



President: Mr. Ismat T. KITTANI (Iraq)

AGENDA ITEM 5

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

1. Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): Since 14 December 1981, the situation in the Middle East has worsened considerably because of the sinister decision taken by Israel to annex the territory of the Golan Heights, which belongs to the Syrian Arab Republic, a Member State of the United Nations. Mr. President, as a worthy servant of the ideals of the international community, you are too well aware of the many implications of this matter for us not to place full trust in you, in the effort which the General Assembly has been making since last Friday to reach decisions in keeping with law and justice, decisions which are urgently called for by the seriousness of the Israeli Government's act.

2. Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar, the new Secretary-General, has started his term of office in the midst of this crisis, one of the most disquieting in international relations today. That is why we should like to assure him of the full support of our delegation at this difficult time, a time which will certainly call for all the skill and devotion which we know him to possess.

3. As a member of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the People's Republic of the Congo would like to emphasize that the principle of the inviolability of frontiers handed down from colonial times is of fundamental importance to us. The founding fathers of the OAU understood the sensitive nature of that principle so well that they made it one of the cornerstones of the system of safeguards for the ideals of the pan-African organization.

4. Therefore, we adopt a very stringent position whenever a dispute involving a violation of the principle of the territorial integrity of States is under discussion. And so we consider the Israeli decision to annex the Golan Heights to be illegal. In our view, this new act of defiance which the Israeli Government has hurled at the world is null and void. Israel's arbitrary decision constitutes a negation of the tremendous efforts undertaken throughout the world to assist the parties involved in this painful Middle East conflict in their painstaking quest for peace and security.

5. Speaking strictly of the definition of the violation, it is difficult to admit that any attack on this principle of territorial integrity does not cover, *ipso facto*, the notion of aggression as defined by General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974. Indeed, aggression can certainly not be excluded from this case either, where the territories occupied by force since 1967 are covered not only by the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949,¹⁴ which forbids, *inter alia*, an

occupying Power to change the legal status of the territory it occupies, but also by the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, in particular of the General Assembly and the Security Council, which specifically call on Israel to withdraw from all the occupied Arab territories.

6. In this context, the act committed by Israel on 14 December last was an extremely arrogant action that cannot be condoned by any Member of the Organization without setting a very dangerous precedent.

7. The Security Council met a few days ago for the sole purpose of conforming with its resolution 497 (1981) of 17 December 1981, which had been adopted unanimously and which envisaged the adoption of appropriate measures in accordance with the Charter in the event that Israel did not rescind its decision to annex the Syrian territory of the Golan Heights, a decision which had been unanimously condemned.

8. We know what resulted from that meeting. The most surprising element was not that the Security Council was once again paralysed by the excessive use of the veto which some of its members are entitled to use. The most glaring example of the Council's failure to act is certainly its deliberate repudiation of the commitments it had made—in adopting resolution 497 (1981) for instance—thus constantly defeating any attempt to achieve the purposes enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

9. There are basic principles, any discussion of which should not, at the very least, lead to the glorification of untenable attitudes. "No consideration of whatever nature, whether political, economic, military or otherwise, may serve as a justification for aggression" is set forth in resolution 3314 (XXIX) on the definition of aggression.

10. However, two points which we feel to be unacceptable have now been advanced by Israel to justify what is unjustifiable. First, it refuses to recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, and secondly, frantically seeks to enforce a right which, according to Israel, has biblical authority.

11. With respect to the rights of the Palestinian people, those States that habitually invoke international law, and particularly the relevant provisions of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), do not know on what legal basis they should deal with Israel in the future.

12. We have hidden our scepticism regarding the sincerity of Israel's desire to meet the elementary needs of equity and justice where the Palestinians are concerned. Constantly resorting to subterfuge, the Israeli Government has always refused to engage in a true dialogue with the legitimate representatives of the Palestinian people, that is, the Palestine Liberation Organization, a dialogue which might pave the way towards a definitive settlement of the Middle East crisis, of which, as everyone knows, the Palestinian question is the crux.

13. It is neither by denying the existence of that problem nor—even less—by creating collaborators among the Palestinians to support solutions that are as specious as they are artificial, that a just and lasting peace will be established in the Middle East.

14. It is even less certain that Israel's relations with its neighbours can be governed solely by a law of biblical origin, which would mean that the present positive law enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and the whole body of international conventions would be nothing but scraps of paper, given the relentless ambitions of that State. On the contrary, a law which is justified by a denial of the law of others can only deny itself in the end, which opens up the most disquieting prospects for the future of the region.

15. There are certainly many Members of the Organization which would be only too happy to believe in the sincerity of Israel and its desire for peace. But how can they do so when we have before us all the despicable acts committed by the Begin Government over such a short period?

16. It is only necessary to cite the annexation of the Arab part of Jerusalem in 1981, notwithstanding the 1947 Conventions which guarantee the international character of the Holy City; the crazy attack on Iraq in June 1981; and the attack on Beirut in July 1981, in which more than 300 civilians perished.

17. The annexation of the Golan Heights cannot in any way be presented as part of a peace process, unless that Israeli peace were simply to involve the annihilation of everything that is not Israeli in the region and, in the long run, actual genocide of the Palestinian people and of the neighbouring peoples which support that martyred people in compliance with the recommendations of the United Nations.

18. That is a frightening prospect, and one which the Security Council has not been able to avert because of the obstruction of one of its most prestigious members.

19. Once again the General Assembly is faced with a unique situation, and we must meet it with a response appropriate to its exceptional gravity. After all, the Charter clearly shows the course we must follow in order to do our duty, that of defending the rule of law and the dignity of peoples against force, arrogance and arbitrary rule. We will give it our support in carrying out this task. Let us, without further delay, seek ways and means of wiping out every trace of this new act of Israeli aggression by helping Syria to recover the part of its territory which has been illegally annexed by the Israeli Government.

20. The Congo once again reaffirms its unswerving devotion to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations; it will strongly support any initiative likely to create the conditions for a genuine, just and lasting peace among all the countries of the strife-torn region of the Middle East, and it unequivocally condemns the acquisition of territory by force and any action that would seriously undermine the principles on which the Charter is based.

21. Mr. AL-NUAIMI (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, first of all, I take pleasure, on behalf of the United Arab Emirates, in expressing to you our sincere congratulations on your presiding over the ninth emergency special session. This reflects once again the confidence of the international community in your ability to conduct the proceedings of this important session.

22. As this is the first opportunity we have had to speak in the Assembly since the election of Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar as Secretary-General, we should like to express to him our congratulations and best wishes for success. We should also like to reaffirm the support of the United Arab Emirates in the efforts of the United Nations to safeguard international peace and stability. His election demonstrates the growing importance in international

politics of the principles embodied in the non-aligned movement, and the world's esteem for Peru, a friendly country.

23. The General Assembly is now meeting in emergency special session after the failure of the Security Council to adopt an appropriate resolution designed to deter Israel and force it to rescind its decision to annex the occupied Syrian Golan Heights. This failure was the result of the United States Government's exercise of its veto to prevent the adoption of the proposed draft resolution.¹

24. Consequently, this session is taking place for two main reasons: first, Israel has proclaimed the annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights and has refused to implement Security Council resolution 497 (1981), thereby defying the will of the international community; and second, the United States has protected Israel's position in the Security Council by preventing the adoption of a resolution calling for the imposition of sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

25. This is not the first time—and it will not be the last—that the Security Council and the General Assembly have taken up Israeli violations of United Nations resolutions and the norms of international law. It has become clear to the entire world that Israel is pursuing its Zionist policy of racism and expansionism, which knows no limits. Anyone observing the Middle East region will note that it has become an explosive part of the world as a result of this policy of aggression against the rights, security and economies of the countries of the area. Israel's decision to annex the Syrian Golan Heights is part of this general policy and also of Israel's expansionist designs. The world has witnessed similar Israeli measures we can mention, as, for example, the annexation of Jerusalem and the declaration that Jerusalem is the capital of Israel, notwithstanding Security Council and General Assembly resolutions clearly rejecting such action and despite the fact that that Holy City epitomizes the social, spiritual and historical values of the three revealed religions. The policy of settlements in occupied Arab countries has continued, as has the confiscation of lands and water resources and the expulsion of indigenous inhabitants. These policies are continuing notwithstanding resolutions of the Organization and the international community's condemnation. Israel's attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations demonstrates a new method of aggression, aimed at paralysing the economic and social growth of the States in the region, and it proves the role Israel plays in destroying and exhausting the wealth and the economies of the area.

26. Lebanon, and southern Lebanon in particular, is the target of daily bombing and acts of aggression. The events in Lebanon are a living example of the barbaric policies being pursued by Israel in the world today.

27. In view of the foregoing, the Security Council was unable to take action to deter Israel and failed to adopt a resolution imposing sanctions against Israel after that country's refusal to implement resolution 497 (1981). The failure of the Security Council is due to the fact that a great Power—the United States of America—exercised its veto. The United States has constantly defended Israeli aggression and tried to justify Israeli violations of United Nations resolutions. The United States bears primary responsibility for the international community's inability to translate its position into specific measures that would commit Israel to rescinding its decision. My country, in denouncing the position taken by the United States, considers that its material, political, economic and military support and the assistance given to Israel encourage Israel to perpetuate its aggression against the countries of the area. We regret that a great nation like

the United States, which is renowned for its ideals and the major events in its history, supports injustice and protects the aggressor.

28. My country is convinced that Israel, which thrives on this support by the United States, would never have dared to adopt such a position and pursue its policies had it not been confident that the United States administration would oppose any deterrent action decided upon by the Security Council by using its right of veto.

29. Considering the level of this session and considering the mandate conferred by the General Assembly "Uniting for peace" resolution (377 (V)), which gives the Assembly in emergency special session a mandate to adopt practical resolutions to safeguard international peace and security if the Security Council has been unable to do so as a result of the use of the veto, the United Arab Emirates expects that this special emergency session will go beyond recommendations, appeals, denunciations and condemnations. The United Arab Emirates expects that the Assembly will rise to the level of the responsibilities conferred upon it and that its resolution may equal the defiance shown by Israel in its annexation decision. The General Assembly resolution should include effective measures, practical steps and applicable methods aimed at deterring Israeli aggression and forcing Israel to respect the will of the international community, international law and the resolutions of the United Nations.

30. My country calls upon the General Assembly to adopt a resolution commensurate with the scope of Israeli aggression. We appreciate the position adopted by peace-loving countries in the Security Council. We regret that certain members of the Council have been pursuing policies contrary to peace and international security, and we would appeal to all peace-loving countries, in particular those which support peace and justice in the Middle East, to take the action that the Security Council was unable to take as a result of the veto cast by the United States. Sanctions should be applied because of our commitment to peace and justice, because my country believes that the entire world is called upon today to put an end to aggression and to oppose injustice, and because every State is requested to act accordingly, be it unilaterally or collectively. My country is quite confident that we can put an end to Israel's folly, that racist entity's greed for domination and expansion, only if effective action is taken, only if political and economic sanctions are imposed. That is why we call on all countries maintaining relations with the Zionist entity to reconsider their relations with that country until it abides by the will of the international community.

31. Ever since Israel was implanted in our part of the world as a result of the efforts of the colonialist Powers, it has been an embodiment of the concepts of evil and aggression in the history of humanity, a clear expression of colonialist and expansionist designs and dreams and a tool in the hands of the exploiting Powers to impose their will on the countries of the area and prevent them from moving along the path of progress and economic development, and attaining prosperity and security for their peoples. It has become clear that Israel, receiving the encouragement of some great Powers, is based on a racist Zionist complex, the principles of which are founded on historical reverie and intricacies that have no relation whatsoever with the Arab peoples, and yet those peoples are suffering the consequences. Some States have been using this entity on the pretext of protecting their strategic interests. The link between the Zionist expansionist dreams and the strategic interests of some Powers threatens the area with total destruction—an area that has always been known for stability and peace and recognized

as the source of the revealed religions throughout the history of mankind.

32. We fear the day when the world finds that it is unable to put an end to this scourge which threatens international peace and stability.

33. The question now before us, Israel's annexation of the Golan Heights, is an expression of the situation in the area. In its statement to the Security Council of 14 January 1982,²⁵ the United Arab Emirates put forward certain legal arguments revealing the aggressive nature of the annexation of the Golan Heights. We will not repeat the arguments we put forward in the Council, but we do wish to say that the decision to annex the Golan Heights is a result of Israel's occupation since 1967—a situation the world was unable to solve, due to the positions taken by certain great Powers. This exposes all occupied Arab territories to the same fate, as has been re-affirmed by the Israeli leaders.

34. The General Assembly, more than any other body of the United Nations, reflects the hopes of all the peoples of the world, especially the peoples of the smaller countries, to found a world governed by justice and right, a world that guarantees the right of the small countries to independence and territorial integrity.

35. Mr. BHATT (Nepal): Allow me to begin by expressing my delegation's congratulations to Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar on his election to the high office of Secretary-General. We are confident that, with his wisdom, experience and skill, he will be able to make important contributions towards the increased effectiveness of the United Nations.

36. My delegation would also like to express its appreciation to Mr. Kurt Waldheim, who served this Organization with great distinction during the last 10 years.

37. Israel's decision to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights has provoked protests and reprobation by the international community. This Israeli action is without any legal or political justification.

38. Nepal shares in the legitimate concern and indignation generated by the Israeli policy. We have always opposed the unilateral legislative and administrative measures taken by Israel in the territories occupied since 1967. The statement issued by my Government on this matter viewed the Israeli step as a serious threat to the already fragile structure of the peace in the Middle East and as a dangerous precedent undermining the accepted norms of international relations. In its resolution 497 (1981), the Security Council categorically declared the Israeli decision null and void and without international legal effect and demanded that Israel, the occupying Power, forthwith rescind its decision.

39. Nepal regrets Israel's non-compliance with the Council decision. It is indeed unfortunate that Israel continues to act in defiance of international public opinion expressed in various resolutions of the United Nations. The Security Council resolutions on the question of Jerusalem and on the question of Israeli settlement in the territories occupied since 1967 are only a few of the important decisions disregarded by Israel. Likewise, Israel continues to ignore the General Assembly resolution which determined that the fourth Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949¹⁴ applies to all occupied territories.

40. Nepal's position on this issue is clear. The Golan Heights is a Syrian territory occupied by Israel in the war of 1967. Thus it is subject to the principles embodied in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which uphold the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. The action of the occupying Power on the Golan Heights is contrary to international law and

tantamount to annexation. Thus those initiatives can have no legal validity.

41. The latest decision by Israel has come at a time when the situation in the Middle East is particularly tense. The Israeli decision has further complicated the search for a comprehensive peace in the Middle East. We once again strongly urge Israel to rescind its decision and to desist from any measure that would affect the status and future of the Syrian Golan Heights.

42. Nepal firmly believes that a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East must embrace three principal elements: firstly, the recognition of the rights of all States in the region, including Israel, to live in peace within recognized and secure boundaries, free from threats or acts of violence; secondly, the withdrawal of Israel from the territories occupied since 1967; and thirdly, the recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to a separate State of their own. While we deeply regret the failure of the Security Council to agree on means to ensure compliance by Israel with its demand to rescind its action concerning the Golan Heights, we earnestly hope that this emergency special session will make a positive contribution towards a just, comprehensive and lasting peace which will enable all the peoples of that region to live in security and harmony.

43. Mr. SEIFU (Ethiopia): The United Nations has been seized with the question of the Middle East for more than 30 years. Over those years, both the Security Council and the General Assembly have time and again made pronouncements on specific situations related to the problem and have taken clear positions on the various aspects of the question. As a result, a solid framework has evolved for a just and lasting peace in the region, the cornerstones of which are the withdrawal of Israel from all occupied Arab territories and the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

44. Regrettably, however, the numerous resolutions of the United Nations on the question of the Middle East and Palestine have so far remained dead letters. The international consensus that has emerged on the same question has been repeatedly and seriously challenged. May we ask, in this regard, for how long the United Nations is to tolerate a total, and what has now become a habitual, disregard for the rule of law and the common will of nations? Clearly, if the international community is to succeed in its noble endeavour to build a new world order based on the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, such lawlessness cannot go unpunished.

45. The occupation and the recent annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights are illegal. That the measures taken by Israel violate the norms of international law, in particular the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, is beyond dispute. There is indeed an international consensus on that point, clearly reflected in Security Council resolution 497 (1981) of 17 December 1981 and in General Assembly resolution 36/226 of the same date.

46. Israel has unfortunately rejected the international consensus and the resolutions embodied in it, ascribing them, as it usually does in similar instances, to the "anti-Israel majority" in the United Nations. To rationalize the situation thus is not only convenient but also relieves Israel of the painful and logical consequence of reviewing and reappraising its actions in the light of international legality. This, however, is an untenable position. Reason and wisdom demand that Israel should rid itself of the false assumption that it and it alone is always right and

the rest of the world is forever wrong. The imperatives of international peace and security also demand that Israel should heed the call of the United Nations.

47. Time and again the Organization has clearly advised Israel that it cannot continue to occupy Arab territories illegally and by force of arms and at the same time hope to achieve lasting peace with its neighbours. It should have been clear by now that the road to a lasting peace in the Middle East cannot pass through the forcibly occupied and illegally annexed Arab territories. For that matter, the right of the Jewish people to a national homeland cannot be guaranteed by the denial of that same right to the Palestinian people.

48. Evidently Israel thinks otherwise. While the choice for Israel is between peace on the one hand and territories on the other, its Government seems to have engaged in an impossible task of attempting to obtain peace and acquire territories both at the same time. Occupation and annexation of territory that rightfully belongs to other peoples might give a transient sense of security, but we submit that, in the long run, such a state of affairs will only remain a source of tension and conflict.

49. In the case of the Golan Heights, we witness that the measures taken by Israel have contributed only to aggravating the already tense situation prevailing in the Middle East and to widening the open chasm of hostility separating the peoples of that region. The call by Israel for peaceful negotiations with Syria—a call that has accompanied the law of annexation—has in no way mitigated the gravity of the situation either, especially when viewed against the repeated statements by Israeli officials that they would never accept a return to the pre-1967 borders on the Golan Heights. The call for negotiations thus becomes nothing but a clever ploy. Faced with an obvious *fait accompli*, one wonders what Syria is expected to negotiate about.

50. Ethiopia condemns the decisions and measures taken by Israel to annex the national territory of the Syrian Arab Republic. This we do not just out of solidarity with the people and the Government of Syria, but more importantly, in defence of the norms of international law as well as the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations.

51. Ethiopia believes that the time is long overdue for Israel to desist from acts of aggression against Arab States and the Palestinian people. The time is long overdue for the friends of Israel, especially the United States of America, to terminate their support of the aggressive and intransigent policies of the Israeli Government. Indeed, the time is long overdue for the United Nations to compel Israel to fulfil its obligations under the Charter.

52. That is why Ethiopia attaches great importance to the convening of this emergency special session of the General Assembly. We all know that, its responsibilities under the Charter notwithstanding, the Security Council is fast becoming less and less relevant in the resolution of the burning issues of our times. In the case of the Golan annexation, it has once again let aggression and provocation go unpunished.

53. Much hope is therefore placed in the outcome of this emergency special session. The Assembly, at this session, must reiterate its call on Israel to abrogate the measures it has taken in regard to the Golan Heights. Furthermore, the Assembly should propose enforcement measures to convince Israel that the world can no longer tolerate actions that have long continued to undermine with regular frequency the fragile edifice of international legality. The Ethiopian delegation, for its part, is ready to support practical measures that would restore the rule

of law and the precepts of justice in the conduct of relations among the nations and peoples of the Middle East.

54. Mr. NISIBORI (Japan): On 14 December 1981, Israel enacted legislation extending its laws, jurisdiction and administration to the occupied territory of the Golan Heights. The gravity of the situation compelled the General Assembly and the Security Council urgently to consider the problem.

55. The position of the Government of Japan on this question was made clear in the statement by the Minister for Foreign Affairs on 15 December 1981.³¹ I reiterated that position before the Security Council on the following day, and I should like at this time to read out once again the Foreign Minister's statement:

"The Knesset (the Israeli Parliament) passed legislation on 14 December 1981 which in effect annexes the Golan Heights. Japan cannot condone such a unilateral change to the legal status of an occupied territory by Israel, following the annexation of East Jerusalem in July 1980, which is in total violation of international law and United Nations Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

"The Government of Japan is deeply concerned that such an action would not only impair the atmosphere that exists for the settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflicts through peaceful means, but would also heighten tension in the region.

"On this occasion, the Government of Japan reiterates its strong demand that Israel withdraw from all the territories occupied in 1967 as early as possible."

56. In deliberations at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, the international community strongly condemned Israel's actions. We wish to remind Israel of the adoption on 16 December 1981 of resolution 36/147 E, regarding Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the population of the occupied territories, by a vote of 141 in favour with three abstentions, with the sole negative note being cast by Israel. And on 17 December, operative paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 36/226 A was put to a separate vote and was overwhelmingly adopted by a vote of 132 in favour and 7 abstentions. Again, Israel cast the only negative vote. Furthermore, the Security Council on that same day unanimously adopted resolution 497 (1981), which demanded that Israel should rescind forthwith its legislation and which decided to consider taking appropriate measures in the event of non-compliance by Israel.

57. Because Israel did not comply, the Council was obliged to work towards a next step, and Japan for its part made every effort to work for a resolution that could be adopted by the Council. As a result of the complexity of the problem, and much to our regret, these endeavours were to no avail.

58. My delegation was obliged to abstain on 20 January last in the vote on the revised draft resolution put forward in the Security Council.¹ We did so because we had some doubts concerning the draft resolution, in the light of Japan's basic position that the question of peace in the Middle East must be resolved through talks. I wish to emphasize, however, that Japan's position in the vote should not be interpreted as in any way condoning Israel's action. My country once again calls upon Israel to rescind its most recent measures and to refrain from taking similar illegal decisions in the future.

59. In accordance with its belief that this question must be taken up once again and fully deliberated in the United Nations, Japan voted in favour of the Security Council

resolution calling for this emergency special session of the General Assembly [*resolution 500 (1981)*].

60. The problem before us is a particularly difficult one since it is deeply related to the over-all task of attaining peace in the Middle East. We believe that a real settlement of the problem can only be achieved through peaceful talks among the parties concerned. My delegation has on numerous occasions made known its fundamental position regarding the Middle East question: namely, if peace is to be achieved in the Middle East, it must be just, lasting and comprehensive. Such a peace is to be achieved through the early and complete implementation of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). It is also Japan's position that any and all conflicts must be resolved peacefully through talks. Thus, I wish once again to urge the conflicting parties to enter into talks as soon as possible.

61. Japan deeply deplores the fact that Israel continues to undertake actions which are in total violation of the Charter of the United Nations, of international law and the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, and which constitute a challenge to the numerous international efforts to achieve peace in the Middle East. I wish to refer here to some of those resolutions: namely, resolution 465 (1980) of 1 March 1980, on the question of Israeli settlements; resolution 478 (1980) of 20 August 1980, on the question of Jerusalem; resolution 487 (1981) of 19 June 1981, on the Israeli bombing of Iraq's nuclear facilities. Most recently, Israel's representative rejected Security Council resolution 497 (1981), on the present question of the Golan Heights, immediately after it was adopted by the Council.

62. In our view, Israel's present attitude will never contribute to the consolidation of its own security; on the contrary, it will only result in deepening mistrust of Israel on the part of Arab countries and increasing its isolation in the international community.

63. I wish to stress that Israel would be gravely mistaken if it were to interpret the fact that the Council did not adopt a resolution on 20 January as international condoning of its actions and attitude.

64. In concluding, I wish to reiterate Japan's demand that Israel reverse its negative attitude towards the relevant resolutions of the Security Council. We also urge Israel fully to recognize that it can further consolidate its own national security only by pursuing peace through peaceful means, and seriously to heed the warnings of the international community as repeatedly expressed in the General Assembly and the Security Council.

65. Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia): The question of the Syrian Golan Heights of which this emergency special session is seized is part and parcel of the long-standing problem of the occupied Arab territories, which the world community has been striving to resolve for the past 15 years.

66. The problem of the grave situation in the occupied territories emerged as a result of the 1967 Israeli war of aggression against the Arab countries and has since been a source of serious threats to the peace and security not only of that region but of the whole world. Over the years, Israel, in absolute disregard of numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and of basic principles and norms of international law, has continued to occupy Arab territories and to perpetrate crimes thereon.

67. The Mongolian delegation has expressed the views and position of its Government on this and related issues on numerous occasions in different forums. Barely three

weeks ago, speaking on 12 January in the Security Council,³² convened in pursuance of its resolution 497 (1981) of 17 December last, my delegation condemned in the strongest terms the Israeli decision to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights as an act of aggression and as the annexation of a part of the territory of a sovereign State, which represent flagrant violations of the Charter of the United Nations and of universally recognized norms and principles of international law and acceptable behaviour of States. It also expressed the support of the people and Government of the Mongolian People's Republic for the Syrian people and our solidarity with them in their struggle for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of their country. We will do so again and again as long as the Israeli Zionists continue their policy of aggression, occupation and annexation and defy world public opinion and the decisions of United Nations bodies.

68. The Security Council, in pursuance of its resolution 497 (1981), was expected, in the event of non-compliance with that resolution by Israel, to take appropriate measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

69. The fact that Israel, with its usual arrogance and cynicism, made it clear that it would not rescind its act of annexation, and the Security Council's deliberations last month, provided clear evidence of the extreme urgency with which the Council should take effective measures against the aggressor under Chapter VII of the Charter. However, the adoption of even the minimum of measures contained in the revised draft resolution submitted to the Security Council¹ was blocked by a permanent member of the Council, namely, the United States. If adopted, the draft resolution, though it contained the minimum of what the overwhelming majority of Member States wanted, could have contributed to the efforts of the world community to bring peace and security to the region.

70. It is against this background that my delegation views the importance of the convening of this emergency special session of the General Assembly, which was strongly urged by the recent plenary meeting of the non-aligned countries.¹⁶

71. We believe that this session of the General Assembly, having been faced with such a situation, cannot but denounce in the strongest terms the aggressive and expansionist policy of Israel towards the Arab countries, and in particular the Syrian Arab Republic. The international community should condemn the illegal annexation of the Golan Heights and declare it null and void.

72. It is absolutely clear—and this has been stated time and again—that without the all-round military, economic and other support rendered by the United States, Israel—in the words of its representative “one of the smallest nations on earth”—would never have been able to persist in its policy of aggression and expansionism.

73. The United States veto cannot be divorced from over-all American policy in the Middle East and should be viewed in the context of the so-called strategic co-operation agreement. The United States veto cannot but be viewed also as a fresh encouragement of Israel to further aggression against the Arab people. In other words, the United States veto has once again unmasked the true nature of the policy pursued by that country in the Middle East.

74. It is quite evident that if effective measures are not taken promptly, the annexation process will continue, and the rest of the occupied territories will follow the fate of East Jerusalem and the Syrian Golan Heights. The Israelis and their protectors are already engaged in preparing

public opinion for the next acts. The latest issue of *Newsweek* carries an article in which Israeli Minister of Defence Sharon is quoted as saying that

“the Egyptians will get their territory back on time but the event will be so dramatic and so full of trauma nobody will dare even think of giving up an inch of the West Bank and Gaza”.

75. The course of events of the recent past, such as the annexation of the Golan Heights and other acts of aggression by Israel, has clearly shown that there can be no peace in the Middle East unless Israel's complete and unconditional withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories is achieved and the inalienable national right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including their right to create their own State, and the security of all States in that region are ensured.

76. Such a solution, in our view, calls for the convening of an international conference with the participation of all the interested parties, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole authentic representative of the Palestinian people.

77. In conclusion, I wish once again to state that the Mongolian people stands firmly on the side of the Arab people and the people of Syria and wishes them every success in their struggle for the speedy restoration of their territorial integrity and for peace and justice in the region.

78. Mr. AL-THANI (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): First of all, I should like to emphasize an important fact. This emergency special session is not a repetition of the debate that was recently held in the Security Council; rather it is the completion of an unfinished debate or a debate that was deliberately prevented from being completed, or, in fact, a corrective measure taken by the international community because of its recent disappointment at seeing its efforts deliberately undermined when it tried to uphold the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law in international relations—in particular the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. This paralysis is thus only the natural result of the abuse of the veto in the Security Council by States which enjoy that right.

79. The veto cast by the United States is a contradiction in the eyes of the world. On 14 December 1981, when the Knesset decided to annex the Golan Heights, Washington hastened to condemn the action and to accuse Israel of having profited from the attention given by the United States to events in Poland and of surprising it by annexing the Golan Heights.

80. This position criticizing Israel's irresponsible conduct found expression in the United States support of resolution 497 (1981), unanimously adopted by the Security Council on 17 December 1981. But it seems that the United States forgot that support for the resolution was not an aim in itself; on the contrary, support of the resolution was a decision entailing the United States support of the subsequent draft resolution.

81. In order to justify the rejection of the draft resolution that was put to the vote in the Security Council on 20 January,¹ the United States claimed that the annexation of the Golan Heights was not part of activities which threatened international peace and security and which called for intervention by the Security Council by imposing sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. Hence, the draft resolution was described as a deviation from the main purpose of the sanctions under the Charter. The representative of the United States appealed for a start to be made on implementing previous resolutions adopted by the Security Council. She said she was convinced of the importance of the previous Security

Council resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973) and 497 (1981), and that those resolutions were a basis for a constructive debate. She requested that negotiations be started.

82. Should we not ask whether the acquisition of other people's territory by force, the occupation and annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights and the annexation of other Arab lands are not threats to international peace and security under the Charter? Who is then threatening international peace and security?

83. We consider the annexation of the Golan Heights to be another stage in a long series of Israeli violations of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. Israel, because of its repeated acts of aggression on the pretext of its professed interest in its security, has been quick to use force when it feels threatened. The Iraqi nuclear reactor was bombed, as were densely populated areas in Beirut, and recently the Golan Heights were annexed. All these acts are the implementation of the Zionist-Israeli policies of aggression.

84. Israel has arrogated to itself the right to be the supreme authority in the Middle East region, an authority which ignores all international customs and laws, striking where it will, whenever it thinks it can act with impunity because it is protected by the United States veto. Peace, to the Zionist mind, differs from the just and lasting peace we seek; it means the relinquishment of the Arab occupied territories and the denial of the rights of the Palestinian people.

85. I do not think we need to give further proof of this here in order to demonstrate Israeli expansionist designs, because Israel itself has provided the proof. It continues to threaten international peace and security by its military and brutal acts of annexationist aggression, which are endless. As long as the international community does not put an end to this flagrant act of defiance of the international will by imposing mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter and as long as the Organization does not reconsider Israel's right to membership in the Organization until it respects United Nations resolutions, which prohibit the use or threat of force, intervention in the internal affairs of other States and acts of aggression against other States and the occupation of their territories, *inter alia*, by implementing the resolutions on Al-Quds al-Sharif and Security Council resolution 497 (1981) on the Golan Heights, Israel will surprise us by annexing the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

86. The State of Qatar always seeks, together with its Arab brothers and with other peace-loving peoples and within the framework of the United Nations, to avoid the scourge of war by exerting every sincere effort to establish security and to put an end to the cause of this tension. The State of Qatar calls upon the Assembly to apply its joint efforts and potential towards implementing the purposes and principles of the Charter by taking the necessary steps to put an end to the threat to peace and security in the region, in accordance with the principles of justice and international law.

87. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): This emergency special session of the General Assembly has been convened to consider the question of the situation in the occupied Arab territories, more particularly in the Syrian Golan Heights. While this is the immediate issue before the Assembly, it cannot be considered in isolation from the over-all situation in the Middle East, which continues to pose a most persistent threat to international peace and security. Every act that aggravates the situation compounds the threat. The decision of the Israeli Government to extend its jurisdiction to Golan is such an act. It is therefore appropriate that the Security Council, and

now the General Assembly, should address themselves to the situation.

88. Security Council resolution 242 (1967) remains the basis for the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. It has lost none of its relevance; if anything, recent events serve to underline the continuing validity of the basic principles of that resolution. That resolution emphasizes the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war. In its key provisions, it calls for the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the 1967 conflict, termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force.

89. Those principles which are the basis of a comprehensive process of peace are yet to be put into effect. Nevertheless, they constitute a basic requirement for a just solution both in the realm of international law and in that of practical politics. It is essential, therefore, that nothing be done by any party to the conflict, either by commission or omission, in contravention of those principles. In terms of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), it is imperative that the ultimate status of occupied territories not be prejudiced before a comprehensive solution has been found.

90. The basic balance of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) was supposed to be simple and straightforward: withdrawal from occupied territories and acceptance and recognition of the right of Israel—like every other State in the area—to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries. Together with the question of the right of Palestinians to self-determination, that remains the key to peace in the Middle East. That has not been achieved; only in relations between Israel and Egypt is the combination of withdrawal and mutual recognition near fulfilment, but in other respects the problems are as far from solution as ever.

91. Israel has acted in consistent contravention of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in its policies with regard to occupied territories; it has continued its illegal settlements policy; it has declared east Jerusalem part of "the united capital of Israel"; and a few weeks ago it imposed its laws, jurisdiction and administration in the Syrian Golan Heights, which the international community has interpreted as amounting to annexation. All those acts of the Government of Israel have been censured by the Security Council and declared null and void. A demand has been made to Israel to rescind forthwith its illegal decision concerning the Syrian Golan Heights. Finland concurs in those Security Council decisions.

92. In accordance with its policy of neutrality, Finland has taken a balanced and conciliatory position on the various controversial issues in the Middle East. It is our firm intention to continue this policy. A tangible expression of that is the sizable contribution which Finland has made and continues to make to the United Nations peace-keeping activities in the Middle East, and more particularly in the Golan Heights area.

93. Against that background, it is with particular concern that Finland participates in this emergency special session of the General Assembly, which has been convened in order to voice in unequivocal terms the condemnation of the international community as a whole of the Israeli act with respect to the Syrian Golan Heights, which we consider not only illegal but also a serious new obstacle to the efforts towards peace in the Middle East.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.