



*President: Mr. Ismat T. KITTANI (Iraq)*

**AGENDA ITEM 5**

**The situation in the occupied Arab territories (continued)**

1. Mr. YANGO (Philippines): Mr. President, my delegation takes great pleasure in congratulating you as the presiding officer of the ninth emergency special session of the General Assembly. Having known you over the years as a diplomat of high standing in the Organization and having observed your performance closely as President of the thirty-sixth session of the Assembly, I have every confidence that with your guidance and leadership this emergency special session will be a success.

2. On this occasion, I cannot help but avail myself of the opportunity to refer to the recent visit to my country of a high-level mission from your own country, Iraq. Reports indicate that that mission was highly successful in promoting understanding, goodwill and a closer relationship between the Philippines and Iraq. That augurs well for the rapidly increasing and mutually beneficial intercourse between the two countries in the years ahead.

3. This ninth emergency special session of the General Assembly has been convened pursuant to Security Council resolution 500 (1982) in order to consider the situation in the occupied Arab territories. This was brought about by Israel's non-compliance with Security Council resolution 497 (1981), which demanded that Israel should rescind forthwith its decision to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights.

4. When Security Council resolution 497 (1981) was unanimously adopted on 17 December 1981, my country was one of the non-permanent members of the Council. The Philippines, acting in concurrence with the rest of the members of the Council, gave its full support to that resolution in the hope that the Israeli Government would heed the consensus of the international community and reconsider its unacceptable action of extending its laws, jurisdiction and administration to the Golan Heights.

5. In the light of Israel's non-compliance with the Council's decision, we had hoped that the Council, during its recent meetings on the matter, would have been able to reach a clear and unanimous decision just as it had done in its resolution 497 (1981). But as was borne out by recent events, such was not the case, and Israel has remained intransigent.

6. The Philippines is fully aware of the complexities of the situation in the Middle East. We have given our firm and unwavering support to all constructive and positive moves to resolve the problem of the Middle East in a comprehensive and lasting manner. In our view, Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) constitute the basis for any serious endeavour to advance the cause of peace in the Middle East. Resolution 242 (1967) sets

out four fundamental elements: first, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war; secondly, the withdrawal of Israel from occupied Arab territories; thirdly, the termination of all states of belligerency; and fourthly, respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and of their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force. Resolution 338 (1973), on the other hand, calls upon the parties concerned to proceed to negotiations on the basis of resolution 242 (1967).

7. In conjunction with those principles, the Philippines has supported the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including their right to establish an independent State.

8. The Philippines views with grave concern Israel's refusal to comply with Security Council resolution 497 (1981). In our view, its decision to apply its laws, jurisdiction and administration in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights amounts to an annexation of the territory. This not only serves to undermine the arduous and painstaking search for a lasting peace in the region, but it also aggravates and heightens tension in a volatile part of the world.

9. The Golan Heights is an integral part of Syrian territory. It was captured by Israel following the June 1967 war. Thus, Israel's present action runs counter to Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), and it infringes the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of the Syrian Arab Republic, a Member State of the United Nations. Paradoxically, Israel continues to maintain its support for resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973); there is a glaring contradiction here. Thus, we cannot accept Israel's action as a *fait accompli*.

10. We call upon Israel to reconsider its Golan Heights law in the interest of universal peace and understanding. Last week, the representative of Israel stated that its action would not impair the prospects for negotiations to achieve peace in the Middle East. But it is precisely because of that action by Israel that the prospects for peace in the Middle East have suffered a setback. In our view, if Israel were to comply with Security Council resolution 497 (1981) it would be much easier for Syria to consider Israel's invitation to negotiations. In the long term, any serious approach to resolving the problem should hinge upon demonstrations of good faith and the avoidance of provocative acts.

11. For those reasons, the Philippines is prepared to support a draft resolution that would express the collective will of the Organization in that Israel should reconsider its decision to apply its laws, jurisdiction and administration in the Syrian Golan Heights.

12. This emergency special session can only have meaning and validity if it can make a positive contribution to the over-all solution of the situation in the Middle East. We know in this Assembly that the basis for a peaceful settlement of the problem was laid 15 years ago. The path to peaceful negotiations among the parties has been indicated and the guidelines for such peaceful negotiations have been set. What has prevented those negotiations from becoming a meaningful reality is the absence of

trust and confidence among the parties. In other words, the basic ingredient, political will, is sadly lacking.

13. My delegation has paid close attention to the genesis of the problem in the Middle East and the tortuous road it has followed over the years, a path leading to a series of wars which have not removed any of the obstacles standing in the way of lasting peace or stability in the region. I therefore make an appeal in this Assembly to the parties concerned to recognize that fact and to understand that peace in the Middle East is not a mirage. It is a goal that should and must be pursued with compassion and with trust in the innate goodness of man and his ability to preserve and perpetuate, in contrast to his power to destroy.

14. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan): As this is the first time that I have had the privilege of speaking in the General Assembly since the Secretary-General, Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar, assumed his responsibilities as Head of the United Nations, I wish to extend to him our warm congratulations on his election to that high office. His election is an eloquent tribute by the international community to his dedication to the cause of international peace and his commitment to the purposes and principles of the United Nations. We are confident that with his vast experience in international relations, his great wisdom and his qualities of leadership, Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar will be able to make an eminent contribution to maintaining and further strengthening the Organization as an effective instrument for safeguarding international peace and promoting fruitful co-operation among Member States.

15. I wish also to place on record our deep appreciation for the distinction and dedication with which the former Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim, served the United Nations and the international community for a decade. His unremitting efforts to promote the cause of peace in times beset with crises and tensions will always be remembered and respected by the international community. We wish him success in his future endeavours.

16. This emergency special session of the General Assembly is being held to consider the Israeli annexation of the occupied Syrian territory of the Golan Heights, which portends a grave threat to international peace and constitutes a serious violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

17. The illegal nature of the Israeli enactment extending Israel's laws, jurisdiction and administration to the Golan Heights is fully evident. That action contravenes the Charter, which prohibits the acquisition of territory by force. It is a violation of established international law, specifically the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949<sup>14</sup> and the supplementary Hague Convention IV of 1907,<sup>15</sup> which prohibit the occupying Power from pursuing any action that might permanently affect the legal status of occupied territories. The Israeli action contravenes Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which remain the foundation of international efforts for peace in the Middle East. The Israeli action flagrantly defies the Council's resolution 465 (1980), which addressed itself to the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, and which censured all measures taken by Israel to alter the character and status of those territories.

18. The Israeli representative has tried to defend the illegal action of his Government on the basis of untenable arguments that Syria regarded itself to be in a state of war with Israel and that the annexation was necessary to "normalize the situation" in respect of the occupied Golan Heights. Those arguments are a perversion of international law. The Golan Heights remain an integral

part of Syria although they have been under Israeli occupation since 1967. The situation can be normalized only by restoring that territory to Syrian sovereignty consistent with the dictates of justice, law and civilized conduct among States.

19. Accordingly, in its resolution 497 (1981), the Security Council declared in clear terms that the Israeli action to annex the occupied Golan Heights was without any legal validity. The Security Council further called upon Israel to rescind forthwith its illegal annexation. However, Israel responded to this demand of the Council with contempt and defiance. That was anticipated. What is regrettable is that the Council, which has a solemn obligation to defend the principles of the Charter and to maintain international peace and security, was unable to take firm action to deter Israel from its outrageous behaviour.

20. The General Assembly is now charged with the heavy responsibility of taking appropriate decisions in the face of the grave threat which Israeli lawlessness poses to international peace and security.

21. Israeli protestations of peace, which are often repeated at the United Nations, cannot conceal Israel's hunger for territory, which is all too manifest in its expansionism. Since its very inception, Israel has been pursuing aggressive policies against the Palestinian and Arab people, policies which have been systematically intensified in recent years. The Israeli state apparatus is geared to acquiring permanent control of the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories. For the achievement of its expansionist objective, Israel has resorted to expropriation and sequestration of Arab property and land and to the establishment of illegal Jewish settlements in the occupied territories. The Palestinian people are being persecuted and evicted from their homes, their leaders in the occupied territories are being harassed, and Islamic shrines have even been desecrated.

22. Israel has stubbornly refused to recognize the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people and has persistently rejected every international attempt to resolve the Palestinian question which is at the core of the Middle East conflict. Over the years, the Israeli policies have seemed to be aimed at nothing less than forcing the entire Palestinian nation into permanent exile and to altering the social, political and demographic complexion of the Palestinian homeland, including the Holy City of Jerusalem.

23. Zionist ambitions seem to extend well beyond the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories. Emboldened in its defiance of international law and world opinion, Israel has arrogated to itself the right to take any arbitrary action against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the States of the region on the pretext of preserving its security. The last couple of years have seen ruthless bombardment by Israel of population centres in southern Lebanon and Beirut. Its planes carried out an unprovoked attack against peaceful Iraqi nuclear installations near Baghdad last June, and they have been violating the airspace of neighbouring States, particularly that of Saudi Arabia, with impunity. Israel's long record of belligerency and intransigence makes it clear that for its security Israel does not believe in peace but in brute force and ceaseless terrorism against its neighbours. In proclaiming the myth of "secure boundaries" it is seeking expansion, and there are signs that southern Lebanon may well become the next victim of Israel's territorial avarice.

24. Contemporary history abounds in examples in which the weakness of the international community in the face of a ruthless aggressor led to catastrophe and destruction. The Foreign Minister of the Syrian Arab Republic, in his address to the Assembly on 29 January

[2nd meeting], drew our attention to these sombre facts of history. The ramifications of Israeli lawlessness are not confined to the Middle East; if allowed to continue unchecked, that lawlessness forebodes grave consequences for a world order based on the Charter of the United Nations.

25. The United Nations has an inherent obligation to act forcefully to prevent the erosion of the authority of its Charter and deterioration of international peace and security. If a few Members of the United Nations fail to see the sinister nature of the Israeli actions, the rest of the membership cannot escape their responsibility to take firm and determined action that could be effective and compel the aggressor to respect the rule of law in international relations, a respect that is imperative for human survival in this dangerous era.

26. We therefore urge the General Assembly at this emergency special session to adopt a resolution that fully reflects the outrage and concern of the overwhelming majority of Member States at the continuing Israeli aggression, the latest manifestation of which is Israel's illegal annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights. The Assembly should endorse the decision of the Security Council contained in resolution 497 (1981) by declaring the Israeli annexation of the occupied Golan Heights as null and void, and demand that Israel should rescind forthwith its decision. The Assembly should call for appropriate comprehensive sanctions in the political, economic and military fields against Israel for as long as it persists in its behaviour contrary to the principles of the Charter, and because we firmly believe that the adoption of such a resolution by the Assembly at this special emergency session and its faithful implementation would convince Israel of the need to terminate its aggression and accept the prerequisites for a lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

27. Mr. OULD SIDI ALI (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, on behalf of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania I should like first to offer you again our sincere wishes for success in your difficult task. We have already noted with satisfaction the objective way—indicative of your great experience—in which you conducted the work of the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session, which proves that your election was indeed a happy choice.

28. To Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar I address heartfelt congratulations on his election to the post of Secretary-General. I take this opportunity to voice once again the expression of confidence that my country places in him, as well as our readiness to co-operate with him in the interest of the United Nations and in order to promote peace in the world.

29. We are meeting today at this ninth emergency special session of the General Assembly to deal once again with the persistent attitude of Israel in flouting the will of the international community through its insatiable expansionism and its policy of *fait accompli*, which have been universally condemned.

30. Members will very well recall that a short time ago it was the Holy City of Al Quds, the sacred holy place of three religions—Islam, Christianity and Judaism—which Israel illegally and unilaterally declared to be the "eternal" capital of its State, if not of its religion. Now it is the Syrian Golan Heights that the Zionist entity confiscated, on 14 December, by an unjustified action that is no less illegal and unacceptable to the whole world.

31. The real purpose of these two attacks is to impose on world public opinion a policy entirely based on the use or threat of force.

32. As members will have noted, year in and year out, month in and month out, for Israel the principles of law or of international ethics, which we all claim as authoritative and for the implementation of which the Organization does everything possible, do not exist.

33. With Israel, we find a new logic, a specious amplification intended to serve the unavowed designs of its racist and intolerant ideology to overturn all the well-known norms recognized by humanity with regard to aggression, war, peace and the law of nations.

34. Thus, in order to promote what it unilaterally considers to be its security and that of its people, the Zionist entity arrogates to itself the right to commit aggression when and where it wants to.

35. Is there any need to recall here in this forum the astonishing arguments advanced by Israel, following the bombing of the Iraqi reactor of Tamuz, which was supplying energy for exclusively peaceful purposes in the authorized opinion of the International Atomic Energy Agency, because the Zionist State, without a shred of evidence, thought that one day it might be used to make atomic bombs and therefore threaten the sovereignty of its territory and the survival of its people?

36. Is there any need to recall the savage, criminal bombings of the populated districts of Beirut and the logic whereby the victims are essentially Palestinians, whose people, according to Israel, can and should be submitted to an implacable genocide for the security of the Jewish people?

37. With the annexation of Golan, this strange argument is further developed. It would seem that this illicit appropriation of other people's territory would eliminate Syrian threats against the Galilee and oblige Syria to join in an unjust, invalid and humiliating peace process. We leave it to the Assembly to be the sole judge of the value of the security, peace or reconciliation acquired by such specious means.

38. It goes without saying that Mauritania rejects that colonial and racist logic used by Israel and those it holds hostage by intimidation and blackmail. The tragedy in the Middle East is, as we see it, an anachronistic case of colonization flourishing in the twilight of classic colonialism. This is a confrontation between a socio-cultural environment rooted in the history and geography of the region and an implantation of the colonial type. This is also a struggle between peoples who want to preserve their independence and have control over their natural resources in order to ensure their natural development and, on the other hand, a foreign bridgehead to be used for committing aggression and repression. Israel, a recent and foreign phenomenon in this region, cannot be accepted unless it has a real desire for peace expressed in respect for the national identity, rights and aspirations of the ancient peoples of the Middle East, including, of course, the martyred people of Palestine.

39. For its part, the international community is in duty bound to impose on Israel this type of behaviour in order to uphold law, justice and peace in this region, which is so strategically, economically and spiritually vital for universal peace and security.

40. Thus, it is for the United Nations, the practical expression of the universal will, to put a firm end to the irresponsible and dangerous misdeeds of Israel, which thinks it can only survive by provoking other people, refusing to allow other people to have rights, seizing their lands, wiping out their history and condemning them to political, economic and technological backwardness.

41. Our great disappointment and frustration after the veto of 20 January 1982, which prevented the Security

Council from living up to its lofty and awesome responsibilities, are therefore understandable. The United States veto, which went against the will of the majority of Council members, thus paralysed that major organ and prevented it from taking the action it had embarked upon on 17 December 1981, thus indisputably encouraging an act of aggression. It also encouraged Israel in its adventurism, encouraged it to threaten the other peoples of the region and to persist in its constant defiance of the international community as a whole, including its only unconditional ally, the one that cast the veto.

42. We had hoped that the Council, in accordance with its own decisions and in keeping with its sense of responsibility, would have taken appropriate steps on 20 January to force Israel to comply with the unequivocal provisions of resolution 497 (1981). In the same way, we had hoped that at the Council meeting on 14 January<sup>25</sup> the Council would act in consequence of Israel's non-compliance and apply adequate sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. That position was widely shared by the overwhelming majority of those who took part in the debate on the question and even by a comfortable majority of Council members.

43. However, despite the broad consensus and despite the arrogance with which Israel officially notified the Secretary-General<sup>11</sup> of its categorical refusal to comply with the Council's unanimous decision of 17 December 1981, on 20 January the aggressor received encouragement for its misdeeds and, therefore, dangerous encouragement to repeat them. How else can one explain the negative vote of the United States which prevented the Council from discharging normally its primary responsibility, that of maintaining peace and security throughout the world?

44. The Government of Mauritania deeply deplores that partisan attitude of a Power which has special responsibilities in the world and which has many friends in our Arab region. Following the strategic alliance, placing at Israel's disposal a quasi-permanent veto to block all measures against it envisaged by the Organization, is an act of hostility with serious consequences against our Arab nation and is an implicit and reprehensible appeal for the Zionist entity to pursue its boundless territorial expansion and its permanent aggression in the region.

45. Our delegation feels that the complicity which Israel enjoyed in the Security Council creates a dangerous precedent for the developing countries. Indeed, there is reason to fear that these countries will no longer find in the United Nations organs, particularly the Security Council, a strong enough determination to discourage aggression, the use of force and unilateral acts of provocation to safeguard their independence and territorial integrity.

46. As an Arab and African country, Mauritania fears that the South African emulator of Israel which recently enjoyed similar protection in the Council will interpret it as a sign to continue its policies, marked by aggression and acts of provocation against neighbouring countries and by persistent acts of defiance of international public opinion and of the Organization.

47. Our delegation considers that this ninth emergency special session offers an opportunity for all Member States to indicate their clear-cut refusal to sanction the obvious and deliberate determination to ridicule the United Nations and flout its authority. We must in no way be accomplices of the manoeuvres of these fascist and racist régimes—the Israeli and South African régimes in particular—aimed at destroying the Organization and the protection it offers weak nations against the law of the jungle and against the aims of these imperialist

lackeys thirsty for political domination and economic exploitation.

48. We are convinced that the overwhelming majority of Members of the Assembly will meet the challenge and thus make a positive contribution to the triumph of right and international moral law and, therefore, the security of peoples.

49. In view of Israel's illegal act in the Golan Heights, our delegation would like to suggest the following measures, *inter alia*: to reiterate the rejection in its form and substance of the annexation by Israel of the Syrian Golan Heights as being null and void; Israel's action should be compared to the conduct of a non-peaceful State which does not respect the decisions of the United Nations and is therefore dangerous for international peace and security; and effective general and comprehensive measures should be decided on so as to isolate Israel diplomatically, militarily, economically and culturally until it complies with the relevant decisions of the United Nations, both in respect of the present situation in the Golan Heights and its previous illegal acts in the Middle East.

50. Our delegation will, however, support any appropriate measures that the Assembly may decide on to put an end to the Israeli escalation of acts of provocation against the Arab peoples and, through them, the international community. Our delegation is convinced that only vigorous, resolute action will dissuade Israel from continuing to complicate to the extreme a situation which has not ceased to deteriorate since the establishment of that State and the looting of Palestine, the confiscation of other Arab lands, the spread of insecurity and the persistent threat to the progress of the Arab peoples of the region.

51. Our country will do its national duty because of its natural solidarity with Syria, Palestine and other fraternal countries, but also and objectively through its sincere devotion to the principles which govern the United Nations. Our country believes that in order to implement these principles properly the Organization must clearly manifest its staunch determination to counter the criminal aims of a colonial and aggressive Zionist State. Our country is convinced that almost all the Member States of the Organization will resist this mental terrorism, this distortion of history, blackmail and intimidation, and will continue to be on the side of law and justice, thus making this ninth emergency special session an opportunity to vanquish the forces of evil, of which Israel is one of the most intolerable symbols.

52. Mr. HALIM (Malaysia): The decision of the Israeli Parliament on 14 December 1981 to extend Israeli laws, jurisdiction and administration to the occupied Syrian Golan Heights violated one of the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as the established principles of international law. The convening of this emergency special session, following a decision of the Security Council taken by an overwhelming majority on 28 January, bears witness to the serious concern of the international community over the dangerous implications of the Israeli action for an already fragile situation in the Middle East. The Government of Malaysia strongly condemns this action, which is tantamount to the annexation of the territory of a sovereign State.

53. The Security Council, which met immediately following the decision of the Israeli Parliament, adopted resolution 497 (1981) on 17 December 1981. The General Assembly also adopted, on the same day, resolution 36/226 B. Both resolutions declared the Israeli action null and void and without international legal effect. Both the Council and the Assembly further demanded that Israel rescind forthwith the annexation. The call made by the

United Nations, however, fell on Israel's deaf ears. Instead, it sought to justify its annexation with untenable arguments that are clearly not acceptable under international law, in particular, the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949<sup>14</sup> and the Hague Convention IV of 1907.<sup>15</sup> It also contravenes the letter and spirit of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) which, *inter alia*, reaffirmed the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and called for the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from occupied territories. The legal status of the Golan Heights under international law therefore remains that of an occupied territory, and it should be returned to Syria, to which it belongs.

54. The fact that Israel chose to ignore Security Council resolution 497 (1981) was hardly surprising. After all, it was just another resolution in a long series concerning the occupied territories that Israel had consistently rejected. It had rejected the call of the United Nations to respect and protect the rights of the local Arab population; it had ignored the call to halt the establishment of new Jewish settlements; and, in an open challenge to the religious, cultural and political sensitivities of the international community, it had decided to incorporate East Jerusalem as part of its undivided capital. Against this background of illegal actions, it is all too obvious to us that the latest Israeli action to annex the Syrian Golan Heights is part and parcel of the country's policy to intimidate its weaker Arab neighbours and to perpetuate its control over occupied Arab territories. Without doubt, the latest action only compounded the already difficult situation in the Middle East and placed yet another obstacle in the way of efforts towards a comprehensive and lasting peace in the region.

55. The central question before the Assembly is whether the present state of affairs in which Israel is able to violate at will the sovereignty and territorial integrity of its neighbours should be allowed to continue and whether Israel, having annexed the territory of its neighbour, should be allowed to get away with it. The answer is obvious. Unless we are united and unless we act together in taking effective measures to compel Israel to comply with the accepted norms of international law, a comprehensive solution of the Middle East problem will continue to be elusive. Of equal concern to the international community is that failure to stop Israel from pursuing its aggressive policies will undermine a principle so fundamental in international relations that it threatens to create a dangerous precedent of modern-day territorial acquisition by the use of force. As a small developing country intent on channelling its resources towards the economic betterment of its people, Malaysia cannot but view with the utmost concern any development introducing such a precedent.

56. We regret that on several occasions in the past the Security Council was prevented from taking effective measures to deal with Israeli intransigence because of the exercise of the veto power by some of its permanent members. The recent failure of the Council to decide on sanctions against Israel under Article 41 of the Charter for its non-compliance with resolution 497 (1981) of 17 December 1981 only encourages Israel to pursue its aggressive policies against its neighbours. It is therefore incumbent upon the Assembly to consider the necessary measures against Israel. My delegation will support any measure against that country, including the imposition of mandatory sanctions. It would not be asking too much of all Member States, in the light of Israel's record of contempt for the United Nations, to join together in a common effort to secure its compliance with United Nations resolutions and the principles of international law.

57. Mr. RUPIA (United Republic of Tanzania): First, I should like to join those delegations which have already extended congratulations and good wishes to Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar on his assumption of the lofty tasks of Secretary-General. His election is equally a well-deserved victory for the developing world, which demands and deserves an enhanced role both in the struggle for peace and prosperity in the world and in the running of the Organization, which is primarily invested with such a duty. In welcoming him back to the Organization, we are well aware of his eminent qualities and abilities in the service of peace and prosperity in the world. We realize the enormous responsibilities shouldered by the individual who occupies the office, and so my delegation, and indeed my country, will spare no effort in giving him our full support and co-operation in the discharge of his duties.

58. I should also like to pay a well-deserved tribute to his predecessor, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, for his dedicated service to the Organization over the past decade.

59. The General Assembly is meeting in an emergency special session amid very disquieting developments both in the Middle East and within the United Nations. It is meeting faced with a prolonged history of aggression by Israel against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of its Arab neighbours which culminated in the occupation of territory, including its most recent decision to annex the Syrian Golan Heights. It was in view of the gravity of the situation that the Security Council in its resolution 497 (1981) of 17 December 1981 declared that:

“the Israeli decision to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights is null and void and without international legal effect”.

The Assembly further demanded, in its resolution 36/226 B of the same date that:

“Israel, the occupying power, rescind forthwith its decision and all administrative and other measures relating to it, which constitute a flagrant violation of all relevant principles of international law.”

60. Immediately thereafter, the Security Council was convened to address itself to this explosive question. Following that meeting, the Security Council unanimously adopted its resolution 497 (1981), categorically declaring that Israel should rescind its annexationist policies in the Golan Heights, that the imposition of Israeli laws, jurisdiction and administration in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights was null and void and without international legal effect and that, in the event of non-compliance by Israel, the Council would meet to consider taking appropriate measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. For most of us, that resolution rekindled our faith in the even-handedness and objectivity of the Security Council and its resolve and ability to safeguard international peace and security.

61. The Israeli response to the call by the Security Council, contained in the report of the Secretary-General to the Council,<sup>11</sup> not only constituted non-compliance by that country with the provisions of resolution 497 (1981) but also contemptuous and arrogant rejection of that resolution in its entirety. Israel proceeded to falsify facts and to employ distorted legal premises to justify what it termed normalization of the situation. It sought to justify its act of annexation of the Syrian territory and its continued atrocities in the area by invoking concepts of national security expressed in aggression.

62. The brazen Israeli refusal to rescind its act in violation of the norms and principles of international law poses a threat to the peace and security of the region and the world at large and sets an ominous precedent with regard

to international régimes guaranteeing respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States.

63. The joint statement of the non-aligned countries of 5 January of this year<sup>12</sup> was made both in realization of that fact and to impress upon the Security Council the need to discharge its duty in reversing such a trend and to consider taking appropriate action as called for in resolution 497 (1981). It was, however, a matter of utmost regret that the draft resolution presented by the non-aligned countries on 19 January<sup>1</sup> could not be adopted because of the exercise of the veto power by a permanent member of the Council.

64. At the level of the Organization, we are alarmed by an evolving trend of systematic misuse of the veto power by certain permanent members of the Council to shield certain States which distinguish themselves by their aggression, occupation and oppression. I am specifically referring to Israel and to South Africa, so notorious for their policies of aggression against their neighbours, which they carry out with impunity. We are all aware of the series of vetoes in the Security Council last year which enabled South Africa to go scot-free and uncensured despite its continued aggression against the people of Angola and its illegal occupation of the international territory of Namibia. Similarly, we cannot view in isolation the inability of the Security Council to adopt punitive measures against Israel after the bombing of the Iraqi nuclear facilities and its aggression against the Lebanese population in Beirut as well as against Palestinians in southern Lebanon.

65. It is clear that when, at a plenary meeting on 25 January 1982, the non-aligned countries decided to request the Security Council to take the necessary steps to convene an emergency special session of this Assembly,<sup>16</sup> they saw the urgency involved. Aggression had been committed and it is continuing. Israel has acted and continues to act in violation of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. The Council was prevented from taking appropriate measures commensurate with the gravity of the Israeli offence. No part of Israeli territory is under occupation. It is thus not unexpected of Israel, which is the aggressor and which is trying to present the international community with a *fait accompli*, that it should claim that the emergency was concocted.

66. The Security Council failed to take action when faced with a clear case of aggression and defiance on the part of Israel. It is thus up to this body to act. The Assembly must take appropriate action against Israel not solely because of its most recent annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights, nor only because of the legal principles involved, but the more so because of the serious implications *vis-à-vis* international peace and security which any inaction on the part of the international community will have for future relations among States. We are faced with what the Israeli authorities want to put forward as a *fait accompli* and if this latest act of violation of the Charter does not precipitate commensurate punitive measures by the Assembly, we shall have allowed for the habitual creation of particularly dangerous precedents.

67. Need I recount the numerous protests by both the Security Council and the General Assembly regarding the deliberate and incessant policies of Israel aimed at changing the physical character, demographic composition and institutional structure of the area, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, the expropriation of land and the establishment of Israeli settlements in the West Bank and Gaza as a prelude to annexation? The catalogue of aggressive Israeli activities is voluminous, yet no action has been taken.

68. The Israeli action is without international legal effect. It is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, which prohibits the acquisition of territory by force, and it contravenes the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949. Israel has acted contrary to the letter and spirit of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

69. Israel therefore cannot call for unconditional negotiations while, through its continued occupation of Arab territories and its annexation of Syrian territory, it is in fact creating conditions for such negotiations. The continued Israeli occupation of the Golan Heights is anomalous, and the situation cannot be rectified by outright annexation.

70. The international community is all too familiar with the Tel Aviv-Pretoria axis. Recently there has been an intensification of the connivance by certain Western countries and Israel with the *apartheid* régime of South Africa. The embracing of South Africa as an ally, with all the obligations that accompany such a status, represents a new phase of partnership between those Western countries and the forces of racism and *apartheid* against the people of South Africa. Ironic as it may seem, the oppression of non-whites in South Africa seems to unite in purpose the forces of *apartheid* in that country and some of those in the West who so loudly profess to champion the cause of democracy.

71. Many of us who come from the developing world are only too conscious of the implications of the Organization's being forced into appearing to acquiesce in a seemingly evolving lawless international system characterized by aggression, occupation and annexation of territory. That is why we trust that this emergency special session will both render justice to the victims of aggression and fulfil the Assembly's obligations in the maintenance of international peace and security and the upholding of the principles upon which international legality is based.

72. Those who truly yearn for peace do not live by the might of the sword. Israel cannot ignore the implications of its expansionist and annexationist policies and expect to find peace in aggression. Israel cannot expect to live in peace when it makes it a policy to trample on the rights of the Arab and Palestinian peoples.

73. In conclusion, let me reaffirm the position of my delegation that there can be no comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the area without adherence to the recognized norms and principles of international law and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. We have always reiterated that peace can only come if Israel returns unconditionally all the occupied Arab territories and recognizes the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and independence, including the right to establish a homeland of their own under the Palestinian Liberation Organization, their sole and legitimate representative. It is only such a solution that would in turn guarantee the independence and the peaceful coexistence of all States of the region.

74. Mr. ABDALLA (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Once again the General Assembly meets in an emergency special session to consider a serious new event, a link in a series of crimes perpetrated by Israel, a series of threats against international peace and security. Once again Israel, through its contempt and by its defiance of the international will, has forced the General Assembly to defend international legitimacy and the purposes of the Organization and to safeguard the security and interests of peoples of the world.

75. This emergency special session has been marked by two serious events. The first is Israel's refusal to implement Security Council resolution 497 (1981), which provides that the law for annexing the Syrian Golan Heights

enacted by Israel is null and void and is a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and international law. The second is that the Security Council failed to discharge its basic obligations in the matter of safeguarding international peace and security and was not able to take effective action against Israel, despite the obvious nature of the threat and the attack on international peace and security and Israel's aggression, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), which defines aggression, and with Article 39 A of the Charter. The first event reflects Israel's desire to aggravate the situation in the Middle East, to step up the threat to international peace and security by using force or the threat of force and aggression against other countries in violation of the sovereignty and political independence of other countries. The second event, which is the failure of the Security Council, reflects the ineffectiveness of the role of the United Nations as an instrument responsible for safeguarding international peace and security.

76. Israel's enactment of a law annexing the Syrian Arab territories of the Golan Heights is a link in a chain of many acts of aggression perpetrated by Israel against the Arab peoples and states and of its policies of expansion and establishment of settlements. In less than two years, to quote one example, Israel declared that it had annexed the Arab part of Jerusalem and its aircraft and tanks entered Lebanese territory and bombed civilian centres, refugee camps and holy places. Many unarmed civilians—men, women and children—fell victim to that aggression. The bombings continued, and recently we witnessed the bombing of the Iraqi nuclear-research centre, following the violation of the air-space of more than one Arab country. Israel continues to refuse and deny the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and to intensify its policies of genocide against that people, thus defying international conventions and custom. Israel did not respond to the will of the international community and refused to rescind its law annexing the Golan Heights, and thus continued to ignore all United Nations resolutions related to its policies of aggression and expansion. Nevertheless, Israel still enjoys the rights and privileges conferred upon it as a Member of the United Nations, even though it has not honoured the obligations provided for in the Charter.

77. How long will Israel's crimes and flagrant violations of the Charter and of international law continue with no international deterrent? Thus we see that Israel has flouted Article 2 A, paragraph 4, of the Charter, which provides that

“All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.”

78. The Security Council's failure to discharge its responsibilities and the fact that it did not take deterrent action consistent with Chapter VII of the Charter alarm the small and weak States which look upon the Charter and the role of the Security Council as the protective shield of their security, territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence and national unity. The Security Council's failure to discharge its constitutional responsibilities encourages the pursuit of terrorist practices by States against other States and the subjugation of those States and their peoples by the use or threat of force—practices that violate United Nations resolutions, in particular General Assembly resolution 2734 (XXV) of 16 December 1970 and resolution 2131 (XX) of 21 December 1965. Is it not strange that Israel's defiance of the international will, its flagrant violation of the Charter

of the United Nations and international law is carried out undeterred and without the mildest of punishment that would force it to reconsider its policies of aggression and expansion?

79. Sudan believes that the first among the four basic purposes of the United Nations should be the safeguarding of international peace and security. To achieve that purpose, the Organization has been authorized to take joint and effective measures to prevent and eliminate the causes which threaten peace and to suppress aggression and other breaches of the peace. The Council's failure to discharge its responsibilities does not relieve the General Assembly of its obligations.

80. The General Assembly should strongly condemn Israel's non-compliance with Security Council resolution 497 (1981) and General Assembly resolution 36/226 B of 17 December 1981. The Assembly must adopt a decision stipulating that the law enacted by Israel imposing Israeli law and administration on the Syrian Golan Heights is a flagrant act of aggression under Article 39 of the Charter. Likewise, the Assembly should reaffirm that Israel's decision to annex the occupied territory of the Syrian Golan Heights is null and void and without legal effect and should not be recognized by the international community. Faced with Israel's record, which is replete with violations of the Charter, the Assembly has to choose between respect for the objectives of the Organization and the elimination of international legitimacy; otherwise, force and violence will remain the only means of communication among States. Israel's escalation of tension in the Middle East was, and still is, the greatest challenge to the will of the international community and to the capability of the Organization to protect the noble principles for which it was established and, most importantly, the inadmissibility of aggression, expansion and acquisition of others' territories by force. Israel's disregard of these established principles and its rejection of the resolutions which were unanimously adopted by the international community pose a serious threat that should compel all Member States in the Organization to shoulder their responsibilities and fulfil their commitments. Israel's violations of the principles of the Charter and of international law and custom leave the international community with only one choice, namely, to confront Israel by applying enforcement measures provided for in the Charter of the United Nations.

81. Mr. BESSAIEH (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, there are many reasons why my delegation is happy to see you preside over the emergency special session of the General Assembly. You are the representative of a fraternal country, and you have conducted the work of the thirty-sixth session of the Assembly in a manner which suggests that the work of this emergency special session will be successful.

82. I should also like to take this opportunity to extend my warm congratulations to Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar on his election to the high office of Secretary-General. His vast experience and his profound knowledge of the Organization give us every reason to hope that the role of the United Nations in the search for solutions to the problems of peace and co-operation among nations will be strengthened. In wishing him every success, we wish to assure him of our complete co-operation in the performance of his task.

83. We are meeting again at a critical juncture. A territory occupied by force as the result of an act of aggression has now been annexed. This crime is neither unique nor fortuitous. For over 30 years, a policy of methodically planned and rigorously implemented expansionism has kept the whole region and the peoples of the Middle East

in a dangerous situation of instability and insecurity. In and around occupied Palestine, there is a relentless effort to deny the Palestinian people their right to live—an effort which has been pursued and intensified ceaselessly since 1948.

84. The annexation of the city of Al Quds, the attempts to dismember martyred Lebanon, the aggression against Iraq, the plan to build a canal linking the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea through occupied Arab territories, the daily violations of the air-space of sovereign countries and, today, the annexation of the Golan Heights place the adventurist policy of the Zionist entity permanently on our agenda.

85. This policy, which has taken the form of ever more bold annexationist thrusts, extends to constant defiance of the international community and, first and foremost, defiance of the Organization, whose foundations and authority are thereby dangerously undermined. Is there any need to recall that with each new crime the debates in the General Assembly as well as in the Security Council have determined the responsibility, established the aggression and identified the aggressor? The repeated injunctions of the international community and its condemnations, which have never been followed up, have only strengthened the intransigence of the Zionist leaders.

86. While the annexation of the Golan Heights only exposes once again the criminal designs of the Zionist entity, it does add a new dimension to the situation in the Middle East. This illegal measure has just rudely reminded us of the fact that, in that region of the world, might is still right. This is not just due to Zionist military superiority, which, incidentally, is dependent on forces from abroad. This situation is maintained by powerful complicity which ensures impunity for the aggressor by means, *inter alia*, of the systematic blocking of the Security Council.

87. It is significant that the Security Council, reflecting the unanimity of the international community regarding the illegality of the annexation of the Golan Heights, clearly condemned that illegal act and declared it null and void in its resolution 497 (1981). By that same resolution, the Security Council reaffirmed the status of the Golan Heights as an occupied territory of a sovereign Arab State. It also, and above all, set a deadline for the decision of annexation to be rescinded, in the absence of which it would consider taking appropriate measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

88. With its customary disdain, the Zionist entity dismissed Security Council resolution 497 (1981). Indeed, it hastened to implement its decision to annex. The refusal to comply with a unanimously adopted decision of the Security Council constitutes further proof of the fact that the Zionist entity still is determined to impose on the international community a concept of peace which is different from that which has commanded universal consensus.

89. While the Security Council clearly called upon it to rescind its decision to annex the Golan Heights, the Zionist leaders engaged in another test of strength by trying to impose on Syria their diktat and to lay down their own conditions for the settlement of the question. Syria is thus the victim of outright territorial blackmail, whereby it has been faced with a choice between capitulation, pure and simple, and the loss of part of its territory.

90. A special feature of this ninth emergency special session of the General Assembly is the fact that it has been convened by the Security Council itself. While not unprecedented, this procedure does reflect the perception by the great majority of the Council of the gravity of the situation as well as of the need for the United Nations to remain seized of the matter and to give it special

treatment. Similarly, this way of placing the matter before the General Assembly fundamentally brings to mind the permanent responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

*Mr. Soglo (Benin), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

91. Thus, the Security Council called unanimously for convening this session after having duly established the facts, reaffirming the status of the occupied Syrian Golan and declaring the annexation decision null and void. It then left it to the Assembly at this session to give practical expression to the universal condemnation aroused by the annexation and to formulate an organized international response.

92. That is to say that there has been a call for the assumption of the collective responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security vested in the States Members, and that it has fallen to the Assembly to take action.

93. That is to say too that there is no conflict of jurisdiction, since the body with limited membership, with the principal responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, has of its own accord called upon the international community's representative body. This means that the Council intends thus to guarantee for United Nations action the continuity and effectiveness necessitated by a challenge to the purposes and principles of the Charter.

94. That is to say, finally, that the Assembly is *not* without means to deal with the situation. Within the framework of its general powers, assigned to it, *inter alia*, by Article 11 of the Charter, the General Assembly can, with all the authority conferred upon it by the special nature of its present session, organize the international response to the Zionist defiance.

95. Such a response is now incumbent on us all in the face of a blatantly heinous crime consisting of several serious attacks on essential obligations both under general international law and under the very provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

96. In the past, recourse to aggression and the occupation of territories by force has often been firmly condemned by the United Nations because it seriously breaches the sacred principle of the non-acquisition of territory by force. Such breach of a strict international norm, duly enshrined in the Charter, is made worse in this case by the proclamation of a decision to annex permanently territories occupied as the result of aggression and the refusal of the Zionist entity to comply with Security Council decisions. The Security Council debates established these facts showing the seriousness of the situation, as well as the unacceptability of the annexation decision and the open rebelliousness of those that took that decision.

97. Reflecting the growing concern of the international community and its condemnation, the required majority in the Security Council agreed on the adoption of a first series of measures aimed at putting an end to the law of the jungle.

98. Misbehaviour left too long unpunished grows and becomes more obvious in its harmful effects. This rebelliousness—more open than ever—by the Zionist entity against the authority of the United Nations is an eloquent illustration of that fact. The lack of firmness in response to the innumerable crimes of the Zionist entity is in direct proportion to the state of insecurity to which Zionist adventurism has doomed the entire Middle East. It is time for the United Nations to take the course that will promote international peace and security: that of firmness.



99. While precedents can motivate us in taking such a position, it is truly the general belief that the General Assembly today bears the full burden of preserving the credibility of the United Nations which should impel us. Without doubt, the scope and relevance of the joint reaction which will be the justification for our debates are dependent on the individual determination shown by Member States.

100. Recent history makes it abundantly clear that it is dangerous for a world organization to resign itself to passivity in the face of persistent rebelliousness. It makes it equally clear that the inevitable effect of becoming accustomed to *faits accomplis* is the crumbling of institutions and the unavoidable loss of their authority. Finally, it makes it clear that, in the face of unbridled aggressive violence, force must be placed at the service of law. The drafters of the Charter of the United Nations had these teachings of history plainly in their minds. It is to be hoped that we will all have learned the lesson when we come to demonstrate, with our votes, our commitment to the purposes and principles of the Charter and our determination to support international legality.

101. In this connection, the General Assembly must solemnly affirm respect for vital principles in international relations. In particular, it must by all the appropriate means at its disposal, safeguard respect for the territorial integrity of Syria and for the principle of the non-acquisition of territory by force.

102. However necessary, this recapitulation of principles, this condemnation of aggression and this proclamation of the nullity of the Zionist decision are, given the seriousness of the situation, clearly inadequate. Having had recourse for years to appeals and injunctions which have remained dead letters, the international community must not now shirk the need to adapt its reaction to the escalation and the intensity of the defiance.

103. Persistent rebelliousness against the authority of the United Nations clearly makes the perpetrator an outcast of the international community. That rebelliousness calls for the appropriate sanctions. That is the wish of the international community. That is the demand of the times. In that way, and in that way only, will this emergency session have responded to the urgent appeal of mankind.

104. Mr. BURWIN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to join with those who spoke before me to express our sincere congratulations to Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar upon his election to the post of Secretary-General. We are convinced that, thanks to his competence, his long experience and his devotion, Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar will help the Organization to achieve its noble purposes. We should like once again to reaffirm the total support of our country's delegation.

105. We should like to pay a tribute to the outgoing Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, for the noble services that he has rendered to the international community.

106. It is only natural that the General Assembly should be holding this emergency special session to consider the situation in the occupied Arab territories following the failure of the Security Council to adopt effective action to strengthen peace and security in the area, which has seen only catastrophes since 1948. The world has already witnessed a series of aggressions perpetrated by Israel against the Arab nation and against the Palestinian people by the plundering of their land, the expulsion of the Palestinians by Zionist gangs and Israel's co-operation with certain Western countries and particularly the country which was administering Palestine in 1948.

107. Since that date, with each passing day there is another act of aggression committed against the Arab nation by the Zionist entity in occupied Palestine. That entity found support from a major Power, the United States, which supplies it with destructive weapons and declares openly at all international meetings that it is not prepared to respond to the will of the international community or to what is right, but says "yes" to what the Zionist entity seeks, "yes" to the genocide of the Palestinian people and "yes" to the violation of the air-space of Saudi territories.

108. That entity, which was created as the result of an act of aggression, can survive only through acts of aggression, especially when the means are made available to it. That is why we are not surprised at seeing the Zionist entity continuing its acts of aggression. Those acts are the very source of its survival and the cornerstone of its political life. Anyone observing the conduct of the Zionist entity since it was created in the Arab homeland will realize these facts. The entire world is well aware of the number of wars waged against Arab States adjacent to occupied Palestine and of the size of the territory that has been annexed. Should anyone forget this, we might refer him to the annexation of Jerusalem less than two years ago. Before, and immediately following that act of annexation, the Zionist entity perpetrated acts of aggression against the Palestinian people and its representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization and against Lebanon, Iraq and Saudi Arabia.

109. The annexation of the Golan Heights is but a link in a long chain of acts of aggression committed against the Arab nation in flagrant violation of the rules of international law and represents overt aggression as defined in General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX). That is why it was only natural that Syria, a brother country, should have turned to the United Nations, represented by the Security Council, in the hope that the Council would be able to deter the aggressor and to take effective action to deal with the matter in accordance with the provisions of the Charter. The Security Council discussed the issue and unanimously adopted resolution 497 (1981), which stipulates that Israel's decision to annex the Golan Heights is null and void and in flagrant violation of international law. It called on the Zionist entity to rescind immediately the law of annexation. But did the Zionist entity respect that decision? It did not. It flouted the resolution as it has flouted so many resolutions in the past. In the circumstances, the Security Council resumed its deliberations this past January to take appropriate measures against the Zionist entity in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Its members prepared a draft resolution that represented the barest minimum needed to remedy the situation that had been created by the intransigence of the Zionist entity. No sooner had the draft resolution been put to the vote than the United States used its veto to block its adoption, and so it was that the Council was unable to discharge its obligations under the United Nations Charter.

110. The United States then used its veto in defence of aggression and oppression and in opposition to logic, justice, liberty and peace, and against the will of the international community. We should like to ask: what is the purpose of the United States using its veto? It has not used that right to maintain international peace and security. Sometimes it did not even use the veto in its own interests. It uses the veto mostly in the interest of the two racist entities, in South Africa and in occupied Palestine. Might it not be more appropriate for the United States to yield its veto power to the Zionist entity, which could then use it without an intermediary? In fact, the right

of veto enjoyed by the United States is no more than a racist Zionist veto used solely in the defence of falsehood and injustice.

111. That action is, however, not surprising. The United States administration has always clearly and unambiguously linked its policies to those of the Zionist entity, owing to an agreement on strategic co-operation that represents an alliance against the Arab nation. That agreement makes available to the Zionist entity United States military means on the pretext of opposing Soviet influence in the area, whereas in fact the true objective of that alliance is to allow Israel to perpetrate aggression against the Arab countries, consolidate its occupation of the Arab territories and subjugate the Arab peoples and force them to capitulate to United States-Zionist plans and to impose a *fait accompli* on the Arab nation within the framework of the Camp David accords.<sup>4</sup> Those accords have been rejected by the Arab nation, for they are aimed primarily at defeating the Palestinian cause. In fact, the Zionist-United States alliance represents a serious threat to international peace and security, not just in that part of the world, but in the entire world, for the relations between the Zionist entity and the United States are well-known. The United States gives all kinds of military assistance and destructive weapons to the Zionist entity, thus making it possible for it to commit further aggression against the Arab States. This military assistance amounts to billions of dollars. This assistance to the Zionist entity rose from \$2.5 billion to more than \$3 billion annually, as was announced on 1 February 1982 over American television channel 5. Most of that assistance takes the form of destructive weapons and other military assistance. Furthermore, the United States Administration gives the Zionist entity even larger amounts than that declared officially and these, it has been declared, are only gifts and tax-deductible contributions by Zionist Americans.

112. Perhaps another star should be added to the stars of the United States flag, and then the Zionist entity could become another state of the Union. In that way the United States could have some justification in providing this kind of assistance to the Zionist entity, showing preference over the other American states.

113. The United States, with its total and absolute support of that entity, is directly responsible for the plight of the Palestinian people and the continued occupation of Arab territories. Misuse of the veto by the United States has, of course, been no surprise to us; in past years the United States repeatedly used its veto to obstruct the legitimate interests of peoples fighting for their liberty and independence; that is true of peoples of southern Africa and the Palestinian people. The abuse of the veto fits neatly into the colonialist policies of the United States, which are based on aggression, interference in the internal affairs of countries and the strengthening of its agents, the dictatorial fascist régimes, by providing them with weapons to subjugate the peoples and deny them their right to choose their political and social régimes, so as to control their economic potential and impose the American hegemony over different parts of the world.

114. This conduct has also affected our part of the world, which has witnessed disasters for some time. It is high time for the Arab people to drive out the hypocritical colonialist United States presence from that part of the world so it can enjoy peace and stability.

115. The representative of the Zionist entity, in his statement of 29 January before the Assembly [*2nd meeting*], tried to justify the annexation of the Golan Heights by the Zionist entity. He tried to mislead the Assembly by pointing out that the Golan Heights overlook some territories in occupied Palestine and that Zionist settlers in

that area are therefore targets of Syrian fire. This argument not only misleads the General Assembly, but also twists facts radically. The truth of the matter is that the occupation of the Golan Heights and its annexation have been completed because the Heights overlook Damascus, the capital of Syria, which has become the target of Israeli fire, and not because they overlook occupied Palestine. That annexation will, in the long term, serve the Zionist policy and help realize its dreams of establishing the so-called Greater Israel, extending from the river Euphrates in Iraq to the river Nile in Egypt. Control over the Golan Heights will provide the Zionist entity with an ideal strategic point from which it could attack Damascus whenever it chooses. The Zionist entity hopes to realize this goal as soon as possible in order to fulfil its expansionist designs at the expense of the Arab nation.

116. The register of the Zionist entity is replete with examples of its defiance of the international will and its constant rejection of all resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly concerning its acts of aggression committed against the Arab nation. All these resolutions call for the condemnation of the Zionist entity and demand that it desist from its policies of annexation and the establishment of settlements and put an end to its continuous attacks against the Palestinian people and the Arab nation. Annexation of the Golan Heights threatens international peace and security and exposes that region to a war the consequences of which could extend to many parts of the world. The United Nations is duty bound to exert every effort to avoid that. The Zionist entity has proven to be an entity that does not respect the Charter or the resolutions of the United Nations; it pursues an aggressive policy which threatens international peace and security.

117. For these reasons, we would like this session to be successful and not meet the fate of earlier sessions. It is necessary for the debates of this session to result in the restoration of faith of the peoples in the role of the Organization as an instrument to maintain peace and security, and we believe that this can only be achieved as follows: first, the Assembly must adopt a resolution stipulating that, in view of the Zionist entity's violation of the Charter and its continued acts of aggression and threats to international peace and security, its membership in the Organization is suspended and it is prevented from participating in the Assembly debate, as in the case of the racist South African régime; secondly, the Assembly should recommend that all States put an end to all kinds of assistance to the Zionist entity and break off all relations with it; and thirdly, the Assembly should condemn States which assist others in committing aggressive acts in violation of the Charter.

118. Mr. ALI BABA (Nigeria): On behalf of the Government and the people of Nigeria, it is my pleasure and privilege to congratulate Mr. Kittani as President of the ninth emergency special session of the General Assembly. Only last 25 September, following his election as President of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, I had the privilege of extending our warmest congratulations to him on his well-deserved election [*14th meeting*]. At that time I expressed the confidence of the Government and the people of Nigeria in his ability to direct and guide the deliberations of our Assembly. I am happy to be able to say today that he has discharged his responsibilities with great distinction, tact and considerable diplomatic skills, not only on the great political issues upon which this Assembly has deliberated, but also with regard to our quest for a new international economic order.

119. The Assembly has been called into an emergency special session to consider the Middle East situation,

which remains a major flash-point fraught with great dangers for international peace and security. For more than three decades now, the crisis brought about by Israel's expansionist policy in the Middle East has remained an enduring and unresolved issue on our agenda, but at no time has the situation been as critical for world peace as it is today in the wake of Israel's purported annexation of Syria's Golan Heights.

120. My Government is deeply concerned that Israel in such an arrogant display of power should seek brazenly to seize by force of arms the territory of a State Member of the Organization. We are even more concerned about the inability of the Security Council to take the appropriate and necessary punitive measures against Israel in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter. We are concerned that, despite Israel's flagrant breach of the provisions of the Charter and the commonly accepted norms of peaceful relations among States, the prospects are that Syria may ultimately be left with no choice in this matter other than to seek redress through the application of force.

121. We are concerned that efforts to resolve the Middle East crisis amicably, through the Security Council, have again failed because one of the permanent members of the Security Council, having special responsibilities under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security, has again, as in the case of the situation in southern Africa, abdicated its responsibilities. Instead of exerting its enormous power and influence for the protection of the weak, the United States, in vetoing the Security Council draft resolution on Israeli aggression, has wilfully chosen to support this act of infamy. Once again, principle has been sacrificed at the altar of narrow-minded considerations.

122. Israel's justification for its so-called annexation of Syria's Golan Heights on the selfish and chauvinistic ground of ensuring its national security is completely unacceptable. It is an extremely dangerous philosophy akin to the Nazi doctrine of *Lebensraum*, and it has nothing to do with Israel's national security. Instead, Israel's motivations are those of excessive greed and inordinate territorial ambition in the Middle East. My Government rejects completely Israel's tendentious and unjustified excuses for its refusal to withdraw unconditionally from occupied Arab land. How much more Arab territory does it need to acquire in order to satisfy its territorial ambitions in the Middle East? And how much longer can the international community continue to tolerate Israel's expansionist policy?

123. The views of the Government and the people of Nigeria on this issue are well known. They are based on fundamental principles of our foreign policy which on this and other similar occasions have been fully and consistently articulated. Nigeria is unequivocally opposed to a policy which is not only based on force but also has, as its main objective, the acquisition by force of arms of any territory belonging to a State Member of the Organization. We oppose such a policy because of our basic conviction that it places in jeopardy the sovereignty and territorial integrity of weaker Member States and constitutes a real threat to international peace and security. This was the main reason why in 1973 we broke off relations with Israel. Further, we repudiate completely such acquisition by force of the territory of a Member State by another because of our conviction that it represents an erosion of the fundamental principles of relations among States. We therefore regard as inadmissible and illegal the purported annexation by Israel of Syria's Golan Heights. We shall in this regard continue to support the Arabs in their just and legitimate struggle against those

who want to deprive them of their territory. We shall continue to oppose Israel until it withdraws completely and unconditionally from all the Arab territory it has occupied illegally and by force of arms. Nigeria will lend its support to those who are determined to resist aggression.

124. My Government is deeply concerned about the fatal erosion of both the spirit and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. The great hopes which the United Nations once inspired, particularly among weak and small States, have in recent times been shattered by those who, for reasons of self-interest, are prepared to undermine the objectives for which the Organization was founded. To the extent that small and weak States can no longer seek and obtain redress in the Organization, international peace and security will continue to be at risk. The situation in southern Africa and the Middle East crisis are glaring examples of the unbridled expansionist ambitions of some States in defiance of the Organization and the will of the international community. Peace is indivisible. It is an illusion for Israel and racist South Africa to believe that they will find peace in the present circumstances, for it is out of the question that either the oppressed people of South Africa or the homeless people of Palestine will ever give up their just struggle. Their quest for freedom will never be stopped by force. They will persevere in the struggle until they regain their birth-right completely.

125. I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to reiterate Nigeria's views on the essential elements of a peaceful solution of the crisis in the Middle East.

126. First, it is my Government's view that the claim of the people of Palestine to their homeland is legitimate and just. No amount of legal or diplomatic quibbling will alter the basic fact that the Palestinians are now refugees in their own country. The people of Palestine have been wronged and are entitled to the restoration of their basic human rights.

127. Secondly, we believe that peace has eluded the Middle East because the direct interests of the people of Palestine have not been taken into account in previous attempts to resolve the problem. For this reason, it is essential that the Palestine Liberation Organization, which is recognized by the United Nations as the legitimate representative of the people of Palestine, be included in any future negotiations. To do otherwise would be like playing Hamlet without the prince.

128. Thirdly, it is our conviction that there are other Powers with interests in the area and that these Powers also have a vital role in the resolution of the conflict in the Middle East. In this connection, we believe that the European initiative of June 1980 for a comprehensive Middle East peace conference, which failed to generate momentum, deserves serious attention. Neither super-Power acting entirely on its own or in conjunction with any one of its allies is capable of resolving this tragic conflict. In addition, other Arab countries with legitimate interests in the issue should participate in such a conference, without which the tension in the area will remain unresolved.

129. Fourthly, there must be a complete and simultaneous withdrawal of Israel from all occupied Arab land to recognized and secure boundaries which can be guaranteed collectively by the Security Council.

130. Lastly, the purported annexation of Jerusalem and the Golan Heights must be declared null and void.

131. My Government is absolutely convinced that any settlement not including these basic elements will not lead to a durable peace in the Middle East.

132. Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, it gives me special pleasure to see you again presiding over the General Assembly. I am convinced that under your enlightened leadership this important emergency special session will fulfil the mission for which it was convened.

133. At the outset, Romania made its position known as clearly as possible on the Israeli Parliament's decision to annex the Golan Heights, territory that belongs to the Syrian Arab Republic and has been occupied by Israeli forces since the war of 1967.

134. If we are speaking again on that extremely grave action which is the subject of the present emergency special session, it is first to reaffirm a position of principle and strongly to condemn any act of annexation of foreign territories by force, and also to stress my country's abiding desire for the achievement of a lasting, just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East and its concern regarding the profoundly adverse consequences of the Israeli Parliament's decision to embark on a process that is dangerous to international peace and security.

135. As was stressed in the statement of the Romanian Press Agency authorized by my country's Government and distributed as an official document of the Security Council,<sup>26</sup> as well as in my statements to the General Assembly on 14 December [97th meeting] and the Security Council on 17 December 1981,<sup>27</sup> Romania considers that act of the Israeli authorities to be illegal and void and to be a flagrant violation of the principle of the inadmissibility of the annexation of territory by force and the principle of the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of an independent State.

136. The international community and almost all States have not hesitated to declare null and void and without any international effect this annexation perpetrated by Israel. That position has been clearly expressed in resolution 497 (1981), adopted unanimously by the Security Council, and in General Assembly resolution 36/226 B.

137. As far as we are concerned, this attitude is based on the position of principle of Romania that, according to the principles and generally recognized norms of contemporary international law and the Charter of the United Nations, the acquisition of territory by force is inadmissible whatever the circumstances and that any territories thus occupied must be restored to the peoples to which they legally belong. No consideration can justify acts of aggression or annexation of territory or, in general, any *de facto* situation created by force.

138. The Israeli action is at the same time in direct violation of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which were accepted by Israel and to which its representatives frequently refer, and which explicitly provide that Israel is obliged to withdraw from the Arab territories occupied after the 1967 war. Any action that would modify the status of those territories, and especially any action to annex part of them, is illegal and arbitrary.

139. Romania has always clearly expressed its position with respect to Israel's continued occupation of Arab and Palestinian territories and the proliferation of illegal measures in those territories, including that concerning Arab Jerusalem, and military actions by Israel against its neighbours. Such actions have in no way contributed to the security and peace of the peoples of the countries and the region; on the contrary, they have only exacerbated tension, with the most serious consequences for the situation in that region and throughout the world. It is obvious that an act such as the annexation of the Golan Heights can only make the situation in the Middle East even more abnormal and more complicated, intensify the

conflict and render more remote the possibility of finding a solution.

140. For States situated in zones of conflict and for all others, the first commandment is, we feel, that they should act in a spirit of responsibility to improve the political climate and to create the necessary conditions for the commencement of the process of peaceful settlement.

141. It has been our abiding position that, however complex and grave they may be, international problems can certainly not be resolved by force but must be resolved through negotiations and by peaceful means. Life has incontestably shown that recourse to acts of force and expansion and the violation of the independence and territorial integrity of other States, far from resolving any problem, represent a permanent source of insecurity and further complicate a situation, with most serious consequences for the peoples concerned and for all the countries of the world.

142. More than ever, Romania and its people consider that at this time which is so fraught with danger for the world, the most resolute efforts of all States must be geared towards speeding up the process of the settlement by political means of situations of conflict and hotbeds of war, and resolving all controversial problems by negotiation only, thus assuring the conditions necessary for all peoples to devote their creative capacities to economic and social development.

143. This emergency special session ever more forcefully confronts the United Nations with its responsibilities with regard to one of the longest and gravest conflicts the world has ever known. Adopting a clear position on Israel's illegal acts, the last of which was the decision to annex the Golan Heights, Romania has ceaselessly maintained that the complicated situation in the Middle East can be resolved only through peaceful means and negotiation.

144. The events of the last few months have shown that it is more than ever necessary without further ado to achieve a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to that conflict. From the outset Romania has often stated that a viable solution to the conflict in the Middle East must be based upon Israel's withdrawal from the Arab territories occupied since 1967 and recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including its right to create its own independent State. A peace settlement must also include guarantees of the independence and territorial integrity of all the States of the region.

145. The solution to this conflict must therefore be comprehensive, covering all its aspects and involving the participation of all the parties concerned. Events have continually proven that a realistic solution cannot be conceived or a climate of peace and security achieved in the zone without first resolving the problem of the Palestinian people, in accordance with their legitimate aspirations and inalienable rights; this is fundamental to a just and lasting solution in the region.

146. Under present conditions, which are characterized by the worsening of the international situation as a result of the mad arms race and policies designed to consolidate and spread spheres of influence, the building of peace in the Middle East is necessitated not only by the urgent need of all the peoples of the region to devote their material and human potential fully to economic and social development but also by the vital need to halt the arms race in the zone, to prevent at all costs the deployment and production of nuclear weapons in the Middle East and to put an end to one of the most dangerous of conflicts, whose adverse effect on the international atmosphere is being felt throughout the world.

147. In order to attain that goal, Romania and its President, Nicolae Ceausescu, have for several years resolutely advocated the creation of a new framework for negotiations and the organization of an international conference under the aegis of the United Nations, which should take an active part in it. Interested countries should take part in it, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, the Soviet Union and the United States, as well as other States that can make a positive contribution to the solution of the conflict in the area. We consider that within such a framework all the complicated problems which make up the situation in the Middle East, including the withdrawal by Israel from the Golan Heights and the other territories occupied as a result of the 1967 war, can be resolved. The need to initiate such a negotiating process in order to achieve a comprehensive settlement is especially timely since the situation in the area is becoming increasingly complicated and explosive.

148. We think that it is the imperative duty of each Government and each politician to demonstrate reason and a high sense of responsibility for the interests of peace and to bring about the immediate cessation of any action which could render even more difficult the present very dangerous situation in the Middle East and raise fresh obstacles to a peaceful solution.

149. The need to achieve a comprehensive settlement and to establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, in the interests of all the peoples of the region, including the Israeli people, requires therefore that the Israeli Parliament and the Israeli Government should give up without further ado their annexation of the Golan Heights and rescind this illegal measure.

150. The emergency special session, the debate that takes place and the resolution that will be adopted must emphasize as firmly as possible the indisputable tenet concerning the inadmissibility of the annexation of territories occupied by force and the absolute invalidity and non-recognition of such annexation—by all States and whatever the form it may take—and thus decide on the rescission of the illegal measure adopted by Israel.

151. We also voice the hope that this session can at the same time contribute to the emergence of a process of comprehensive, peaceful settlement, through negotiations dealing with all aspects of the Middle East conflict, and to the opening of a new era of stability and tranquility in that part of the world.

152. It is high time for the United Nations, the General Assembly and the Security Council, by adopting a clear and staunch attitude in respect of the annexation measure of the Syrian Golan Heights, to give top priority in their concerns to the basic objective, which is a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, and for them to deploy all their efforts in order to overcome the present state of affairs and for them to act firmly to bring about a comprehensive settlement of the conflict in accordance with the profound aspirations of all the peoples of the region.

153. If those are the conclusions of this debate, this emergency special session will make an important contribution to the solution of the Middle East conflict, in conformity with the interests of peace and security in the area and throughout the world.

154. Mr. AMEGA (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): As I am speaking for the first time in the General Assembly, I should like to congratulate the President on his election to the presidency of the thirty-sixth session of the Assembly.

155. It is significant that a worthy son of the Middle East should have been chosen as President of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly and of our present

emergency special session. My delegation is pleased to see him presiding over the present session, the importance of which escapes no one. We are familiar with his personal qualities, his talents as a seasoned diplomat and the competence and devotion which he displayed during the thirty-sixth session, and that augurs well for the positive outcome of our work.

156. I should also like on this occasion to express once again to our Secretary-General, Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar, the congratulations of our Government on his election to head the Organization and to assure him of the complete readiness of my country to co-operate with him in the discharge of his heavy tasks, which are concerned essentially with the maintenance of peace in the world, a world where persistent contradictions abound, a world in crisis where the decision to annex the Syrian Golan Heights may lead us towards a future of unpredictable consequences.

157. On 14 December 1981, the Israeli Parliament passed a law imposing Israel's laws, jurisdiction and administration in the Syrian Golan Heights, occupied by the Israeli State since the 1967 war. That decision, adopted in defiance of the law of nations, is unquestionably the result of a long chain of events in the course of which Israel has never concealed its intention to expand its territory. This emerges clearly from Israel's conduct after the 1967 war, which was characterized by the refusal to evacuate the occupied Arab territories and by the policy of establishing settlements. Israel, by waging war, has been trying to expand its 1948 borders; this was clear in the case of the Sinai, on the West Bank and in Jerusalem. This is a permanent feature of the policies of that country, whose intentions have been revealed by the decision of 14 December 1981 which is based on the use of force.

158. On 17 December 1981, the Security Council, seized with the matter, adopted resolution 497 (1981), the stern and laconic terms of which clearly reflect the unanimous condemnation by its members. That resolution contains a twofold condemnation and injunction: namely, that the acquisition of territory by force is inadmissible and the decision to annex is null and void and without legal effect; and that Israel should rescind forthwith its decision and respect the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949.<sup>14</sup>

159. On the same day, the General Assembly adopted resolution 36/226 B, the operative provisions of which contain the same condemnation and injunctions; further, the General Assembly called on the Security Council, in the event that Israel should not implement the above-mentioned resolution, to invoke Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

160. Referring to the recommendations of the Security Council and of the General Assembly, the Israeli Government replied to the Secretary-General that Israel could not and does not accept the resolution just adopted,<sup>17</sup> and that "The Government of Israel wishes to reiterate that it is willing, now as always, to negotiate unconditionally with Syria, as with its other neighbours, for a lasting peace . . .".<sup>11</sup>

161. Those rebuffs cannot conceal the substance of the matter, which is that Israel, using armed force, purely and simply annexed the Syrian Golan Heights, which it has occupied since 1967. Such an act is clearly one of aggression within the meaning of the term as defined in General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974, and it constitutes a violation of positive international law and of the fourth Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949.

162. Authorities greater than I have amply demonstrated this in the course of Security Council debates. I might merely add that the forced occupation of the

territory of a sovereign State cannot confer upon the occupier the rights and powers of a legitimate sovereign State: that is to say that the State whose forces have been driven from an occupied territory retains sovereignty over that territory even after having been physically removed, and annexation of that said territory by the occupier remains completely without effect. That theory has been accepted by a respected Israeli jurist to justify the occupation, which we deem unlawful, of Judea and Samaria, the pretext being that there was an absence of legitimate sovereignty over those areas. Unfortunately for him, the Supreme Court of his country, in the Elon Moreh case, took a contrary stand in a separate judgement, and one judge declared that

“it is an error to think . . . that the Geneva Convention does not apply to Judea and Samaria. It does indeed apply to them . . .”.

Again unfortunately for him, others have expressed the opinion that the Convention does apply to all the territories occupied since 1967. That was the conclusion of the International Committee of the Red Cross in its annual report of 1968 and that of 1976, and of the International Commission of Jurists in its review No. 19 of December 1977. The General Assembly, in its resolution 33/113 A of 18 December 1978, and the Security Council, in a statement by its President of 11 November 1976<sup>28</sup> and in subsequent resolutions, notably resolution 478 (1980) regarding the annexation of east Jerusalem, also took a stand in support of the applicability of that Convention.

163. In summary, this theory, buttressed by points of international law and by the opinions of bodies with authority in the field, leaves no doubt about the fact that the fourth Geneva Convention applies to all the territories occupied by Israel since the Six-Day War. Consequently, any change in status of property or persons, of laws, jurisdiction or local administration must be declared unlawful and without legal effect. That is why we declare that the act of annexation is an act of aggression based on considerations having to do with the doctrine of “homeland”, according to which Israel considers that the territories acquired in 1967 are a part of the Jewish homeland. This doctrine is dangerous, because it denies the Palestinian people their fundamental right to self-determination. Thus, far from respecting the rights of peoples subject to its military control, the State of Israel subjects them to a status that is foreign to their nature, thus violating the Geneva Convention, which forbids the annexation of territory acquired as spoils of war and also forbids moving the citizens of the occupying State into occupied territories.

164. Since then, a number of States have denounced the illegal decision to annex. My Government, for its part, expressed through my statement to the Security Council on 14 January last,<sup>25</sup> its deep concern and its fears of a new war in the region. It called upon the Security Council—in vain, regrettably—to take a courageous decision by applying to the State in question the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter and by recommending resolution 36/226 B directly and Security Council resolution 497 (1981) indirectly.

165. This convening of the General Assembly is a source of hope. A firm decision by it would mean that a solution based on despair will not further darken the already cloudy horizon of the Middle East. Such a decision, by holding out hope, would dry the tears of thousands of widows and orphans and would put an end to the hard sacrifices of the innocent who have been sacrificed on the altar of human intolerance. The world is watching us, and we must make it proud of us by restoring the rights

of those who have been plundered. Any resolution based on that principle will be supported by us. Togo has always supported the institution of a legal balance between parties to a conflict by voting for Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). No party has the right to aggravate the *status quo* of the region that resulted from the cease-fire of 1973. By acting contrarywise, Israel has placed itself in a position meriting reprobation, and it now knows the position of the international conscience as regards its action.

166. It is time for the General Assembly to take note of Israel's failure to heed the injunctions contained in its resolution 36/226 B of 17 December 1981 and to draw the necessary *de facto* and *de jure* conclusions. It must be stressed, however, that regardless of the decision adopted, peace will not return to the area unless the political will of the parties concerned is asserted.

167. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Israel has asked to exercise his right of reply. May I remind Members that, in accordance with resolution 34/401 of the General Assembly, statements made in exercise of right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first statement and five minutes for the second statement and that delegations must speak from their places.

168. Mr. BLUM (Israel): This debate follows its predictable course. A flood of invective against Israel is being let loose again in this hall, and for many of the speakers this kind of speech is apparently in the nature of a ritualistic incantation.

169. The fact that this kind of verbal pogrom is severely damaging what little is left of the badly battered prestige of the United Nations is apparently of no consequence to the slanderers. Nor are they impressed by the fact that even within this hall, representatives have massively “voted with their feet”—to use a Leninist expression—by absenting themselves from this charade as much as possible, while the few remaining representatives in the hall can hardly conceal their boredom.

170. All this, however, cannot exempt the participants in these proceedings from observing a modicum of decency that is obligatory even in exchanges of this kind. To our regret, the representative of the Soviet Union, in his statement yesterday [*4th meeting*], saw fit to overstep the bounds of elementary decency in drawing an obscene comparison between the accursed régime of Hitler's Germany and Israel—the homeland of the people that was the foremost target of Nazi lunacy, both before and during the Second World War.

171. This is not the first time that a Soviet representative has indulged in such despicable desecration of the memory of six million Jewish martyrs—the victims of Nazi tyranny. These Soviet representatives apparently believe—like the Nazi Goebbels before them—that the mere repetition of a big lie makes it eventually stick, however absurd and however sacrilegious it may be. There is no redeeming feature to the repetition of lies and obscenities. Their repetition merely heightens the obscenities.

172. Let me tell the representative of the Soviet Union that my people never compromised with Nazi tyranny and never signed a pact with Hitler's Germany, as did the Soviet Union when it concluded with it its infamous Non-Aggression Treaty of 23 August 1939. That treaty not only precipitated the Second World War, with all the resultant misery and destruction, but more specifically, it provided for the joint dismemberment by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union of Poland, the disappearance of which was hailed by the then Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Molotov, in his address to the Supreme

Soviet of the USSR on 31 October 1939, when he termed Poland "that monster child of the Treaty of Versailles".

173. In view of the events of recent weeks, it is particularly pertinent to draw the Assembly's attention to the Secret Additional Protocol appended to the Pact on Non-Aggression of 23 August 1939. It reads as follows:

"On the occasion of the signature of the Non-Aggression Pact between the German Reich and the USSR [*Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*] the undersigned plenipotentiaries of each of the two Parties discussed in strictly confidential conversations the question of the boundary of their respective spheres of influence in Eastern Europe. These conversations led to the following conclusions:

"1. In the event of a territorial and political rearrangement in the areas belonging to the Baltic States (Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania), the northern boundary of Lithuania shall represent the boundary of the spheres of influence of Germany and the USSR. In this connection the interest of Lithuania in the Vilna area is recognized by each Party.

"2. In the event of a territorial and political rearrangement of the areas belonging to the Polish State the spheres of influence of Germany and the USSR shall be bounded approximately by the line of the rivers Narew, Vistula and San.

"The question of whether the interests of both Parties make desirable the maintenance of an independent Polish State and how such a state should be bounded can be definitely determined only in the course of further political developments.

"In any event both Governments will resolve this question by means of a friendly agreement.

"3. With regard to south-eastern Europe attention is called by the Soviet side to its interest in Bessarabia. The German side declares its complete political disinterestedness in these areas.

"4. This Protocol shall be treated by both Parties as strictly secret.

"Moscow, August 23, 1939  
For the Government of the German Reich:  
V. Ribbentrop  
Plenipotentiary of the Government of the USSR: V. Molotov."<sup>29</sup>

174. Representatives will have noted that in this protocol Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union speak of their respective spheres of interest. This term, of course, has a well-known colonialist and imperialist ring, thus revealing the true character of Soviet foreign policy.

175. In compliance with the said protocol, the Soviet Union, in September 1939, joined Nazi Germany in overrunning and dismembering Poland. On 28 September 1939, it concluded with Nazi Germany a Frontier and Friendship Treaty to which was appended the following declaration:

"After the Government of the German Reich and the Government of USSR have, by means of the Treaty signed today, definitively settled the problems arising from the collapse of the Polish state and have thereby created a sure foundation for a lasting peace in Eastern Europe, they mutually express their conviction that it would serve the true interests of all peoples to put an end to the state of war existing at present between Germany on the one side, and England and France on the other. Both Governments will therefore direct their common efforts, jointly with other friendly powers if occasion arises, toward attaining this goal as soon as possible.

"Should, however, the efforts of the two Governments remain fruitless, this would demonstrate the fact that England and France are responsible for the continuation of the war, whereupon, in case of the continuation of the war, the Governments of Germany and of the USSR will engage in mutual consultations with regard to necessary measures."<sup>30</sup>

176. The representative of the Soviet Union should be among the last to invoke the memories of the 1930s or to draw comparisons based on them. But since he chose to speak of the catastrophe that culminated in the Second World War, he would do well to ponder who abetted the Nazi policy of aggression and expansion, accompanied by claims of living space, who acted as its accomplice and who supplied Germany with strategic materials, including foodstuffs, raw materials, minerals and oil, right until June 1941.

*The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.*