

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

UN LIBRARY

AUG 9 - 1982

UN/ISA COLLECTION

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR

2323rd

MEETING: 7 JANUARY 1982

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2323)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the occupied Arab territories:	
(a) Resolution 497 (1981);	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General (S/14821)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2323rd MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 7 January 1982, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Oleg A. TROYANOVSKY
(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Panama, Poland, Spain, Togo, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2323)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in the occupied Arab territories:
 - (a) Resolution 497 (1981);
 - (b) Report of the Secretary-General (S/14821)

The meeting was called to order at 4.30 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the occupied Arab territories:

- (a) Resolution 497 (1981);
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General (S/14821)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): In accordance with decisions taken at the 2322nd meeting, I invite the representative of Israel and the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to take places at the Council table. I invite the representatives of Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Morocco, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Yemen and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber. I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Blum (Israel) and Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) took places at the Council table; Mr. Roa Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Kittikhoun (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Mrani Zentar (Morocco), Mr. Sarré (Senegal), Mr. De Silva (Sri Lanka), Mr. Mufareh (Yemen) and Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber; Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Bangladesh, the German Democratic Republic, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the Sudan in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Bedjaoui (Algeria), Mr. Kaiser (Bangladesh), Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Krishnan (India), Mr. Burwin (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Jamal (Qatar), Mr. Allagany (Saudi Arabia) and Mr. Abdalla (Sudan) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The first speaker is the representative of Democratic Yemen. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

4. Mr. ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen): Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to address the Council under your eminent and distinguished leadership. We salute you as a refined and tactful diplomat hailing from the Soviet Union, a friendly country whose support for the just Arab cause has been both consistent and firm. We are bound together in our common struggle for genuine peace and progress. To your predecessor, Mr. Otunnu, I pay a special tribute for his outstanding performance last month. Thanks to his prudence and wisdom, we now have a new Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, to whom I am happy to extend a warm welcome and sincere wishes for a successful tenure of office.

5. The Council has before it an unequivocal case. In many ways it is faced with a challenge and a severe test—a challenge to its authority and a test of its credibility.

6. On 14 December 1981, the Israeli Government committed yet another act of aggression. In a swift move, it annexed the occupied Syrian Golan Heights by imposing there its laws, jurisdiction and administration. Three days later the Security Council unani-

mously adopted resolution 497 (1981), condemning the Israeli annexation of the Golan Heights and declaring it null and void and without international legal effect. The Council also demanded that Israel immediately rescind its decision. Not surprisingly, the Israeli reply was abrupt. "Israel cannot and does not accept the resolution", Mr. Blum said [2319th meeting, para. 37].

7. On 29 December, Israel addressed a note to the Secretary-General seeking to justify its annexation of the Golan Heights on the grounds that, *inter alia*, "Syria has regarded itself as being in a state of war with Israel" [S/1482], para. 3] and that Israeli legislation in the Golan Heights sought to normalize the situation in the area. As to the demand of the Council that Israel should rescind forthwith its illegal decision, the letter only expressed regret that the Council should have adopted a resolution that ignored the background of the situation.

8. What arrogance and what contempt for the Security Council and the international community at large. First, Israel illegally annexed the Golan Heights; then it refused to abide by the unanimous decision of the Council that Israel rescind its annexationist legislation. To add insult to injury, Israel offered baseless arguments which, if taken seriously, would be tantamount to justifying the Israeli annexation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Not only that, but since Israel is technically in a state of war with the Arab countries, it can claim to have a right to annex any Arab territory in order to normalize the situation in the area.

9. It is obvious that the Israeli arguments are frivolous. They should be dismissed as legal absurdities intended to rebuff the Council and undermine its authority. Israel acted like a bandit who, having committed armed robbery and snatched his victim's wallet, laid claim to it because the lawful owner could not retrieve it in time. In the United States such a bandit would be brought to justice, but in the Council the bandit is let loose, because the United States will shield the bandit. That is the significance of the United States promise to the Israeli Ambassador in Washington, a promise to stop the Council from taking any punitive action against Israel under Article 41 of the Charter of the United Nations.

10. In fact, Israel behaves as if it had a veto power over the United States veto power in the Security Council. Israel knows only too well that it cannot withstand international military, economic and diplomatic sanctions imposed by the Council. But it is also aware that the United States will never allow such sanctions to be imposed. The United States not only is committed to safeguarding Israeli security, as defined by Israel, but is bound to defend Israel's policies and even to put up with the political whims of its leaders. Little wonder that Israel pays little respect to this body.

11. Yes, Israel is not a "vassal State", nor is it a "banana republic"; Israel is virtually a super-State in the American Republic. In terms of power and influence, it has more leverage in Washington than any number of States put together. It is more privileged than any state in the Union, for it neither pays taxes to the Federal Government nor repays the American taxpayer, to whom it owes its very existence. To the chagrin of American generals, Israel is provided with the most sophisticated weapons system, while they patiently wait in line. To say that Israel is spoiled by the United States is an understatement. Israel is literally the political and strategic extension of the United States in our region; it serves an American purpose in the Middle East.

12. Apart from the usurpation of Palestine and the colonization of its people, the continuing aggression against Lebanon and Syria and the threat Israel poses to other Arab countries, Israel is assigned a new strategic role: to keep the Middle East in a state of tension and turmoil. Such a situation would enable the United States and its allies to increase their military presence in the Arabian Gulf and around the vital oil fields under the pretext of defending them. It is interesting to note the correlation between the sharp increase in Israeli acts of terrorism and aggression last year and the build-up of United States naval power in the Arabian Gulf.

13. The brutal Israeli raid on Beirut and the bombardment of the Iraqi nuclear installation were immediately followed by American military manoeuvres and war games in the Middle East. The Israeli annexation of the Golan Heights might be a harbinger of more American military involvement in our region.

14. Should we then expect the United States to vote for a draft resolution that would impose sanctions on Israel, within the purview of Article 41 of the Charter? The answer is obvious: no such draft resolution will pass, and Israel will not rescind its decision on the Golan Heights unless it is forced to do so. The Arab world will once again have to face the Israeli challenge, and the Arab friends of the United States will have to reassess their relations with it.

15. In my capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States for this month, let me declare that all the Arab States, without exception, stand firmly in support of Syria, as well as its demand that the Security Council apply sanctions to Israel in order to force it to rescind its decision to annex the Golan Heights.

16. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Sri Lanka. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

17. Mr. DE SILVA (Sri Lanka): Allow me to extend to you, Sir, my delegation's congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the

month of January. The Council is fortunate in having your valuable experience, your guidance and, not least of all, your genial disposition to advance its work in this first month of the new year.

18. May I also express our appreciation of the services of your predecessor, Mr. Olara Otunnu of Uganda, who presided over the Council's deliberations in December. I need hardly say more than that what he was able to accomplish has been widely acclaimed.

19. I would also extend to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, who has just assumed his duties, our felicitations and warmest good wishes for success in the tasks that lie ahead. When he was called to assume the burdens of his office, the Organization and its Member States had already recognized his worth and his labours, both on behalf of his country and in the service of the Organization itself.

20. The Council meets as a sequel to its resolution 497 (1981) which it adopted following the Syrian Arab Republic's complaint over Israel's decision to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration in the occupied Golan Heights [S/14791]. With an unusual demonstration of unanimity in an area which is the frequent subject of deliberation both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly, the Council, in that resolution, categorically demanded that Israel, the occupying Power, rescind forthwith its decision to annex the Golan Heights and decided that Israel's decision was null and void and without international legal effect.

21. The adoption of resolution 497 (1981) was acclaimed as evidence that the Council had made an unambiguous decision to call a halt to the continuing Israeli aggrandizement through its occupation of neighbouring territories by force. My delegation refrained from coming before the Council when it was considering that resolution because we had expressed our views quite clearly when we co-sponsored General Assembly resolution 36/226 B, which was overwhelmingly adopted on 16 December.

22. The Council is now meeting again, in pursuance of paragraph 4 of resolution 497 (1981), to consider taking appropriate measures in the event of Israel's non-compliance with the Council resolution. That non-compliance was heralded by a vituperative outburst by the Israeli leadership directed at Israel's allies and friends, among others. It has now been conveyed in the note addressed on 29 December from the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General [S/14821, para. 3] and repeated in his statement to the Council yesterday [2322nd meeting]. Israel's reply is a recital of a garnished record of 30 years in the history of the Middle East problem, including a holier-than-thou reference to Article 2, paragraph 2, of the Charter, which speaks of fulfilling in good faith the obligations assumed by Members in accordance with the Charter.

23. What my delegation finds rather curious is the description of the situation in the Golan Heights as "anomalous" and hence Israel's decision to install a civil administration. There was no anomalous situation in the Golan Heights, nor were the Golan Heights or their inhabitants placed in limbo, as the Israeli representative's letter claims. The Syrian Golan Heights remain exactly where they have always been, though the vast majority of the Syrian citizens have been compelled to seek—if not intimidated into seeking—refuge beyond the cease-fire lines in Syrian territory. Since 1967 Israel has unabashedly exploited the plea of security and of secure boundaries to install settlements which have been, and are, no more than a prelude to annexation. What Israel has done in the Golan Heights is what it did in East Jerusalem and continues to do in the occupied West Bank. The present Government of Israel has pursued that policy with a bravado that, to say the least, is an embarrassment to Israel's most durable friends.

24. Let me briefly recount the Jerusalem story. First, there was the holding of a military parade. The Security Council adopted resolution 250 (1968) ignored by Israel. It then adopted resolution 251 (1968), deploring the holding of the parade. Then came resolutions 252 (1968), 267 (1969) and 298 (1971), all of which either censured or deplored Israel's legislative and administrative measures and declared or confirmed them as invalid. Israel just went ahead regardless. The Security Council and the international community notwithstanding, Israel functions from a Jerusalem which it has proclaimed as its undivided and eternal capital.

25. At least in resolution 497 (1981), the Council decided that in the event of non-compliance it would consider taking appropriate measures in accordance with the Charter. In General Assembly resolution 36/226 B, the Security Council was requested to invoke the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter, which provides a range of remedies. It is now for the Council, which is aware of the outcome of previous resolutions addressed to Israel in similar situations, to determine how best it could compel a defaulting and defiant Member State to heed the authority of the Council. A conclusion that is limited to deploring or condemning Israel will have the predictable result of Israel's again profiting from its policy of presenting a *fait accompli*. My delegation would like to share the expectation of the several members who have spoken before us that at least on this occasion the Council will discharge its responsibilities and ensure compliance with its own decisions so that its authority will not be casually dismissed.

26. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States, to whom the Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure at the 2322nd meeting. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

27. Mr. MAKSOUD: Mr. President, I should like to express to you and, through you, to the members of the Council the appreciation of the League of Arab States for allowing us to address the Council on an issue the gravity of which cannot be overstated. It is regrettable that the year 1982 has to start with the Council meeting to discuss Israel's non-compliance with a previous Security Council resolution.

28. Perhaps the term "non-compliance" inadequately describes the contemptuous and arrogant nature of Israel's rejection of Council resolution 497 (1981).

29. I wonder what this augurs for the future of the United Nations. Still, Israel's non-compliance should not be allowed to determine the mood of the future and the credibility of the Organization. On the contrary, it is perhaps a timely reminder for all of us who are in one way or another engaged in the constructive work of the Organization to renew our commitment to its ideals and objectives by ensuring the implementation of its resolutions, the applicability of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the reinforcement of its moral, political and diplomatic authority.

30. Sir, it is from this standpoint that we view your presidency with high expectations. The maturity you have constantly exhibited in your diplomatic performance, the friendliness you have demonstrated and the soundness of your judgement reflect not only the traditional wisdom that is abundant in the history of your great country but also a keen awareness of the responsibilities that all of us—particularly the super-Powers—have towards peace, progress and justice. I should also like to say how much the League of Arab States and the Arab Member States appreciate the sustained understanding and support your country, the Soviet Union, has given to Arab causes—support which has been functional and consistent.

31. I wish to point out, too, that the former President of the Council, Mr. Otunnu, has proved a new theory: that youth and statesmanship are not necessarily contradictions in terms.

32. The Council is meeting for the first time this year as the new Secretary-General, Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar, assumes his duties, which entail articulating the world's conscience, besides eliciting and expressing world consensus. It is clear that our people have a stake in the growing capacity of the Secretary-General to succeed in those ennobling endeavours.

33. The report of the Secretary-General submitted to the Council on 31 December 1981 in document S/14821 speaks for itself. It is not a detailed analysis of obvious non-compliance by Israel with the provisions of Council resolution 497 (1981). The Israeli response is allowed in effect to constitute the report, and judgement has therefore been deferred to this

body. Thus, clearly, Israel's response is Israel's indictment. It provides sufficient reason to condemn and penalize Israel.

34. Yet, there are some—in decreasing but still effective numbers—in the United States who see in the Israeli response, believe it or not, some "positive" points. You, Mr. President, and the members of the Council will undoubtedly agree that it takes a large degree of intellectual audacity to come to such a mind-boggling conclusion.

35. To begin with, the response is wholly extraneous to what the Council, in resolution 497 (1981), asked Israel to do. The Council declared Israel's imposition of its laws, jurisdiction and administration on the Golan Heights to be "null and void". The Council demanded that Israel, the occupying Power, should rescind its decision forthwith. The Israeli answer is a brazen and categorical refusal to comply. On the contrary, Israel, as the report clearly shows, sought to justify the so-called Golan Heights Law. Not only did Israel seek to deflect attention from the core issue which led the Council to adopt its resolution 497 (1981), but it also sought to ignore the resolution, reject its demand and refuse its admonition. All this obviously constitutes non-compliance in its most glaring manifestation.

36. It is needless to point out that Israel instantly upon the adoption of resolution 497 (1981) informed the world of its determination not to comply, and it did so in the most emphatic terms, when Mr. Begin "lectured" United States Ambassador Lewis in the most insulting language to be recorded in the annals of modern diplomacy, thus reminding the world that the Hitlerite vocabulary is yet with us—and I shall return to this aspect later.

37. In view of Israel's non-compliance, the Council's anticipation of the Israeli response was wise, logical and justified. Paragraph 4 of resolution 497 (1981) states:

"the Council would meet urgently, and not later than 5 January 1982, to consider taking appropriate measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations."

38. The need to take appropriate measures follows naturally when a determination of non-compliance is ascertained. The issue is: What constitutes "appropriate measures"? What defines the measures is inevitably the nature, extent and level of non-compliance. In this case, Israel's non-compliance is unmistakable, total and categorical. Hence the extent is sweeping, the level of rejection is the highest and its nature is one of utter contempt, defiance and a clear intent to pursue the implementation of that which the Council has decided to be null and void. Inasmuch as this description is considered by the world community as objective and conclusive, there is no way of

avoiding a determination that Israel's non-compliance is lawless and reckless and that the administration Israel is imposing in the Golan Heights is a direct challenge to the Geneva Conventions of 1949, a violation of international law, a defiance of United Nations resolutions, a threat to peace and a clear act of aggression. In other words, the act of legislative piracy which the so-called Golan Heights Law constitutes is a further attempt on the part of Israel to establish in the Syrian Arab territory of the Golan Heights counterfeit legalism to offset and defuse the thrust of international legitimacy and of the Security Council resolution.

39. Even if one is to make an analysis of the content of Israel's response as included in the Secretary-General's report, one finds that the audacity with which Israel distorts facts, falsifies history, asserts proven lies is unbelievable. The Israeli policy in this field is again reminiscent of Goebbels' big-lie doctrine: when you want to obscure the truth, repeat the big lie. Israel has repeated the big lie concerning the Golan Heights prior to its 1967 aggression so often that the lie is no longer even challenged.

40. I should like to refer briefly to the truth about the Golan Heights, as has been done previously by my colleague, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic [*ibid.*], and its role prior to the 1967 war. Israel alleges that before that war Syrian guns frequently shelled "without provocation" Israeli farm settlements in the Hula plains below [*ibid.*, *para. 180*].

41. What is the reality? Israel claimed sovereignty over the entire demilitarized zone designated by the 1949 Armistice Agreement.¹ Not only Syria, but also the United Nations and particularly the United States rejected Israel's claim to that zone and held that Israel had no right to fortify it with military personnel and equipment. In summarizing the situation, General Burns, the former head of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), wrote:

"Briefly stripped, so far as possible, of technicalities, the question at issue may be put thus: The Israelis claimed sovereignty over the . . . zone. They then proceeded, as opportunity offered, to encroach on the specific restrictions, and so eventually to free themselves, on various pretexts, from all of them . . . The Israelis in fact exercised almost complete control over the major portion of the . . . zone through their frontier police . . . This was directly contrary to article V of the General Armistice Agreement and the 'authoritative interpretation' of it . . ."

How reminiscent of the procedures constantly followed by Israel in the West Bank and other places.

42. Furthermore, Major General van Horn of Sweden, also a former UNTSO Chief of Staff, concluded:

"[Israeli encroachments were], of course, part of a premeditated Israeli policy to edge east through the demilitarized zone towards the old Palestine border [with Syria] and to get all the Arabs out of the way by fair means or foul. In fact, the Israelis never observed the rules of the Armistice Agreement, which allowed only limited numbers of locally recruited civilian police in the demilitarized zone. Instead, a patrol from the border police of the State of Israel would arrive, usually in an armoured vehicle . . . It was hardly surprising that the Arab farmers should feel . . . threatened . . . [The farmers] drew strength from the knowledge that [their] activities were watched by [Syrian gunners on the Golan Heights]. It [was] unlikely that the [Syrian guns] would ever [have] come into action had it not been for Israeli provocation."

43. Israel attempts to justify its annexation of Syrian territory by claiming that Syria has repeatedly rejected Israeli offers to negotiate peace. The question here is: What sort of peace and negotiations, in what conditions? Under duress, coercion and occupation. Is it not obvious that ever since its creation Israel's every action and policy has been aimed at undermining peace and preventing negotiations?

44. Israel has not even defined its borders. It keeps expanding in every direction and hints broadly that its appetite may require even more territory that it has already seized. And it has carried out its nefarious designs against its neighbour secure in the knowledge that it enjoys unlimited support and protection from its ally the United States. Yet we have recently witnessed the gratitude Israel feels for that support and protection in the form of Begin's astonishing and insulting diatribe against the United States because it dared to show its displeasure at his reckless behaviour and policies.

45. Begin complained that the United States had taken punitive measures against Israel for its bombing of Iraq's peaceful nuclear installations—an act of pure aggression against a target hundreds of miles away from Israel. He moaned that the United States had admonished him for destroying the centre of Beirut, the Lebanese capital, and killing hundreds of innocent civilians, among them many children. He raged against the suspension by the United States of the so-called strategic co-operation agreement with Israel in the wake of his annexation of the Syrian Arab territory of the Golan Heights. And he warned that Israel was not to be treated by the United States as either a "vassal State" or a "banana republic" [*see para. 11 above*].

46. What is it, one should ask, that makes the United States so paralysed in the face of Israel's diplomatic, political and intellectual terrorism? Why does a super-Power seem at times so helpless to curb the intransigence, lawlessness, recklessness and aggression of an obvious dependant?

47. Events in the past few weeks show that the United States is not averse to imposing sanctions when it believes that its own standards of behaviour and its own interests have been undermined. And yet Israel repeatedly violates the concepts the United States stands for and unquestionably harms American interests without fear of effective United States retribution. Why is the great American Republic such a prisoner of indecision when it comes to Israel?

48. The United States fails in its clear responsibility towards the maintenance of world peace and security when it pampers an aggressive Israel, an expanding Israel, an annexationist Israel. It abdicates its duty as a major Power when it succumbs to obvious Israeli blackmail and insults; and it detracts from its stature in the eyes of the world when it permits Israel not only to defy the international community but also to ignore, with untold harmful consequences, America's own national interests and global responsibilities.

49. The history of the United States proves conclusively that it has hardly ever accepted from others even a fraction of the abuse that Begin heaped on the United States Government and its leaders in his outbursts. We are astonished that instead of engaging in firm diplomatic retaliation, the United States appears traumatized by Israel's brazen assault and even eager to placate the aggressor.

50. We welcomed the United States action in suspending its strategic co-operation accord with Israel. We considered it a punitive step, but hoped that it would not be a terminal one; that other, more effective measures, more inhibiting measures, more deterrent measures would be taken when Israel refused to comply with Security Council and United States admonitions and demands. Moreover, the United States joined last month with the other members of the Security Council in laying the groundwork for "appropriate measures" to be taken against Israel in case of non-compliance.

51. The time for such measures has arrived, since Israel has utterly refused to rescind its effective annexation of the Syrian Arab territory of the Golan Heights. The United States and other members of the Council now face the task of defining the means to compel Israel to comply.

52. But how can any measure be "appropriate" and, therefore, effective when the United States signals to the world that it intends to prevent the imposition of sanctions against its pampered protégé—a sort of pre-emptive diplomatic strike?

53. It is no exaggeration to say that in once again shielding Israel from the consequences of its illegal actions, the United States risks creating an atmosphere of international anarchy. It is sanctioning, in effect, the historically condemned practice of acquiring territory by force. In other words, by protecting Israel

again and again the United States would be opening the door to the kind of chaos that it has always condemned and abhorred.

54. We believe that a great deal is at stake as the Council deliberates on what course to follow. What is involved is not just the illegal act of annexing the land of a sovereign Arab State but also the principles of international law, the sanctity of international conventions, the respect due to codes of behaviour among nations, the reputation of the United States as a principled protector of world peace and security and, last but by no means least, the very credibility of the United Nations and especially of the Security Council.

55. It is imperative that the international community should come to consider Israel's behaviour a major threat to peace in the Middle East. That is a fact that no Israeli lies can obscure any more. We in the League of Arab States and in the Arab world fervently hope that the members of the Council clearly see, as we do, that their duty—in fact the only course left open—is to impose the sanctions that would make Israel understand that the world's patience with its depredations has run out.

56. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Bangladesh. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

57. Mr. KAISER (Bangladesh): At the outset, Sir, let me express felicitations on your assumption of the office of President of the Council for the current month. We are confident that the deliberations of the Council will be successfully steered under your able and effective guidance.

58. I should also like to take this opportunity to convey my profound appreciation to Mr. Otunnu of Uganda for his innovative and far-sighted leadership in solving some of the most crucial problems facing the Council and the United Nations during the month of December.

59. It gives us immense satisfaction to express our warmest greetings and heartfelt congratulations to Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar on his election as Secretary-General. His experience in diplomacy and his active involvement in complex negotiations on international crisis situations lend him a unique position to head the world body. We wish him success in his new responsibility.

60. The Council is again seized of a crisis threatening international peace and security arising out of Israeli aggression on Arab territories. The annexation of the Golan Heights by an act of the Israeli Parliament, in utter violation of international law and the Geneva Conventions of 1949, is yet another example of the callous disregard with which Israel has treated international opinion.

61. It is the bounden duty and solemn obligation of all Member States to uphold and honour the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The world community cannot come to terms with the idea that Israel can afford to be a singular exception. Here is yet another clear example of blatant disregard by a Member State not only of the wishes of the vast majority of the Members of the United Nations but also of the international obligations and duties enjoined by the Charter. No words of condemnation can be strong enough to denounce the illegal move by Israel to annex Syrian territory in the Golan Heights.

62. Bangladesh has strongly condemned this move by Israel as an act of unwarranted provocation and a blatant violation of all international laws, canons and conventions. The concern and anxiety felt by Bangladesh about this serious development have been emphatically demonstrated by its President and Minister for Foreign Affairs and they apprehend that this aggressive and illegal act on the part of Israel is bound further to aggravate and complicate the already explosive situation in the Middle East and thus cause a serious threat to regional and global security.

63. The flagrant defiance by Israel of the norms of conduct of international relations and its disregard for the relevant decisions of the United Nations make it crystal clear that Israel is still wedded to a policy of aggression, belligerency and provocation towards its neighbours. With such an expansionist policy, how can Israel have the world believe that it is inclined to a peaceful settlement of disputes with its neighbours?

64. Bangladesh has always unequivocally condemned all acts of annexation of territories by force. In the case of the Golan Heights, Israel not only has illegally occupied Syrian territory by force of arms but also has sought to legitimize, consolidate and perpetuate the fruits of aggression. This deserves to be condemned. Bangladesh joins all the peace-loving countries of the world in expressing unreserved consternation at the continuing bellicose conduct of Israel.

65. This move, coming as it did shortly after the announcement of the eight-point peace proposal by Prince Fahd, has further diminished the prospects for a peaceful, comprehensive and lasting solution of the Middle East problem. Bangladesh has always stood for the peaceful and negotiated settlement of problems. In the Middle East, the search for peace has been seriously thwarted by the aggressive and thoughtless act of Israel in deciding to legitimize the illegal occupation of Syrian territory in the Golan Heights. Israel will have to bear the full responsibility for endangering international peace and security by this act of belligerency and aggression.

66. Bangladesh fully supports Council resolution 497 (1981) declaring the Israeli decision to impose its laws in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights as null and void in international law. We also join the mem-

bers of the Council and in fact all Members of the United Nations in demanding that Israel should rescind its decision forthwith and continue to apply to the Syrian Golan Heights the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.²

67. Bangladesh has always favoured the settlement of the Middle East problem in conformity with the relevant United Nations resolutions and the principles of the Charter. We reaffirm our belief that there can be no comprehensive, lasting and just peace in the Middle East without adherence to the recognized principles of international law and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. Appropriate action must be taken to ensure that Israel desists from extending its laws to the illegally occupied Syrian Golan Heights and refrains from creating further provocations in the area. We demand that the Council condemn this aggressive conduct by Israel and, if necessary, impose mandatory sanctions to compel Israel to rescind its decision to extend the operation of its laws to the occupied areas of the Syrian Golan Heights. The Council should also fully discuss and examine the various economic and political measures that can be adopted with a view to the immediate withdrawal of Israel from all illegally occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem, and the restoration to the Palestinians of their inalienable rights, including their right to a State of their own.

68. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Cuba. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

69. Mr. ROA KOURÍ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I wish to thank you and the members of the Council for allowing me to speak at this meeting on "The situation in the occupied Arab territories" and to express our pleasure at seeing you presiding over the work of the Council this month. Your recognized talent and diplomatic skill, together with the unswerving position of principle of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which you so worthily represent, guarantee in advance the just conduct of the debate which we are resuming today on the Israeli decision to annex part of the territory of the Syrian Arab Republic in the Golan Heights.

70. I wish also to reaffirm my delegation's gratitude to Mr. Olara Otunnu of Uganda for his outstanding work as President of the Council last month.

71. Barely three weeks ago, on 16 December 1981, speaking here in the Council on the same question [2317th meeting], I pointed to the recurrence of the acts of aggression perpetrated by the Zionist régime of Israel against a number of Member States and the inability of the United Nations to curb its illegal conduct, which is contrary to the letter and the spirit of the Charter, as a result of the collusion of a permanent member of the Security Council with the rapacious,

expansionist and aggressive policies of Menachem Begin.

72. At that time I said that quite obviously that policy was aimed at annexing once and for all the Arab territories which Israel had occupied unlawfully since 1967 and at de-Arabizing the territory of Palestine and denying the Palestinian people the exercise of their inalienable rights and in fact preventing a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement of the conflict in the Middle East.

73. On 17 December 1981, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 497 (1981), in which, in paragraph 1, the Council decided 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", and consequently, in paragraph 2, it demanded that "Israel, the occupying Power, should rescind forthwith its decision".

74. The Israeli reply, sent to the Secretary-General in a note of 29 December 1981, is an insolent rebuff of the Council and the international community. The quintessential aggressor in the Middle East, the occupier of a territory that is an inalienable part of the Syrian Arab Republic, is now calling the victim to account and blaming it for its own unlawful acts, completely disregarding the decisions of the United Nations which are, moreover, perfectly clear and unequivocal. The representative of the Zionist régime has cynically argued that the Israeli legislation in question in no way diminishes the rights of what he has called the local population [see S/14821, para. 3].

75. The Government of Israel, violating all the norms of law and the Charter of the United Nations, has stripped the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights, expelling them from their homeland and occupying their property and land. It has militarily seized and today still holds other Arab territories, including the Syrian Golan Heights. It has carried out the forced colonization of those territories, and daily violates the rights of the Arab citizens. It has annexed the city of Jerusalem, wishing to make it its capital. It pursues an expansionist, annexationist policy that has repeatedly been condemned by the General Assembly and the Council. It engages in aggression and terrorism, and it is even shameful enough to claim that its unlawful actions are aimed at protecting the rights of the local population of the Syrian Golan Heights.

76. We must conclude that, as in *Alice in Wonderland*, when the Israeli representative speaks of respect what he really means is trampling underfoot the rights of the Syrian people, just as he attributes to others Israel's own expansionist, annexationist designs.

77. But we have not come to this meeting of the Council to hear the fables of the representative of Israel regarding the wonders of Israel's occupation of the Golan Heights. We have, rather, come to reiterate the demands contained in resolution 497 (1981) and the recommendations of the General Assembly re-

garding the Middle East, especially those concerning the exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights as a *sine qua non* for any just and comprehensive settlement of the conflict.

78. The Group of Non-Aligned Countries, over which it is my honour to preside, met the day before yesterday here at Headquarters and issued the following communiqué [S/14829, annex] which, with your permission, I will read:

"The plenary meeting of non-aligned countries held in New York on 5 January 1982, having listened to the statement made by the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic and bearing in mind the reports of the Secretary-General of 21 December [S/14805] and of 31 December 1981 [S/14821], expressed its deepest concern and indignation at Israel's defiance of Security Council resolution 497 (1981) and General Assembly resolution 36/226 B.

"The plenary meeting further condemned the action taken by Israel on 14 December 1981 to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration on the occupied Syrian Golan Heights as an unequivocal act of aggression under the provisions of Article 39 of the Charter of the United Nations as well as General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX) and, accordingly, expressed its firm conviction that the international community should immediately apply the necessary sanctions in conformity with Article 41 of the Charter.

"In this regard, the non-aligned countries called on the Security Council to take appropriate measures under Chapter VII of the Charter to oblige Israel to restore all Syrian occupied territories to the full sovereignty of the Syrian Arab Republic.

"The plenary meeting reaffirmed the solidarity of the movement of non-aligned countries with and support for the Government and people of the Syrian Arab Republic and called upon all members to participate actively in the forthcoming session of the Security Council which will examine the situation in the occupied Arab territories."

79. Those, then, are our considerations and our demands. We hope that the Council will be able to act jointly, in accordance with the dictates of justice and law and in keeping with the will of the majority of Members of the Organization and the mandate of the Charter.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.

NOTES

¹ Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 2.

² United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973, p. 287.