.

118. Never since its creation has Israel complied with any General Assembly or Security Council resolutions. At every session the leaders of that entity resort to one pretext after another. We have heard the representative of Israel at this session using the same scheme, the Israeli logic which consists of accusing the Palestinian people and the Arab countries of using peace as a pretext for aggressive action. The Arabs and the Palestinians, who are the victims, are the aggressors according to the Israelis, and Israel, which is the aggressor, has thus become the victim of aggression. According to that logic, Israel, a Member State of the United Nations, has the right to occupy the remainder of Arab Palestine and the lands of its Arab neighbours, to annex those lands and to establish settlements, to oppress the indigenous population, to pursue the most horrible forms of terror and aggression, colonialism, oppression, massacre, detention and imprisonment without trial, to impose collective punitive measures, close schools and universities, destroy houses, deport Arab leaders and murder or attempt to murder mayors and all those who are suspected of opposing the imperialist policy of Israel.

119. The Zionist movement obviously exists, although the objectives it pursues have eluded for so long the supporters of the Jewish State in Palestine. Despite the fact that the vast majority of States have now come to realize the truth about that criminal movement and its objectives, some States still support Israel or do not dare to oppose the Zionist influence in the world, which vigorously supports the Israeli entity.

120. The Zionists and leaders of Israel object when the General Assembly considers the Zionist movement a racist movement. In fact, it is one of the most racist movements existing, and its policy, patently based on the distinction that what is right for them is not right for others, is but the concretization of the racist philosophy whose believers consider that their people are superior to others and have superior human and moral qualities and who consider that the others, particularly those who resist them, are inferior, corrupt and evil.

121. There are numerous specific examples to support that statement. The occupation by Israel of other countries and the dispersion of the indigenous peoples and populations are democratic and peaceful acts, while the resistance of such occupation is an evil and aggressive act. The usurpation and confiscation of the lands of others, the dispersion of the inhabitants and the settlement of foreign Jews on those lands are noble acts serving the interests of humanity and human rights, but seeking to put an end to that dispersion and to the extermination of the owners of the land is an act which conflicts with the simplest rules of humanity.

122. Palestinian infiltration across the borders for the purpose of liberating some detainees is an unjust, terrorist, barbarous act, but air raids on refugee camps in southern Lebanon, bombing the houses and villages of refugees and the destruction of their homes and the murder of the men, women and children living in them are preventive measures which would never be condemned by the human conscience and which are a source of pride for Israel, since they protect Jewish lives which are valuable to the human community.

123. Liberation acts which are conducted by the dispersed owners of the land are considered terrorist acts contrary to the simplest rules of humanity, but Jewish terrorism in Palestine prior to 1948, the leaders of which have come to take power in that so-called democratic State, is considered a legal act of liberation.

124. Israel and the Zionist movement still pursue those methods of challenge and rejection of all United Nations resolutions. The Jewish people was and still is entitled to establish a Jewish State in Israel, as delineated in the Partition Plan [*resolution 181 (II)*], but not with the extended boundaries of Israel of 1949; not with Israel's occupying the rest of Palestinian Arab territories; not in Jordan, which Israel still refers to as part of Palestine and which to its great regret it has not been able to annex so far. But the Palestinian people and other Arab peoples resist this aggression and expansion and support the Charter, which prohibits aggression against the integrity and independence of other countries and recognizes the right of all peoples to self-determination, as aggression constitutes a violation of the Charter and the subjugation of world conscience, which only Israel understands, while accusing the vast majority of the international community of being devoid of principles, without conscience, stripped of every human sentiment, and of paying attention only to its own material interests. Therefore Israel, which upholds the lofty principles of ethics and human values, refuses to comply with General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, insisting that mankind as a whole should adhere to those values, even though it is the furthest from applying them. Consequently, Israel cannot understand how anybody can go so far as to describe it or the Zionist movement as racist.

125. The situation in the Middle East is grave and serious because Israel pursues a policy of aggression and defiance. Israel now tries to shirk its responsibilities and points its finger at some Arab disputes or the Iraqi-Iranian dispute and says that they are clear evidence that Israel is not the core and source of the danger which threatens the region. My Government and all those who have followed the development of the situation in the Middle East throughout the past 32 years have no doubt that the question and the cause of Palestine have been and still are the main source of instability in the Middle East and of the dangers threatening the area.

126. Many political events have taken place in the region since 1948. They include coups, subversions, coalitions, unifications, alliances, disputes and wars. Well-versed experts know full well that in all cases those events emanated from the need for rebellion and revolution of the Arab peoples of the area, including the Palestinian people, because of the immense injustices inflicted on Palestine and its people, as well

as on the lands and peoples of countries which are neighbours of Israel.

127. Because it is impossible for the United Nations to adopt effective measures to implement its successive resolutions, as a result of the position adopted by some major countries, Israel closes its eyes, as usual, to the evident and indisputable fact, namely, that the Balfour Declaration of 1917⁴ was void of any legality, for the party which made the concessions contained in that Declaration did not possess Palestine or the right to grant part of it to any but its lawful inhabitants.

128. This is true also of the partition resolution, which granted the Jews more than half the area of Palestine at a time when the Jewish population was less than 30 per cent of the indigenous Arab population. Israel should not forget that its occupation of the West Bank, the Gaza strip and other occupied Arab territories is void of legality and legitimacy and contrary to the provisions of the Charter, as well as General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. It should realize unequivocally that its continued occupation and usurpation of Arab territories and its confiscation of lands and establishment of settlements are the major causes of Palestinian resistance and the Palestine liberation movement, which Israel unjustly describes as a terrorist movement. The Palestine liberation movement is not a terrorist movement; terrorism is Israeli occupation, oppression, persecution and the murder of innocent civilians in refugee camps in Palestine, southern Lebanon and elsewhere. That is real terrorism, planned and carried out by a State armed with the most modern weapons and by a major Power which has not ceased providing arms and military equipment to Israel, despite its aggressive policy and brutal acts. This is the true picture of terrorism: the illegality of the occupation of Palestinian and Arab territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, and that is the main reason for the noble efforts at liberation exerted by the Palestinian people, whether on Palestinian soil or elsewhere. This illegality and this continued occupation, the settlements and the injustice constitute the main causes, direct or indirect, of the troubles in the Middle East.

129. Until a few years ago, the leaders of Israel denied the existence of a Palestinian problem or of a Palestinian people. But now that the whole world has recognized the existence of the Palestinians, the Israelis and their supporters deny that the Palestinian problem has any link with peace and security in the Middle East. They likewise deny that the Palestinian people has any connexion whatsoever with the land of occupied Palestine and say that they must choose to settle down and exercise their right to self-determination in other Arab countries, not in their own land, that of their forefathers.

130. The attempts by the leaders of Israel and their representative in the United Nations to alter the truth have no limits. The representative of Israel, in his statement before the General Assembly on 2 December, mentioned that "the Arab-Israel conflict has also provided a convenient cover for Arab oil-producing countries to extort excessive prices for their oil" [*77th meeting, para. 93*]. That representative knows

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Supplement No. 11, vol. II, annex 19.*

full well that the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries includes non-Arab members and that the price of oil exported by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and other Arab countries is far less than the price on the free market or the price charged by other countries. Up to now, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has exported a greater quantity of oil than it needs to export, in order to serve the needs of consumers, be they in developed or developing countries. The representative of Israel is aware that in this respect also he is distorting the truth, as Israel customarily does when dealing with the cause of Palestine, the Middle East problem and everything having to do with these two subjects. Equally falsely, Israel says that if the right to self-determination is granted the Palestinian people and if its legitimate representatives are allowed to exercise that right, this will pave the way to the establishment of a military base for a major State on the West Bank and in Gaza that would threaten the interests of Western States. While Israel pretends to serve the Western community by rejecting the provisions of the Charter and refusing to comply with General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, it seeks only to consolidate its usurpation of and its foothold in occupied Palestinian territory.

131. The Palestinian cause is indivisible from the Middle East problem. There will be no comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the area until Israel realizes that its friends and supporters have begun to suffer from this situation. They are suffering from Israel's defiance, from its continued aggression, from the pressures exerted by world Zionism to obtain continued support for aggression and from the tendency of the Zionist movement on every occasion to refer to the Nazi oppression of the Jews during the Second World War, linking all that to a somber future for Jews who would be exposed to Arab persecution. But the Zionist movement and all Jews know that the Arabs have been far more tolerant than any other people in regard to Jewish minorities in their countries.

132. Israel and Zionism use these methods to achieve their imperialist aspirations and ambitions, but my Government believes that there are no further grounds for accepting such pretexts. The Palestinian people has the right to live in peace and security in its own land, the land of its forefathers, handed down for thousands of years, to enjoy its own resources and the right to self-determination and independence without foreign pressures.

133. The Camp David agreements, in which the PLO did not participate and which took place outside the framework of the United Nations, do not constitute the proper road to a comprehensive and lasting peace, for the Palestinian people is a principal party concerned in the dispute, and no country can speak on its behalf. The General Assembly recognized this in its resolution 34/65 B, where it is clearly indicated that the Camp David accords and other agreements "have no validity in so far as they purport to determine the future of the Palestinian people and of the Palestinian territories occupied by Israel since 1967", and that such accords and analogous treaties constitute a flagrant violation of the rights of the Palestinian people, the principles of the Charter and the resolutions adopted in the various international forums...".

134. My Government believes that it is high time to adopt a decisive measure on this subject. It is no longer sufficient to adopt resolutions expressing affirmations and reaffirmations, condemning and denouncing. It is time for the international community to realize that the greatest danger in the Middle East lies in the Israeli policy of aggression and violation by Israel of international rules and laws and that, unless Israel realizes that it is essential to put an end to this policy and to comply with United Nations resolutions, the Middle East region will experience varied and violent crises whose serious consequences are difficult to predict. That is why at this juncture we invite all peoples supporting Israel to end their assistance which enables Israel to pursue its aggression. We call on the Assembly to recommend to the Security Council the application of the necessary measures indicated in Chapter VII of the Charter. We are certain that such measures will help to a great extent in the restoration of peace and security in the Middle East in a manner that will take into consideration the interests of all the peoples of the world.

135. Mr. AL-QASSIMI (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation has considered the report of the Secretary-General which is now before the General Assembly and which deals with developments in the Middle East. It appears from that report that various resolutions have been adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council which condemn the expansionist policies being pursued by Israel. Those resolutions have requested Israel to put an end to its challenge to the will of the international community and to comply with their provisions. But it is clear that Israel has ignored those resolutions and has failed to abide by them, thus showing its contempt for the United Nations and its role in the preservation of international peace and security.

136. Israel is trying to question the effectiveness of the United Nations and has accused the United Nations of being subject to Arab pressures. Those baseless accusations arise, in our opinion, from two principle reasons. The first reason is that the various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and by the Security Council have unmasked the policies of Israel before the world, which prompted the General Assembly quite recently to seek more decisive means of dissuading Israel from its course by calling for the application of the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. The second reason is that any organ which is not subject to Zionist pressure and which is not completely under its domination is, in their eyes, defective. This is because Zionism does not restrict itself to violating territories but even goes so far as to violate the principles and human values on which the Organization is founded.

137. Israel has become accustomed to accusing the great majority of the States Members of the United Nations of being ignorant or of submitting to Arab opinion whenever the General Assembly condemns its policies. This accusation is only a desperate attempt on the part of Israel to disguise the truth, which is so clear to one and all, namely that the Palestinian people, which has been uprooted from its lands and its fatherland, still exists, that it is a living entity and that the world as a whole has recognized its inalienable rights.

138. The support of peoples throughout the world for the Palestinian cause is not attributable to the lack of awareness on the part of those peoples of the true situation, as is claimed by Israel. Rather it is due in particular to a historical truth, which cannot be changed and which goes right back to the historic confrontation between the colonialist and imperialist forces that created Israel and those peoples that suffered from the evils of colonialism in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world. The attitude of those peoples is to be seen simply as an appeal for an end to colonialism and for its eradication wherever it exists, so that the true owners of the lands can recover their rights and social justice, rights that had been trampled upon by colonialism. The support of the peoples of the world for the struggle of the Palestinian people to defend its national existence and national independence is a good illustration of the legitimacy of that struggle against Zionism and colonialism.

139. If General Assembly resolutions are one-sided, as Israel has claimed, does that apply also to the members of the Security Council and to the resolutions of that Council, specifically resolution 471 (1980), which requested Israel to respect the provisions of the Geneva Convention, relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, as well as other relevant Security Council resolutions? Would that apply equally to Security Council resolution 476 (1980), which reaffirmed the need to put an end to Israel's occupation of Arab territories, including Jerusalem?

140. I do not believe that American television network reporters were subject to Arab influence when they reported on the terrorist means of oppression employed by the Israeli occupation troops in order to put an end to the demonstrations in the occupied West Bank. Those reporters were recently prevented by Israel from carrying out their duties. Israel considers the West Bank a closed military zone, as reported in *The New York Times* yesterday morning and this morning as well.

141. Despite all these challenges to the international community, Israel always claims that it is the defender of democracy in the Middle East. Is it democratic to jeopardize the lives of the representatives of the Palestinian people—its legitimate representatives—and to expel them from their homeland by using oppression and repression in the manner of dictators? Is democracy, in the eyes of the Israelis, to be interpreted as limiting essential freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of movement, freedom of education—in the daily lives of the inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories?

142. We cannot refer there to all the acts perpetrated by Israel against the most elementary human values of contemporary times and against the inhabitants of the Arab territories. Even if Israel continues to disguise the racist nature of Zionism, its history and its conduct reveal that nature in full daylight.

143. Joseph Weitz, the Deputy Director of the Board of the National Jewish Fund from 1951 to 1973, wrote in his memoirs, published in 1940 and quoted in the newspaper *Davar* on 29 September 1967:

“... among ourselves it must be clear that there is no room in this country for both peoples together... with the Arabs we shall not achieve our aim of being

an independent people in this country. The only solution is Eretz Israel, without Arabs... and there is no other way but to transfer the Arabs from here to the neighbouring countries, to transfer all of them: not one village or tribe should remain.”⁵

144. That, therefore, is the Israeli mentality, whatever methods may be made to obscure it by deceptive appearances or by the use of propaganda methods that are contrary to the truth.

145. The policy of *fait accompli* practised by Israel in regard to the occupied Arab territories and, in particular, the latest ordinance towards bringing the Golan Heights under Israeli control are nothing but a new strike against international conventions and practice. Israeli acts of aggression against southern Lebanon and against the Palestinian refugee camps are now carried out without ceasing, for two well-known reasons. The first is to terrorize the inhabitants and encourage them to leave their lands, which is part of the policy of Israel's leaders to which I referred a moment ago. The second reason is the desire to exterminate the Palestinian people so that there will be no one left to keep alive the wish to return to the homeland.

146. The question of Palestine is at the very heart of the Middle East conflict. So long as that problem is not solved equitably, peace can never be established in that region. The attempts to solve the Palestinian problem outside the framework of the United Nations and without the participation of the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people will result only in protracting the problem and in increasing the suffering of the Palestinian people, year after year.

147. The State of the United Arab Emirates has reaffirmed its rejection of the Camp David agreements, because they do not solve the essence of the Middle East problem, which is none other than the problem of Palestine. Therefore, we believe that any just solution to the Middle East problem must be based on the following elements: first, the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem; and secondly, recognition of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination, its right to sovereignty over its own land, without outside interference; and recognition of the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of that people.

148. The various previous United States Administrations have taken an attitude towards the Palestinian question that has been characterized by a total bias in favour of Israel and a total disregard for the Palestinian people, from 1948 to this very day. This conduct of United States policy is directed against all the Arab peoples, whose enmity it arouses in order to please Israel. The United States has furnished Israel with the weapons it has needed to occupy Palestine and the other Arab territories. The United States has been politically and morally on Israel's side in the Security Council, while completely disregarding the other side of the problem: the aspirations of the Palestinian people to return to its homeland. That is why we wish to remind the next United States Administration that preceding Administrations have failed to grasp the facts of the Middle East conflict and to invite it to re-evaluate its policy and to take the following elements

⁵ Quoted in English by the speaker.

into account: first, the Arab aspirations must be reconciled with United States national interests; secondly, a dialogue must be initiated with the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, the PLO, in order to bring a just and lasting peace to the region, under the auspices of the United Nations; thirdly, the Middle East region must be kept apart from international conflicts. Those are the principles that my delegation hopes will be observed by the next United States Administration when it carries out its policy towards the Middle East.

149. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At this session the General Assembly is considering the question of the Middle East at a time when that sensitive region is going through an extremely important and dangerous stage of its life, when brothers are killing each other, when that which was built over generations is destroyed, when dialogues are begun by the mobilization of armies along the frontiers, instead of preparing the way for a dialogue which will call for logic and reason. We regret very much the deterioration of the situation in the region. As the Secretary-General states in his report on the situation in the Middle East, "the situation in the Middle East as a whole [is] unstable and [will] remain so unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem [can] be reached" [A/35/563-S/14234, para. 45].

150. Egypt fully agrees with the Secretary-General when he says, at the end of his report, that "the main aspects of the Middle East problem are interdependent and cannot be separated" and "a continuous and determined effort must therefore be made to achieve a comprehensive settlement through negotiations involving all the parties concerned" [*ibid.*, para. 48].

151. We should like to state once again here that any solution of the Middle East problem must be based on the right of all the States in the region to live in peace and security and on the assurance that the Palestinian people will regain its inalienable rights, including its natural right to self-determination without outside interference, as well as on Israel's withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories, above all from the Arab city of Jerusalem.

152. Egypt has had a stable position of principle since the very beginning of the Palestinian problem. Egypt has always asked the international community, in all forums, to use every possible means to support the struggle of the Palestinian people to regain its rights. While some Arab régimes were engaged in a race of interference in the affairs of the Palestinian people and its leaders and were attempting to limit its freedom of action to the point of perpetrating collective massacres of that courageous people, those responsible being those who today claim to support Palestinian rights, Egypt has always refrained from interfering in the affairs of the Palestinian people, has called for a halt to the trusteeship practised against that people and has always condemned the exactions perpetrated against the Palestinian people by the Israeli occupation authorities. Egypt has also drawn attention to and condemned acts committed by certain Arab States.

153. Egypt has participated in four wars in self-defence and so that the Palestinian people may exercise

its rights. The most recent of those wars was the glorious October War of 1973, or the Ramadan War. That war placed the entire situation in its proper perspective and was the first step towards the establishment of a comprehensive, lasting and just solution. Egypt's position has always been consistent. We have not waged war for pleasure but to defend ourselves and to defend the rights of the Arab nation and its just causes, especially that of the Palestinian people, and to affirm the principles of international legitimacy.

154. Thus, Egypt accepted Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which was adopted unanimously. In that resolution the Council defined a general framework for a settlement and the obligations that all parties must fulfil if there is to be a comprehensive and just solution of the problem of the Middle East. It reaffirmed the essential principles for that settlement, first and foremost among which is that of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, which necessarily means the withdrawal of Israel from all occupied Arab territories.

155. Unquestionably, withdrawal by Israel is an essential condition for the exercise by the Palestinian people of its rights and the establishment of a just and lasting peace that will permit all the peoples in the region to live in security, free from foreign threats.

156. In conformity with this position, Egypt responded positively to the aide-memoire of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Gunnar Jarring, of 8 February 1971.⁶ That aide-memoire contained a request—and this was in 1971—that Egypt and Israel conclude a peace agreement in exchange for Israel's withdrawal to the international boundaries of Egypt. Despite the fact that the General Assembly, in its resolutions 2799 (XXVI) and 2949 (XXVII), had called upon Israel to respond favourably to this proposal, Israel at that time refused to promise to withdraw completely, and we know that Mr. Jarring's initiative came to nothing.

157. The General Assembly clearly supported the Egyptian position in resolution 2799 (XXVI), adopted on 13 December 1971 by an overwhelming majority, when it expressed its "full support for all the efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967)". Furthermore, the General Assembly noted "with appreciation the positive reply given by Egypt to the Special Representative's initiative for establishing a just and lasting peace in the Middle East". The Assembly also called upon Israel to respond favourably to the Special Representative's peace initiative.

158. The General Assembly reaffirmed its position in resolution 2949 (XXVII), adopted on 8 December 1972 by an overwhelming majority. I hope that some of those delegations that have spoken today will refer to those two resolutions in order to remind themselves of the position the General Assembly took at the time and of the fact that it supported Egypt as early as 1971 and 1972. Egypt's hope for a just and lasting peace is based on the principles of the Charter and on international law. Members will recall that President Anwar

⁶ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10403, annex I.

Sadat, when the armed forces of Egypt had destroyed the Bar-Lev line of defence and crossed the Suez Canal, launched an appeal for a peace conference in which all parties concerned would participate, including the representatives of the Palestinian people, in order to lay the foundations for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. But that appeal was rejected.

159. The policy of Egypt, which is based on principle, was clearly expressed once again when my country signed the Camp David agreements and the peace treaty with Israel,⁷ for those documents are based on the provisions of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), and above all on the principles of the Charter and of international law, which aim to solve all aspects of the Palestinian problem.

160. A comprehensive and just settlement in the Middle East will never be achieved until Israel withdraws from all occupied Arab and Palestinian territory, including the Arab city of Jerusalem, and until the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people are recognized, in particular its natural and sacred right to decide its own destiny without foreign interference. Egypt managed for the first time to get Israel to enter into an official commitment—the Camp David agreements—to allow the Palestinian people to exercise its legitimate rights. The documents relating to that commitment are there to be read by anyone who wishes. Until that day, Israel had never wished to recognize even the existence of the Palestinian people.

161. As far as the question of withdrawal is concerned, the peace treaty, for the first time since 1967, contains the commitment by Israel to withdraw to the internationally recognized borders of Egypt. That commitment must apply also to all the other Arab territories occupied by Israel in June 1967. The logic of this cannot escape those who are willing to understand logic. Egypt is working patiently and hard for the restoration of Arab and Palestinian rights, and Israel's withdrawal from the Sinai is but one step toward the withdrawal by Israel from all the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories. That is how we conceive and understand the withdrawal from Sinai and how all those who wish to grasp the true meaning of Israel's withdrawal from Sinai understand it.

162. Since we are talking about the Middle East question, it is important to reaffirm here the principle of withdrawal to the international boundaries, the need for the elimination of Israeli settlements in Sinai as much as in the occupied Arab territories and the possibility that exists for the peaceful coexistence among all the peoples of the region without exception—Arabs and Israelis—on the basis of mutual respect and co-operation. That is why the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt sets an important precedent which could be followed in all efforts to reach a settlement on all the other fronts and enable the various parties to recover their legitimate rights. This would enable Syria to recover its territories and, even more important, enable the Palestinian people to regain its legitimate rights while at the same time ensuring Israel's security within the framework of reciprocal security arrangements.

163. The comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East—which we talk about so often—must be based, we believe, on the following essential principles: first, scrupulous respect for the principles of the Charter and of international law and international legitimacy; secondly, the implementation of the United Nations resolutions on this problem that lay the groundwork for its solution, foremost among them Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), in which the Council clearly reaffirms the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and the need to use peaceful means for the settlement of international disputes; thirdly, the necessity of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable national rights, in particular its right to return to its homes, its right to self-determination and its right to establish an independent State.

164. If we wish to establish a lasting peace, it must be based on justice and must be comprehensive. That is why we cannot abandon any of our principles or any of our fundamental rights, nor can we seek a partial peace.

165. The time has come to face reality squarely and honestly. Lofty statements about other people's rights such as we have heard yesterday and today, and to which some of those represented here have confined their efforts, will never bring about complete withdrawal or restore to the Palestinian people the exercise of its legitimate rights. We must all endeavour to adopt positive and practical action to bring about a solution to the problem.

166. As I said a few days ago when we were considering the question of Palestine [76th meeting], Egypt has accepted its national and historical responsibilities as regards the brother people of Palestine. Ever since 1948, when that people was uprooted and displaced—for more than 30 years, that is—Egypt has struggled by both peaceful and military means to help the Palestinian people to recover its legitimate rights. I should like to reaffirm once again that the paramount, historic and natural role that Egypt plays in the Arab world is not based on manoeuvres or declarations but is the fruit of moral and intellectual effort flowing from a creative civilization which has existed for centuries. Our role is the natural result of the sacrifice of generation upon generation of Egyptians for the cause of the Arab nation, to raise the standard of the Arab nation, to strengthen its unity, cause its dignity to be respected and defend its rights. That is the role of the Egypt that we know.

167. As for those who reject peace and shout slogans, they do nothing to make the slightest progress towards a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement. Those people have no practical alternative solution but content themselves with shouting their slogans louder. A peaceful settlement of the conflict can be brought about only by constructive and sincere efforts on the part of all those who, like us, cherish peace. Egypt is not among those who advocate recourse to war, of the kind that some are carrying out now and that leads to destruction. Egypt continues its sincere, persistent and laborious efforts to establish peace, paying no heed to those who reject peace.

168. The Middle East, the cradle of three divine religions—Islam, Christianity and Judaism—can

⁷ Treaty of Peace between the Arab Republic of Egypt and the State of Israel, signed at Washington on 26 March 1979.

once again become a source of spiritual inspiration for the entire world. All the peoples of the Middle East long for the day when peace reigns in that region so that all, including the brother Palestinians people, can enjoy their legitimate rights and live in security in their own country. Egypt will continue to do everything within its power to achieve that noble objective. We shall continue our efforts, whatever the price, with peace-loving States, to lay the true foundations and pillars for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, in the interest of the peoples of that region and of the entire world.

169. Today I listened with much regret to the representative of the Arab League, who made another statement full of meaningless slogans. He even allowed himself to speak about the interests of the Egyptian people itself. I wish to reaffirm absolutely, for his benefit as well as for that of others, that the interests of the Arab Egyptian people are in the hands of honest

and sincere people who are making every effort to protect the true interests of the Egyptian and Arab peoples, in the interests of a just and lasting peace.

170. Egypt needs no advice from certain parties capable only of hurling meaningless slogans at others, who interfere with the Palestinian cause itself. Egypt is not teaching anyone about patriotism, but at the same time it is not prepared to be taught any lessons by anyone else. We will not allow nor accept that. Egypt is pursuing its own course without paying any attention to the clamour of those who, unfortunately, do not understand the danger of the responsibilities they have assumed.

171. It is high time for everyone to understand that Egypt, its people, its Government and its armed forces, have always been and will always be the true champions of the Arab and Islamic nations as a whole.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.