



President: Mr. Jorge E. ILLUECA (Panama).

#### AGENDA ITEM 34

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

1. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The General Assembly is considering the situation in the Middle East when the region is experiencing grave and difficult conditions as a result of the qualitative escalation of the aggression against the Arab people and the geographical widening of that aggression. Recent developments in the Middle East show that a solution to the crisis of the region and the restoration of the just peace that the international community seeks, a peace based on international legitimacy, have become more remote than ever. The dimensions of the grand conspiracy against our Arab nation have been revealed, and that conspiracy is now being carried out by force. There is no doubt that the international community, as represented in this Hall, agrees with us that these conditions, created by Israel and developed and exacerbated by the United States of America, constitute a serious threat to international peace and security. The United States policy of aggression is being systematically applied. That policy holds peoples in contempt and attaches no value to them; this aggravates the situation. The world today has become a jungle in which the law of force prevails. In this contaminated environment created by Israel and the United States of America, how can we achieve a solution based on international legitimacy as embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and in United Nations resolutions?

2. The policy of President Ronald Reagan—as manifested before, during and after his assumption of the presidency of the United States of America—is a well-established, clear and primitive policy, a policy with force as its basic principle and the use or threat of force as its systematic approach to all problems. We in the Middle East knew full well the nature of the Reagan Administration even before it came into office. President Reagan himself, in his statements and his writings, has revealed that he is determined not to place the immense capabilities of the United States of America in the service of international peace and co-operation for the solution of crises and problems, but to use force anywhere and in any circumstances where he believes that the interests of United States imperialism are in need of enhancement, promotion or expansion. The Reagan Administration's policies place it in continuous confrontation with peace-loving nations and countries, and especially with the interests of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, which are concerned with stability and demand respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. This obsession with the use of force is seen especially in the Middle East, the most sensitive region in the world and the one which poses the greatest threat to international peace and security.

3. The United States-Israeli alliance—intended to impose hegemony and to create a sphere of exclusive influence for the two partners, at the expense of Arab national interests—is nothing new. Since the end of the Second World War, the policy of the United States has always been characterized by aggressive actions and plans against the Arab nation. But a dangerous escalation has started with the Reagan Administration, which believes in force as a way of imposing its will. It even believes in force as an end in itself. While still a Presidential candidate, Reagan expressed his concerns about the Middle East in terms of which the meaning was clear to any political analyst: the use of all available means to seize the Middle East, to exercise hegemony over it, to expropriate its energy resources, and to hold full sway over the destiny and resources of the region. Before he even took office, President Reagan had elevated Israel from the status of puppet ally to that of equal ally. In August 1979, commenting on the fall of the Shah, Reagan wrote:

“Israel's strength derives from the reality that her affinity with the West is not dependent on the survival of an autocratic or capricious ruler. Israel has the democratic will, national cohesion, technological capacity and military fibre to stand forth as America's trusted ally.”\*

4. The Reagan Administration has continuously resorted to deception to divert the attention of the Arabs from the fact of the organic relationship between Washington and Tel Aviv. The suspension of the delivery of F-15 and F-16 aircraft and its subsequent resumption and the freeze and subsequent thaw in the strategic alliance were nothing but an attempt at calming Arab wrath at Israeli actions which went beyond anything ever faced by a United States Administration. But Arab analysts understood this tactic of the United States and were never tricked into believing that the United States could really be serious in its claims of breaking its ties with Israel, for those ties have their original basis in a denial of Arab rights and in the determination to force the Arabs to accept a status of dependence upon Israel and the United States.

5. The invasion of Lebanon revealed the true face of the Reagan Administration. Not only did Israel invade Lebanon in pursuit of its aggressive interests; it did so with the foreknowledge and encouragement of the United States in order to create new conditions—conditions of aggression—that would make it possible for Israel to annex the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights in addition to southern Lebanon, thus making part of Israel's historical dreams come true.

6. In addition, the aim was to make Lebanon dependent on Israel, to isolate Lebanon completely from the Arab homeland and to force it to pay the price of a war waged not by Lebanon but by Israel, on tendentious and fabricated pretexts. On the other hand, this brutal war served the interests of the United States. The United States presence in Lebanon is part of its scheme to establish new bases for its rapid deployment force and to support

\*Quoted in English by the speaker.

Israel's occupation of Palestine, Lebanon and the Golan Heights and the expansion of that occupation.

7. Since the present United States Administration took office, it has been specifically hostile to the Arab people, and that hostility has reached an unprecedented level. It is reflected particularly in the encouragement given Israel to persist in its colonization of the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories and not to recognize the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, without foreign interference, and to independence. Moreover, this Administration has violated its commitment under the Charter with regard to the implementation of Security Council resolution 509 (1982), in which the Council demanded that Israel withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon. The United States even dispatched Marines under the label of "peace-keeping". The real intention of sending these Marines was the contrary—that is, to share the "responsibility" with Israel in blackmailing Lebanon and to serve its interests and those of Israel in Lebanon and in the Middle East as a whole. The Marines have participated in the internal fighting, thus becoming a party to the civil war. They have shelled Lebanese cities and villages, killing innocent persons and wreaking havoc. Moreover, the United States Administration attempted to impose on Lebanon an agreement signed on 17 May under Israeli occupation. This agreement was actually the main reason for the resumption of the civil war. The United States Administration has massed off the coast of Lebanon the largest armada seen since the Second World War. It is taking an active part in attempts to suppress the struggle of the Lebanese people for its freedom, independence and territorial integrity.

8. The United States Administration has placed military and political conditions, rejected by Lebanon and the other Arab States, on Israel's withdrawal, which, under the terms of Security Council resolution 509 (1982), was to be unconditional. It has resorted to deception in its attempts to convince world public opinion that the struggle is between what it alleges to be a foreign threat and the so-called free world. But everyone knows that the struggle is between the Arab nation, defending its entity, its identity, its territorial integrity and its independence, and racist and expansionist Israel. Was the occupation of Palestine, then of the other Arab territories and then of southern Lebanon carried out to save the region from "danger", or were they occupied to achieve Israeli territorial designs and assimilate the remaining parts of Palestine?

9. In war-torn Lebanon, as soon as the heroic Lebanese people had reached a cease-fire agreement, as soon as the first round of Lebanese national reconciliation talks had started at Geneva, as soon as it was realized that national reconciliation was going forward, Israel—in co-operation with the United States—began committing acts of provocation and aggression against the people of Lebanon, acts that were more brutal than ever before. The design was to renew the conflagration, on the calculation that thereby the 17 May agreement could be pushed through—this agreement that breaches Lebanon's sovereignty, threatens the security of the Syrian Arab Republic and other Arab countries and would lead to the subjection of the entire region to United States-Israeli hegemony.

10. The abrogation of this agreement, which had been imposed by force under occupation, aroused the hatred of the United States and the wrath of Israel, because it deprived Israel of the fruits of the mad war that it had launched against Lebanon in June 1982 in order to exercise hegemony over that country and then to strike at

the Syrian Arab Republic. Thus, the aims of these so-called democratic countries, the United States and Israel, met in an unprecedented way.

11. The National Security Council of the United States, in its Decision No. 111 of 29 October 1983, defined the United States priorities in the Middle East. Its most important elements concern the new strategic co-operation between Washington and Tel Aviv. Two days later, Under-Secretary of State Eagleburger hastened to occupied Jerusalem to announce total acceptance of or to offer complete acquiescence in Israel's military, economic and financial demands. We read the following in an article by Bernard Gwertzman, in *The New York Times Magazine* of 27 November 1983, in which he quotes Eagleburger:

"The President and everyone in the Administration wants to sit down with you"—meaning Israel—"and really talk about strategic co-operation in the future—in Lebanon, in the Middle East generally, and everywhere. We want to act on it in the context of Presidential desires and decisions. We like Israel and want to establish the closest relationship. You and we have a long-standing special relationship. This is the time for defining it."\*

At that time, Reagan's Secretary of State, Mr. Shultz, was occupied in studying a working paper submitted by his assistant, Peter Rodman, calling upon the United States to utilize Israel fully in the Middle East equation. John M. Goshko commented in *The Washington Post* on 22 November 1983 on the strategic co-operation accord expected with Israel:

"Agreement would cement Israel's confidence in the United States support on which its security ultimately depends, while it would help the United States extricate itself from Lebanon and go on to pursue other American interests in the region."\*

Those quotations speak for themselves.

12. The worst thing is that the United States pursues an imperialist foreign policy which also reflects the internal contradictions in the United States of America. This has resulted in the blurring of the demarcation line between internal policy—and naturally by that I mean the war raging between different lobbies and interests—and the foreign policy of the United States. In view of the enormous influence of the Zionist lobby, American foreign policy is based on the achievement of the interests of that lobby. If we take into account the policy of violence stemming from the American imperialist instinct for violence translated most appropriately by the Reagan Administration to the international arena, and if we take into account the obsession with obtaining the votes of the influential lobbies, headed by the Zionist lobby, we find that what has happened in the Middle East region results from the fact that the Zionist lobby has hijacked power in Washington. Hence, the United States of America cannot commit itself to international law and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, since these interests, which are at times conflicting and at times in agreement, are unable to acknowledge the interest of the international community in a just peace.

13. Bernard Gwertzman said, in the article which I have mentioned, something that affirms that internal requirements, foremost among which are selfish electoral interests, govern America and its foreign policy, and not its international commitments under the Charter and under international law. He wrote:

\*Quoted in English by the speaker.

“Any improvement in relations with Israel will be welcomed by the President’s political advisers. Mr. Reagan, in his 1980 Presidential campaign, won many Jewish voters away from President Carter by his uncritical acceptance of Israel’s actions. In office, however, he has disappointed many of Israel’s supporters in this country. Implementation of Decision 111 would strengthen a Reagan re-election bid, particularly if the Democrats nominate Walter F. Mondale, who is in high standing with the pro-Israel camp.”\*

That is why we say that the Zionists have hijacked the American administration.

14. As for the American Congress, it is even more vulnerable to the pressures of the Zionist and other lobbies. Here we wonder about the nature of American “democracy” and its reality, and we wonder how it is that the Congress—in the House of Representatives and in the Senate—imposes taxes on the American taxpayer in the interest of Israeli aggression against the Arab nations.

15. The Washington report on Middle East affairs of 28 November 1983 published an analysis of the rivalry between the Congress and the White House to satisfy Israel and Israel’s greed for money, especially concerning the 1984 budget. It said:

“For example, the money approved for Israel will be provided on terms even more generous than in preceding years. In military aid, Israel will receive \$1.7 billion split equally between an \$850 million forgiven loan . . . and \$850 million in the form of a low-interest, repayable loan. Last year it got the same total allocation, but with only \$750 million in the form of a grant and \$950 million in loans which have to be repaid. In economic assistance, Israel will now be getting \$910 million entirely as grant, compared with \$875 million last year (1983).”\*

16. The United States Congress departed from laws and the established traditions of foreign aid when it allowed Israel to use the funds allocated for foreign military assistance to develop Israel’s war machine through scientific research in the United States itself, thus granting an opportunity to Israel to compete with American economic interests in their own backyard. Here I quote from the same source:

“Also approved as part of the amendment was an unprecedented provision allowing Israel to spend up to \$550 million of its United States military assistance to produce ‘its own fighter plane, called the Lavi.’”\*

17. In a nutshell, it is an open secret that Israel alone receives 23 per cent of the total American foreign assistance received by all the countries of the world. Israel receives \$2.61 billion out of \$11.4 billion, the total amount of what is called the foreign aid of the United States. This enables Israel to enhance its economic and military capabilities and promote its aggressive policies against the Middle East.

18. We consider the strategic co-operation agreements, which are based on the identity of American and Israeli strategic and political aims as regards the Middle East and the co-ordination of those aims and policies, to be agreements on institutionalized aggression designed not only to consolidate Israel’s occupation of Palestine, the Golan Heights and southern Lebanon but also to widen the scope of United States-Israeli hegemony by means of practical operations. Through these agreements, described by an American analyst as “the unholy alliance”, the United States, in co-operation and co-ordination with Israel, can commit acts of aggression against all the

countries of the Middle East and against countries outside the Middle East. If we study this strategic alliance in the light of geopolitical data we see that the African continent is also threatened, especially since the United States is linked to the Pretoria régime by an alliance called “constructive engagement”. Hence the importance of issuing a warning about the threat represented by the South African-Israeli-American alliance against Africa and the Middle East.

19. The strategic co-operation agreements not only cover political planning within the concept of unity of aims, but are translated into the incorporation of American and Israeli capabilities in the manufacture and stockpiling of American weapons of all kinds in Israel and in the occupied Arab territories. On 29 November 1983, after an interview with the assassin of Count Bernadotte, the Prime Minister of Israel, Shamir, and his Minister of Defence, who is of American origin, President Reagan said that he was pleased to announce that it had been agreed to establish a joint political-military group to examine ways in which Israeli-American co-operation could be enhanced.

20. It has become widely known that the strategic co-operation includes American military and economic concessions which are not merely concessions but grants, and which include suspension of the embargo on the supply of cluster bombs to Israel. It is also widely known that the most important economic reward to Israel is represented by the expressed readiness of the United States to negotiate an additional agreement to abolish customs duties on trade between the two parties. Naturally, Israel expects that such an agreement will help it increase its exports of weapons to various regions of the world, especially those regions described by the Israeli Minister of Commerce as “politically sensitive”, where Israel acts as a broker for the United States.

21. The negotiations between Washington and Tel Aviv also covered the amount of American assistance to Israel, not only in 1984 but also in 1985. The American Administration declared its readiness to give Israel a grant of \$1.275 billion as military assistance, as well as economic assistance in the form of grants totalling \$910 million. In addition, Israel is to be allowed to spend 15 per cent of the funds allocated for military assistance in Israel itself, which, as indicated in *The New York Times* of 30 November 1983, is an exception under American law, which generally requires that such funds be spent in the United States itself. Israel is also to be allowed to use \$550 million of the military grant to manufacture the Israeli jet fighter, the Lavi. I am quoting these figures only to prove that Israel has no capabilities of its own, but is part of the system of the United States Administration. It could not commit aggression against us without this support, without this assistance provided to Israel by the American taxpayer.

22. In brief, co-operation between Israel and the United States has made Israel the fifty-first state, and the favoured state, since several American states are not granted such preferential treatment. The people of the United States of America has been enlisted in the service of aims which inflict the gravest damage on Arab-American relations. We wonder how the United States can reconcile its alliance with the prime enemy of the Arabs, Israel, and co-operation with the Arabs, especially since the United States has opted to be a full ally and partner of Israel in its aggression in occupied Palestine, in the Golan Heights and in southern Lebanon.

23. As soon as the agreements between Israel and America on the co-ordination of acts of aggression and hegemony against the Arab nation were announced at the end

\*Quoted in English by the speaker.

of last month American warplanes launched raids against the Syrian forces in the Arab territory of Lebanon. The American act of aggression came in the wake of an Israeli raid against Lebanese cities and villages. This was the first result of the strategic co-operation and the military alliance between America and Israel. The American action against us complements Israel's aggression, and Israel's aggression complements that of America, and so it goes on. By its reckless action, the United States has put itself in confrontation with all the Arab people. Suffice it to recall the condemnation voiced in all Arab capitals, and in other capitals, of the American aggression against Lebanon. American treachery against the Syrian forces which are in Lebanon to protect part of the Arab homeland against the expansionist Zionist enemy represents full participation in Israel's achievement of its dream of dismembering Lebanon, bringing the Syrian Arab Republic to its knees and undermining the Arab ability to stand up to American-Zionist designs against us and against the entire region.

24. On Sunday, 4 December 1983, according to American sources, 28 American warplanes, under direct orders from the United States President, launched a raid against our forces using cluster bombs and bombs of more than 1,000 lbs. However, the response was unexpected by the American Administration, which we hope has learnt a useful lesson therefrom. We will not leave our forces vulnerable to any United States operations, regardless of their nature or objective. Arab airspace is not the property of the United States, of Israel or of any other State, and let this be crystal clear.

25. We are not warmongers. We are defending ourselves and our nation, repelling aggression in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions. We are committed to the achievement of the objectives and aims of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. We support the peace efforts to achieve Israel's unconditional withdrawal from all the territories which it has been occupying since 1967, the exercise by the Palestinian people of its right to self-determination and the establishment of its own independent State without foreign intervention and its return to its homeland, Israel's immediate withdrawal from southern Lebanon in implementation of Security Council resolution 509 (1982) and the withdrawal of the multinational forces from Lebanon. Otherwise, we will defend ourselves in accordance with our natural right to self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter.

26. The situation in the region requires the full attention of the General Assembly, since it is a situation which presages expansion and the possibility of developments which would threaten peace and security not only in that sensitive region but throughout the world. Perhaps the most dangerous developments are the following.

27. First, the United States military build-up in Lebanon, the involvement of United States forces in Lebanese internal problems and the participation of these forces in military operations against certain parties.

28. Secondly, the escalation of United States military activities from involvement in the internal fighting to the launching of aggression against Syrian forces in Lebanon. The United States forces came to Lebanon on the pretext of keeping peace in that country, but soon those forces were transformed into forces threatening the peace and security of the region, and what we fear is that the region is on the verge of becoming a new Viet Nam.

29. Thirdly, the strategic agreement arrived at between United States President Reagan and Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir during the latter's visit to Washington. Under this agreement, the interests of the United

States, a super-Power, are linked to those of Israel, which places the immense capabilities of the United States in the service of Israel's expansionist and aggressive designs.

30. Fourthly, the pressure exercised by the United States and Israeli Governments to hold up the process of national reconciliation and to prompt certain Lebanese parties to aggravate the situation in Lebanon and to eliminate the prospects of reconciliation among the Lebanese parties, so that Lebanon and the entire area would remain volatile and a hotbed of tension.

31. We are confident that the members of the General Assembly appreciate, as we do, the gravity of this persistent aggressive approach and the threat directed by the United States against a Member State of the United Nations which is only interested in maintaining its independence, defending its territory and protecting its national interests against any aggression.

32. We are also confident that the members of the General Assembly, realizing the threat in this situation, will take the necessary action to put an end to this policy of aggression and support us Arabs in defending our rights, our sovereignty and our national dignity. We are confident that the General Assembly will condemn this strategic alliance and call firmly for its abrogation.

33. The Syrian Arab Republic still has confidence in the ability of the international community to achieve peace based on justice, which requires essentially the following: first, as I mentioned before, Israel's withdrawal from all Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967; secondly, enabling the Palestinian people to exercise its national inalienable rights; thirdly, the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli forces from southern Lebanon in conformity with Security Council resolution 509 (1982); fourthly, the withdrawal of all the multinational forces from the region.

34. To achieve these aims and to enable the Security Council to carry out its essential responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and to deter aggression, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, we call upon all States to adopt, jointly and severally, all the measures necessary to isolate Israel, to force it to bow to the will of the international community.

35. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): This is the seventeenth time the General Assembly has considered at a regular session the question of the situation in the Middle East. Over the years, it has adopted dozens of resolutions and decisions. All of them were designed to put an end to the protracted Middle East conflict and to eliminate the hotbed of war which has long smouldered there. However, that conflict has not died down, and its settlement is nowhere in sight. Moreover, with each passing year the knot of Middle East problems is drawn ever tighter and the obstacles to settlement become more imposing. This year is no exception in that regard. As is quite correctly pointed out in the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in the region: "The developments in the Middle East during the past year have given little cause for hope that the problems of that region are nearer to solution." [See A/38/458, para. 39.]

36. The reasons for this situation are perfectly obvious. They are, as it were, visible to the naked eye. The malignant tumour of Israeli expansionism, which for many years has eaten away at the Middle East, has once again brought the region to the brink of an extremely dangerous military confrontation, with unforeseeable consequences for international peace and security. The frontiers of Israeli expansion are advancing ever deeper into Arab

lands. The number of victims of Tel Aviv's piratical policy now includes Lebanon, the southern part of which has long been a target of Zionist territorial ambitions, and the Palestinian people continue to languish under the yoke of harsh oppression. On its ancestral land, before the eyes of the whole world, massive colonization is being carried out on an unprecedented scale. Systematic military blackmail and pressure have also been directed at the Syrian Arab Republic, against which, day after day, gross military provocations are being perpetrated.

37. In one substantial aspect, the situation which has now come about in the Middle East is radically different from the past. The difference is this: today, behind the Israeli aggressor, its senior "strategic" partner and protector has now stood up to its full stature. I refer, of course, to the United States. Washington's reckless policy, designed to guarantee the United States a dominant position in the world from which it can dictate its will to other countries and peoples, has led to a serious deterioration of the international situation.

38. The Middle East, which is particularly subject to the effects of shifts in the international political climate, has become the setting for truly feverish military and political activity on the part of the United States. United States imperialism is trying here to solve problems which are not merely regional. Its actions in this region obey the far-reaching global requirements of Washington's hegemonistic policy, which is aimed not only at the socialist States but also at countries which have freed themselves from colonial dependency.

39. It is fitting to recall here some calculations made by two faculty members of Harvard University, Barry Posen and Stephen Van Evera. According to their figures, even before the current United States Administration came to power, 25 per cent of the entire United States military budget was devoted to the preparation of interventionist operations against countries of the third world. I repeat—one quarter of the entire United States military budget consists of expenditures for the preparation and launching of interventions against the newly emancipated countries. This is why the rapid growth of military appropriations for the Pentagon in the recent past constitutes a direct military threat to the countries of the "third world", including the Arab States.

40. For the Middle East, this imperialistic policy of the United States is taking the form of violation of the genuine and vital interests of the peoples of that region, in order to serve the militaristic ambitions of the Pentagon and to serve the selfish interests of United States monopolies which are striving to restore their control over the natural wealth of the Arabs, first and foremost their control over Arab oil. The purposes of United States Middle East policy are matched by the methods used: reliance on strong-arm tactics, blackmail, unceremonious interference in the internal affairs of the Arab States, and encouragement, by all possible means, of the aggressive acts and leanings of Israel.

41. The principle lever of the United States to promote its neo-colonialist plans in the Middle East is its "strategic alliance" with Israel. At the base of this truly unholy partnership lies Washington's willingness to make available unlimited political, military, financial and any other kind of assistance to Israel. United States assistance to Tel Aviv in the years which have elapsed since the current United States Administration came to power has grown in material terms by 60 per cent. I repeat—60 per cent. The reason for this generosity is simple: Israel is helping Washington to establish its rule over the Middle East.

42. The Israeli aggression last year in Lebanon openly showed the whole world that Washington and Tel Aviv

are acting in tandem. Although, at the time of the piratical acts of Israel, the United States had put forward the widely publicized Reagan plan,<sup>1</sup> thereby donning the false mask of peace-maker, in actual fact it did not intend at all to put its so-called peace initiative into effect. It was simply trying to use it as a smoke-screen in order to supplant a just Middle East settlement with the thoroughly flawed tactics of separate deals, in order to block completely the solution of the crucial question of any settlement, that of the establishment of a Palestinian State. It is not surprising that Washington was not helped by either threats or false promises to the Arabs, and its widely touted plan, as was to be expected, led nowhere. Today, the clearly militaristic and anti-Arab essence of United States Middle East policy is nowhere as manifest as in Lebanon. Having assumed, uninvited, the role of a "peace-keeping mission", Washington has been trying to use the Israeli occupation of the south of that country, and the introduction of its own occupation forces into the area, to expand and consolidate the imperialistic military presence in the region. Having imposed, together with Israel, an enslaving and anti-Arab agreement on Lebanon, the United States subsequently shifted its approach to outright attempts to suppress the national patriotic forces in Lebanon, thereby seeking to undermine the process of national reconciliation which had begun there, designed to secure the genuine independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the country. This was done because the United States well realizes that genuine independence for Lebanon would mean the withdrawal from that country of Israeli and North Atlantic Treaty Organization armed forces.

43. The actions of Israel and the United States have created a tragedy for the Lebanese people. Lebanon has been dismembered. Its very existence as an independent sovereign Arab State has been called into question. With each passing day, there is an increase in crude pressure on the Syrian Arab Republic, which is situated at the very boundary of opposition to United States-Israeli intrigues in the Middle East. There is a steady stream of threats against the Syrian Arab Republic from Washington and Tel Aviv—threats which in the recent past have been stepped up to large-scale aggressive outbursts.

44. The recent mass United States air raids on positions of the Lebanese patriotic forces and Syrian troops belonging to the inter-Arab containment force constituted a new rung in the ladder of direct military interference by the United States in the Middle East. This action is clearly designed to exacerbate further the situation in Lebanon and the surrounding area and to provide a pretext for expanding United States aggression against the Syrian Arab Republic.

45. The increasing involvement of United States troops in military actions against the Arabs in the Middle East means that Washington has become a direct accomplice in Zionist aggression. It is impossible not to see the direct link between these events and the far-reaching anti-Arab strategic conspiracy which was reaffirmed during the recent visit to Washington of the Israeli Prime Minister, Mr. Shamir. Those who still had any illusions about United States claims to be acting as an honest broker in the Middle East were able to see for themselves the lengths to which Washington is prepared to go to accommodate the aggressive, expansionist ambitions of its Israeli protégé.

46. The fruits of this sinister United States-Israeli alliance are clearly apparent not only in the Middle East but also within the United Nations. In the less than three years that it has been in power, the present United States Administration has seven times used its veto to block the

adoption by the Security Council of resolutions aimed at even the slightest curbing of the Israeli aggressor. The United States has openly disavowed its vote in support of Security Council resolution 509 (1982), which called for the unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon, and has declared, out of hand, that it is outdated. United States representatives have stated publicly that henceforth, in the eyes of the United States Administration, Israeli settlements on Arab lands are not unlawful.

47. The events of this year have thus convincingly shown that the core of American policy in the Middle East is a 100 per cent pro-Israeli and 100 per cent anti-Arab course. The mounting rebuttal by the Arabs of United States and Israeli aggression is, therefore, the outcome of the American policy of force. In this struggle, the Arab peoples have relied and can continue in the future to rely firmly on the support and assistance of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has never been, and will never be, a passive observer of events in the Middle East, a region in immediate proximity to our southern boundaries, a region in which the United States and Israel are trying to perpetuate a flagrant injustice against the Arabs.

48. The policy of the Soviet Union in respect of the Middle East is based on the need to put an end to the imperialist arrogance and aggression of Israel and to secure the establishment in that region of a just and lasting peace. Such a peace must be based on the return to the Arabs of all their lands which have been occupied by Israel since 1967; on the complete restoration of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including its right to self-determination and to establish its own independent State; and on the guarantee of a secure and independent existence for all the Middle East countries.

49. The Soviet Union has on many occasions taken constructive initiatives aimed at a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict. The Soviet position was set forth in more detail in our proposals on the Middle East dated 15 September 1982,<sup>2</sup> which have been confirmed once again by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Mr. Y. V. Andropov. The Soviet proposal for the convening of an international conference on the Middle East with the participation of all parties concerned, including, of course, the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO], the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, remains in force. We are firmly convinced that such a conference, given good will, would be the most realistic way of finding an integrated solution of the Middle East problems and a just and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict. It is extremely satisfying that the appeal for the convening of such a meeting met with unanimous support at the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983.<sup>3</sup>

50. In the present circumstances, in which Israeli aggression in the Middle East has now been supplemented by United States aggression there, the situation in the region has become particularly complex and explosive. The United States can, of course, as it has been doing, use the big guns of its warships and warplanes against the Arabs. But nothing will alter the fact that this is a dangerous policy, a criminal policy, and a course of action which is doomed to failure. The total failure of American aggression against Viet Nam will inevitably and implacably be followed by the total failure of United States aggression against the Arabs.

51. Mr. LESSIR (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): When the General Assembly began its consideration of the item entitled "The situation in the Middle East" at

the thirty-seventh session, my delegation, like many others, felt that a new dynamism had been given to developments in that part of the world. Despite the tragic events of the war in Lebanon and Israel's persistence in its policy of aggression and defiance, there was room for hope, not because the latest war had solved the problem of the Middle East but because new horizons had been created by the presentation of several peace initiatives.

52. My country attached great importance to the proposals put forward, aware of the need for the international community finally to embark on a peace process which could lead to a comprehensive, just and lasting solution of the problem. It thought, with good reason, that a historic turning point had been reached by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference when it adopted, on 9 September 1982 at Fez, the Arab plan for peace in the Middle East,<sup>4</sup> a plan which, based on international law and in particular on General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947, resulted from a realistic appreciation of the situation in the Middle East and took account of peace initiatives made public during the same period. Moreover, the plan had the merit of presenting specific and detailed means of implementation.

*Mr. Pelletier (Canada), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

53. Today, more than a year later, we note with bitterness that neither the Arab peace plan nor the Reagan plan<sup>1</sup>—still less the Soviet plan<sup>2</sup> and the Franco-Egyptian draft resolution<sup>5</sup>—is any longer part of the foreground. This regrettable situation is due to Israel, which has simply rejected all these peace initiatives and given the world yet again irrefutable proof of its defiance and its denial of all justice.

54. We are now all familiar with the tactics adopted by Israel, which it must be admitted have worked for all these years: a *fait accompli* against its neighbours, condemnation in the Security Council or the General Assembly, another *fait accompli* built on the first, and so on. The cycle of violence against the Palestinian people and the neighbouring Arab countries embarked on by Israel since its creation is based on an entrenched policy of militarist expansion, designed to impose the Israeli point of view by brute force, regardless of the rights of others and against the principles of international law.

55. It is a fact that for Israel condemnation by the international community of its wrongdoings is no longer of any great importance; in fact, it never was, since Israel's very creation was an act of injustice against the Palestinian people, which is today reduced to the state of wanderers. After all, yet another territorial conquest is well worth a condemnation. As long as Israel keeps the territories concerned, being condemned by the United Nations does not count for much, despite the protests of those who wish to show us how irritated, or even shocked, they are by the views of those to whom some refer as the "vocal majority". Even worse, even the condemnation of the aggressor no longer seems to be tolerated by some, and this is a regrettable development for world peace and security.

56. The situation in the Middle East today is more threatening than ever. The polarization of the conflict, the consequences of which must be feared, has contributed to the steady deterioration of the situation. While thus far the conflict has been between the parties we all know, with material assistance from Powers from outside the region, we must now recognize that the situation is undergoing new and very serious developments which are full of pretext. The massive foreign presence in the region and off the Lebanese coast is increasing so great a tension that a major conflict in the Middle East is not impossible.

57. It is to be feared that this atmosphere of war psychosis, added to by an increasingly complex situation on the ground, will further harden the respective positions and lead to a point of no return from which the region could find itself forced into another war, with unforeseeable consequences. In the first place, that policy leads in the present case to further exacerbation of the feelings of frustration of one party whose territory is occupied, and encourages the other in its policy of defiance and violation of the rules and principles of international law. The lifebelt thrown to those who practise aggression represented by strategic agreements with Israel amounts to giving it a free hand to continue its policy of aggression against the Palestinian people and the neighbouring Arab countries.

58. Whatever the strategic considerations of the parties involved, in our view they do not justify the new developments, the intended result of which is nothing but the burial of the Palestinian cause and the creation of a new running sore in Lebanon to divert attention from the true problem which underlies the conflict in the Middle East. The latest developments to which I refer are a direct threat to our Arab brothers in the region, including the Syrian Arab Republic, Lebanon and the Palestinian people. Perhaps we should also remember here the extraordinary sufferings of the Lebanese people, who have more right than any other people to independence and sovereignty. Their sufferings are equalled only by those of our Palestinian brothers.

59. We had hoped that after so much suffering endured by the people of the region, and particularly after the bloody events in Lebanon, which Israel planned meticulously in order to give the *coup de grâce* to Palestinian resistance, the time had finally come to restore to the Palestinians their rights and to do them justice.

60. Unfortunately, that has not happened. The cycle of violence has started afresh. We note that in the Middle East State terrorism has been made into a system of government. Whether in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip or the Golan, Israel's aim is the same: to use all the means necessary to strip the Arab owners of their land and provide for the needs of the new Israeli settlers, thus making it possible gradually to swamp the Palestinian and Arab populations in order to facilitate the annexation of their land.

61. After Al-Quds and the Golan, Israel is now preparing to annex the West Bank, where the number of settlements exceeds 130 and the number of settlers will soon reach 100,000.

62. In an article which appeared in *The New York Times* on 1 November 1982, Anthony Lewis wrote:

“The Begin Government aims to have 100,000 settlers in the West Bank as soon as possible. That figure would be, it says, a ‘critical mass’ . . . a number [so large] that no Israeli Government thereafter could agree to withdraw from the territory.”

63. Last summer in the Security Council, the Israeli representative, availing himself of Talmudic arguments, said the following:

“We do not regard ourselves as strangers in any part of the Land of Israel, as foreigners in Judea or Samaria or in any other part of the Land of Israel . . . We cannot accept that Jews should be prohibited from settling and living in areas which are the very heart of our homeland.”<sup>6</sup>

64. Menachem Begin once told the British Broadcasting Corporation that he hoped history would remember him as the man who established forever the borders of Eretz Yisrael.

65. Along with the attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor, the annexation of Al-Quds and the Golan, the doubling in three years of the number of settlements in the occupied territories, the invasion of Lebanon and so forth, do not those statements—which the Israelis are translating into deeds—constitute aggressive milestones or intentions which form part of an integral, deliberate and systematic policy? We believe that Israel's objective is to Judaize the occupied Arab territories before annexing them, and to stifle the just cause of the Palestinian people, whose status has been reduced to that of wanderers.

66. The pretexts of security and of the Arab threat and other quibbles are today nothing more than a myth nurtured by the Israeli propagandist machine. It is the Palestinians who have been hounded for more than 35 years. It is the neighbouring Arab countries which are faced with the dangerous policy of encroachment pursued by the Israeli leaders. In fact it is they who need security, not Israel, which, we are told, is the fourth-ranking military Power in the world.

67. Why, then, is Israel obstinate and why does it refuse to respect the norms of international law? Apart from Israel's argument of security, it has been shown that the destabilization—or rather the disintegration—of neighbouring Arab States is another form of Israeli expansionism.

68. In his diary for 21 May 1948, Ben-Gurion wrote:

“The Achilles heel of the Arab coalition is Lebanon. Muslim supremacy in that country is artificial and can easily be overthrown. A Christian State should be established in that country. Its southernmost border would be the Litani River. We shall sign an alliance with that State. Then, when we have broken the strength of the Arab Legion and bombed Amman, we shall get rid of Transjordan, after which Syria will fall. And if Egypt still dares to wage war on us, we shall bomb Port Said, Alexandria and Cairo . . . We should thus put an end to the war, having avenged our ancestors against Egypt, Assyria and Chaldea.”

69. I would also note that Moshe Sharett, in his diary for 16 June 1955, says the following about a plan of Moshe Dayan's for Lebanon: “the Israel army will enter Lebanon, occupy the necessary territory and create a Christian régime which will be Israel's ally. The territory south of the Litani will be totally annexed by Israel.”

70. The amazing timeliness of some of those references should give the international community food for thought. Further comment on them would be superfluous. Worse still, the plan to split up neighbouring Arab States is spelt out in an article in *Kivunim* magazine, published by the World Zionist Organization, from which I should like to quote a few extracts:

“The reconquest of Sinai with its present resources is a priority objective of which the Camp David accords and the peace agreements have thus far stood in the way . . . Deprived of oil and the income from it and condemned to enormous expenditures in that sector, there is no question that we must act to return to the situation which prevailed in Sinai before Sadat's visit and the unfortunate agreement signed with him in 1979.

“The division of Egypt into separate geographical provinces must be our political objective for the 1990s on the western front. Once Egypt is thus dismantled and deprived of central power, countries such as Libya, the Sudan and other more distant countries will undergo the same dismemberment.”

With regard to the Syrian Arab Republic and Iraq, the strategy has it that:

“Rich in oil and prey to internal struggles, Iraq is in Israel’s sights. Its dismemberment would be more important for us than that of Syria, for in the short term it represents the gravest threat to Israel. A Syria-Iraq war would promote its collapse from within before it could find itself in the position to embark on any major conflict against us. Any form of inter-Arab confrontation would be useful to us and would hasten its outbreak . . . The present war against Iran may well precipitate this phenomenon of polarization.”

71. The World Zionist Organization has other plans for other Arab countries, including those of the Arabian peninsula. Obviously, Jordan is among that organization’s present strategic objectives. As to the Palestinians, they must understand that they can have a homeland only outside the area which the Israeli leaders call Eretz Yisrael.

72. Those are a few of the things that are being concocted against the Palestinians and against neighbouring—and even distant—Arab countries. I shall say only that those who have thus far had hope for the situation in the Middle East must now accept the facts and understand the true nature of Israel and its designs—demographic, strategic and economic regional designs which are diabolical to say the least.

73. Rarely has so serious a question, one which jeopardizes the future of an entire people—the Palestinian people—and of several neighbouring Arab countries, met with so much inertia and paralysis, despite the number of debates it has given rise to in the Security Council, the General Assembly and other international bodies.

74. The question of Palestine, which is at the core of the problem of the Middle East and onto which the other aspects of the conflict have been grafted, must have a just, lasting and comprehensive solution as soon as possible. Otherwise, instability and war will always be the lot of the region.

75. By defusing this bomb, the world will have restored justice to the Palestinian people and laid the foundations for lasting peace in the region. Tunisia is convinced that this is the only way to ensure stability in the Middle East. The only way to guarantee peace in the region is through the participation of the PLO in any process aimed at the settlement of the Middle East problem, through the withdrawal of Israel from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967, and through the establishment of an independent Palestinian State. The bases for a long-awaited solution are to be found in the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, the Arab peace plan,<sup>4</sup> adopted on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez, and the Geneva Declaration on Palestine<sup>3</sup> and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights,<sup>3</sup> adopted at the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September this year.

76. We agree that this places a very great responsibility on the United Nations system, but the stakes, too, are very great: the survival of this system and of international peace and security.

77. I should like to conclude my statement by quoting a passage from the statement made by Ms. Felicia Langer to the International Conference on the Question of Palestine. Referring to the rebellion of the Palestinian and Arab peoples in the occupied territories, Ms. Langer said:

“ . . . the oppressors themselves are responsible for this rebellion and its tragic results, because of their stubborn denial of any rights to the Palestinian people, a people whose third generation is growing up in refugee camps, a people who will not surrender. Day by day

more and more Israelis recognize this fact, condemning the occupation, regarding it as a disaster to our people and its future and to our country, sometimes even more than to the victims of the conquest, refusing to serve in the army in Lebanon and in the occupied territories. They realize that we are paying for it with corruption, galloping inflation, with an arms race, growing dependence on the United States and the image of being the ‘Sparta’ of modern times—a country in which fathers are burying their sons.”\*

We can only salute these women and men who have discovered that the role of a “Sparta” that Israel is now playing can only lead in the end to catastrophe.

78. Mr. ABULHASSAN (Kuwait) (*interpretation from Arabic*): If there is one region in the world which has been through hell and has had the lion’s share of intractable problems, if there is one region in the world whose problems have been escalating year after year throughout most of this century, that region is without any doubt the Middle East.

79. If there is one region in the world that aspires more than any other to the secure, stable life that it has lost over the past years, that region is the Middle East.

80. The reason why the problems and therefore the fate of the Middle East seem unique is that its strategic-geographic position has made it the target of the ambitions of the major Powers. Those Powers have attempted—and some of them are still attempting—to turn that region into a sphere of influence dependent on them, at the expense of the region’s peace, security and stability and the safety and well-being of its peoples.

81. A great tragedy has befallen that region—a tragedy unprecedented in any other period of history or in any other region of the world. That is the tragedy of the Palestinian people, which has paid and continues to pay a high price in land, in the lives of its children, even in its right to a dignified life, because of the ambitions of the major Powers, which participated in the imposition of a racist Jewish State on the land of that people’s fathers and forefathers. Because of the tragedy of the creation of this alien State in its midst, the Middle East has also paid a high price in security and stability. This alien State was imposed on it through a bending of international morality and of international law, and even of the international conscience.

82. Since the creation of Israel, the Middle East has been experiencing a never-ending series of bloody wars. There has been an unbroken chain of violent events. Generations of inhabitants of the region have lost the taste of security, stability and peace of mind.

83. We have not the slightest doubt that what the Middle East is suffering—wars, revolutions, upheavals—is the result, even though the link might not be apparent, of a general state of frustration in the region caused by this unnatural event: the establishment of an alien State, inhabited by aliens, on Arab territory. It is the result also of the insistence of some major Powers not only on supporting this extraneous presence but also and above all on changing this presence into a military arsenal to be used as a tool for imposing this alien State and its backers on our region. This feeling of frustration to which I have referred is the inevitable result of the refusal of the Arab world to accept the distorted values which the aggressor, Israel, uses against the victim, the Palestinian people. That is the basis of the tragedy in the Middle East. My delegation believes that so long as these distorted values persist, there can be no hope whatever of restoring peace and security to our region.

\*Quoted in English by the speaker.



84. The unbroken chain of bloody events in the Middle East has only confirmed the warnings issued by the Arabs to the world from the very creation of the Jewish national homeland on the territory of Arab Palestine, against the wishes of the Palestinian people. The Arabs warned that this would lead the Arab region to the gates of hell, because the Palestinian people would not stand by with folded arms when confronted by attempts to deprive them of their lands and their homeland, piece by piece.

85. Recent developments in regard to the suspicious relationship between this alien State and one of the super-Powers also confirms what the Arabs have been saying from the very beginning—namely, that the main aim of the creation of a national homeland for Jews in Palestine was not to unite a dispersed people, as was always claimed, but, rather, to drive a military spike into the heart of the Arab region and, by sowing chaos and confusion, to fragment the region and facilitate its becoming a sphere of influence for some major Powers.

86. The events in the Arab region since the creation of Israel—events which have been escalating year after year because of Israel's sense of its own power—not only confirm all previous Arab warnings, but also make clear that the reality in the region, because of the creation of Israel, is even more bitter than could have been imagined or expected.

87. This State, which was supposedly created for the weak of the earth—as we were told—has now been turned, through its previously secret but now overt alliance with one of the super-Powers, into a strike force and a cradle of the worst types of aggression against the peoples of the region, particularly the Palestinian people, which has not ceased to agitate and struggle for recognition of its rights in its homeland. What increases the feeling of dejection and despair is that the super-Power which provides the monster it has created with all the tools of force so that it may pursue its policies, including its colonialist settlement policies and its racist practices, against the people of Palestine and its land, and which should, because of its international stature, stand by the side of the people whose rights have been taken away, stands instead on the side of the aggressor—or rather that State which can have no life except through aggression.

88. We believe that the United Nations, which participated in the creation of Israel, bears a major, special responsibility to eliminate all aspects of the accumulating, continuing Israeli aggression, including Israel's continuing occupation of the West Bank and Gaza; its continuing occupation of the Syrian Golan Heights; its continuing annexation of Al-Quds al-Sharif, its invasion of Lebanon; its continuing occupation of southern Lebanon and its refusal to withdraw forthwith and unconditionally, despite Security Council demands; and its continuing muscle-flexing and show of military power in an attempt to impose Israeli military hegemony on our Arab region.

89. As we have already indicated, Israel's hegemony has recently taken on a new characteristic, which underlines the earlier fears of the Arabs and causes them to urge the international community to note this with concern and oppose it as being an international development of which it must take due account. This development is the linking of the Israeli military hegemonists in a relationship of strategic co-operation with the United States of America. This raises many questions about the real role of the United States of America as a super-Power with particular responsibility, because of its international stature, because of its permanent membership of the Security Council, because it is a State which is attempting to mediate in order to bring about a solution of the problems of the Middle East and, last but not least, because it is a

State which was established on the basis of values and ideals which have made a very large number of the peoples of the world regard it as a high example. However, those peoples cannot but condemn its present behaviour, which is in contradiction with all we have seen and studied of these ideals and values in modern history.

90. The Government of Kuwait recently expressed its concern regarding two important developments which carry grave warnings for us all, and we wish to draw the attention of the international community to these.

91. In a statement released on 6 December, my Government said that it

“feels grave concern regarding the flagrant aggression against Syrian forces. This goes beyond the mandate of the multinational force and is a breach of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations. Furthermore, it exposes the Arab region and international peace to danger.”

Furthermore, the Government went on,

“the Government denounces the strategic co-operation agreement between the United States and Israel. It considers that it shows a clear bias on the part of the United States in favour of the Zionist enemy. The Government believes that the continuing stability of the region requires that the United States re-evaluate its policy in the Middle East and take account of the security of the Arab nation, the safety of the Arab people of Lebanon and the rights of the Palestinian people.”

The fact is that these last three points form the axis on which any effort to restore peace, security and stability in the Middle East must be based.

92. Israel's military hegemony, which has in the past few years ranged from aggression against Iraqi nuclear installations to the brutal invasion of Lebanon, makes it only logical that, in any attempt to find a comprehensive, just settlement of the Middle East problem, emphasis be placed on the security of the Arab nation and not on the security of Israel, as is the case now on the basis of distorted American values.

93. Furthermore, the continuing upheavals and bloody wars, the violence of which has been increasing year after year with the use of the most modern means of destruction, show that unless the Palestinian question—which is the core of the Middle East problem—is solved in a way that guarantees to the Palestinian people its inalienable, legitimate rights and the exercise of those rights, including its right to self-determination, its right of return and its right to establish its own State in its homeland, the region will not enjoy peace, security or stability.

94. The guarantee of the safety, independence and sovereignty of the Arab people of Lebanon is the foundation of the solution of the question of the Middle East; therefore this must be given the priority it deserves.

95. The recent attempts to drag the Middle East into the struggle between East and West by hinting that the American-Israeli alliance is but an alliance against Soviet penetration in the region are but naive efforts to hide the real dimensions of this alliance. We all know that the only danger in the Middle East is the Israeli danger. We all know that American weapons in Israeli hands are the only weapons aimed at the Arabs wherever they are. We all know that any alliance with the Zionist menace is an alliance with aggression.

96. The United Nations, as I have said, has a special responsibility for restoring security and stability in the Middle East by redressing the injustice done to the region's peoples. My delegation believes that the Organization does not lack the resolutions or plans of action to achieve

this end; rather, it lacks the political will to impose the will of the international community through the implementation of those resolutions and plans of action on the Middle East and thus to restore rights to those to whom they belong and maintain its own reputation.

97. Mr. SHIHABI (Saudi Arabia) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Here we are, returning within days to this rostrum to deal with another aspect of a multi-faceted crime committed by the same outlaw whose victims are numerous, as are the venues of its crimes, and who still persists in committing those crimes.

98. The situation in the Middle East, the horrific situation in the Middle East, is our subject today. Last week, our subject was the question of Palestine; the week before, it was the Israeli practices in Palestine against the Palestinian people, in contravention of all laws and rules of conduct. I do not want to repeat the discussion of the other subjects or the many aspects of Zionist crimes against Palestine and the peoples and nations of the Middle East discussed by the General Assembly at this session under various designations and titles.

99. The criminal is one and the same: for world Zionism and Israel, its executive organ, are a threat to Palestine, a threat to the security of the Middle East States, a threat to peace in the region as a whole. Aggression and crimes in the West Bank; human tragedies in the Gaza Strip; invasion and massacres in Lebanon; raids and aggression against the Syrian Arab Republic; raids against the nuclear reactor in Iraq; none of the neighbours of the Israeli entity has been spared its armed aggression in all its forms in the 35 years since Israel was established in the Arab homeland. No sooner have we begun to discuss an aggression or a crime than we are surprised by a new aggression or a repeated crime or by the creation of a new situation, violating the safety and rights of human beings, in contravention of rules of conduct and threatening the vital interests of the Arab nation.

100. This is like a horror film in which cannibals roam a quiet city from time to time, preying upon the population and terrorizing the area. What is the remedy? More important, what will be the fate of those people? What will be the fate of the area as a whole? That is the most important question.

101. The situation in the Middle East is an extension of the basic problem in Palestine, and the remedy is one and the same: curb Israel and then we can think of a solution and correct the course of history in the region. Here we address ourselves to the States providing Israel with the means of aggression, foremost among which is the United States, which has not concealed its legal responsibility for Israel's capacity for aggression and defiance by its recent agreements with the Zionist entity. We ask the United States if it has reflected upon the consequences of this continued aggression.

102. We must stand firmly on the side of reason and wisdom and tell the United States that it is impossible to defeat a people in its own homeland. You may kill the largest possible number of Arabs and you may make part of the land run with blood, but you will not defeat a people being robbed of its rights before its very eyes. It will still refuse to surrender and you will not have a moment's peace, once the sword of terrorism on which you depend is removed. Terrorism is shortlived, regardless of the passage of time.

103. It is a well-known fact that Israel threatens the security of the region. This has been affirmed by the General Assembly and reaffirmed by the Security Council. It has been demonstrated by Israel's continued acts of aggression. The security of the area is an essential base

for world security. The Zionists paid lip service to the ideal of peace until the Arabs demonstrated their readiness for peace based on justice and right, when the talk of peace ceased and only the voice of terrorism spoke in Israel.

104. Peace in the Middle East was never part of the aims of Israel and Zionism. This is the reality in the region. Had Israel wanted peace at any time, it would have declared its acceptance of United Nations resolutions, including General Assembly resolution 194 (III), in which it was resolved that the refugees who left in 1948 should be permitted to return to their homes and that compensation should be paid to those who chose not to return. That resolution has been repeated at every session and on every occasion. If Israel had wanted peace, it would not have annexed Arab Al-Quds or declared Al-Quds al-Sharif as the capital of Israel. If Israel had wanted peace, it would not have decided to apply its laws, authority and administration to the Syrian Golan Heights. If it had wanted peace, it would not have embarked from the outset on its occupation of the Arab territories or the establishment of Jewish settlements, racing against time to confiscate land and establish settlements which now exceed 150. If Israel had wanted peace, it would not have refused to co-operate with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Gunnar Jarring, who was authorized by the Secretary-General under Security Council resolution 242 (1967) to assist in the finding of an acceptable peace settlement, a refusal which led to the failure of the mission. If Israel had wanted peace, it would not have invaded Lebanon in 1978 and in 1982 on contradictory, flimsy and false pretexts. The Israeli authorities first said that the invasion was launched to protect Upper Galilee from the rockets fired by the fighters of the PLO from Lebanese territory. It was later revealed that the PLO did not fire a single rocket during the 10 months prior to the invasion. Then the Israeli authorities said that the invasion was aimed at establishing a security zone within Lebanese territory, extending for 25 miles. Then it was revealed that this was not the real aim, because Israel pushed on to the outskirts of Beirut, causing further death and injury to hundreds of thousands of innocent Palestinian and Lebanese civilians. The real aim was the annihilation of the largest possible number of Palestinians living in Lebanon and the demoralization of the survivors, taking from them all hope of regaining their usurped rights, and creating conditions of political, economic, social and religious instability in Lebanon. If Zionism wanted peace in the region, it would have informed the United Nations of the boundaries of the Israeli entity, as is required by international law. Is there a State that has no boundaries? I challenge the Zionists to declare from this rostrum the boundaries of the State of which they dream. Its boundaries are those of aggression alone.

105. At its fifth emergency special session, the General Assembly adopted resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V), in which it deplored the decision of the Israeli authorities to change the status of the city of Al-Quds al-Sharif and demanded that Israel rescind those measures, but to no avail. On 21 May 1968, the Security Council adopted resolution 252 (1968), in which it declared that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel in this regard were invalid. It urgently called upon Israel to rescind those measures, but to no avail. On 30 June 1980, the Security Council dealt with the question once more and adopted resolution 476 (1980), in which it reaffirmed its determination, in the event of non-compliance by Israel with resolutions regarding the city of Al-Quds, to examine practical ways and means in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter

of the United Nations to secure the full implementation of the resolution. In its resolution 478 (1980), the Security Council called upon all Member States to accept the decision and urged all States that had established diplomatic missions in the city of Al-Quds to withdraw such missions. Nevertheless, the Israeli authorities refused to comply with those resolutions.

106. The Israeli authorities declared their intention to annex the Syrian Golan Heights in 1980. On 14 December 1981, Israel implemented that annexation through the promulgation of invalid legislation. The Security Council convened at once and unanimously adopted resolution 497 (1981), wherein it demanded that Israel should rescind forthwith its decision. Nevertheless, Israel did not comply. In 1982, the General Assembly, at its ninth emergency special session, adopted resolution ES-9/1, wherein it strongly condemned Israel for its failure to comply with Security Council resolution 497 (1981) and determined that the continued occupation by Israel of the Syrian Golan Heights and its effective annexation constituted a continuing threat to international peace and security. It declared that Israel's record and actions confirmed that it was not a peace-loving Member State and that it had carried out neither its obligations under the Charter nor its commitments under General Assembly resolution 273 (III) of 11 May 1949. The Israeli authorities did not yield to the demands of the General Assembly, despite that resolution.

107. His Majesty King Fahd ibn Abd al-Aziz took the initiative in September 1981 and declared eight principles, which the United Nations had already determined, and repeatedly affirmed, to be the guidelines for reaching a just settlement of the problem of the Middle East. Nevertheless, the Government of the Israeli entity categorically rejected those principles. The Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez, supported the Saudi principles for peace, with certain amendments and clarifications, and these became the Arab peace plan, adopted on 9 September 1982.<sup>4</sup> However, the leaders of Israel rejected this plan from the outset, because they know themselves; they know that peace is not their purpose and that continued war and aggression form the bases of their existence. The declaration of the Arab peace initiative, which incorporated the Saudi declaration of principles, came at the same time as the declaration by President Reagan of his principles for peace in the Middle East.<sup>1</sup> Israel rejected these principles, despite the fact that they were slanted in its favour. Do these people want peace?

108. After the rulers of Israel had declared their categorical rejection of the Arab peace principles emanating from United Nations resolutions, those rulers continued, through their declarations and measures, to present one proof after another of their firm determination to absorb and Judaize the occupied Arab territories and to create *faits accomplis* which would make it difficult for any succeeding Israeli authority to relinquish them.

109. This is the actual situation with regard to the question of Palestine, which is the core of the conflict in the Middle East. The Israeli authorities do not want peace. They want expansion. They want land. Israel has not voluntarily adhered and will not voluntarily adhere to the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations or to international law, treaties or norms. The Zionist entity in Palestine has defied the United Nations and its resolutions for 35 years, and it has so far succeeded in doing so because of the unlimited support it receives from certain countries and because of the use of the veto in the Security Council, and the voting in other bodies. In addition, one country is supplying Israel with funds, arms and all the means of aggression, instead of imposing

sanctions against it in accordance with the Charter and bringing pressure to bear on it to accept and implement United Nations resolutions, or at least to deter it from its continued defiance of these resolutions, from its expansion and creation of new *faits accomplis* in implementation of Zionist designs, and from the extension of Israeli occupation at the expense of the Palestinian people and the Arab countries.

110. The phenomenon of Israel, an aggressive, expansionist, racist, inhuman Israel, is a matter that requires more than police, military or legal measures. It requires that one stop and think for a moment and reflect on history, so that one may see the dangers which the Zionist movement poses to the lives of a large number of Jews throughout the world because of its adventures, which are doomed to failure, quite apart from the other dangers to which I have referred.

111. We urge the United Nations, while we are dealing with the means of solving the problem of the Middle East, to act immediately to stop the deterioration of this situation. We urge the States that fan the flames in the region to realize that it is easier to light a fire than to extinguish it. We urge them to open their eyes to their real, fundamental interests, not the interests of the irresponsible Zionist terrorists. Once more we urge the Security Council, and its permanent members in particular, to take action before it is too late to end the deterioration of the situation with regard to the question of Palestine and the region of the Middle East. We are confident that any firm action in this regard will be of great benefit to world peace and even greater benefit to all those with interests in the region.

112. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on representatives who have asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes.

113. Mr. MOJTAHED (Islamic Republic of Iran): The representative of the imperialist Zionist base, an illusory, false entity, in the guise of a State, spoke shamelessly this morning about the situation in the Middle East and the problems there, all of which have been created by that illegitimate entity.

114. As far as my delegation is concerned, no matter what the situation in the Middle East, only honest and legitimate parties should be involved in the debate, not a hypocritical, racist Zionist element illegitimately forged by imperialists.

115. It should be brought to the attention of all representatives that the Zionist entity is not merely one part of the problem of the region, a co-instigator or co-conspirator, but the main problem of the Middle East. As far as Lebanon is concerned, and the situation that has recently developed there, to which the Zionist element referred this morning, the Muslim people of Lebanon, inspired by the divine value-oriented ideology of Islam, and on the basis of an overall global political consciousness, are strongly defending themselves against oppression, aggression and military invasion by imperialism and its Pentagon-Zionist surrogates in the region.

116. I should like to reaffirm the position of my Government, which has been stated previously. The Islamic Republic of Iran categorically and unequivocally rejects the baseless allegation projected by the imperialist-based Zionist entity concerning recent bombing attacks in Lebanon. The Muslim people of the region will continue to defend their honour, values and territory and will overcome the Zionist enemy, by the grace of God, very soon.

117. Mr. BLUM (Israel): We have known for a long time that behind the so-called anti-Zionist tirades, as well as behind the attacks against the State of Israel, there lurks anti-Semitism, pure and simple. We have known all these years that the closet anti-Semites and the crypto-anti-Semites in this building use anti-zionism and anti-Israelism as slogans behind which to hide. But it was these anti-Semites who throughout the years have been strenuously denying this association and maintaining that, while they campaign against zionism here and elsewhere, they regard themselves as great admirers of the Jewish people and the Jewish religion.

*Mr. Illueca (Panama) resumed the Chair.*

118. The mask has finally fallen. In an unguarded moment, without a prepared text in front of him, one of the petty and vulgar anti-Semites in our midst today made a wild and obscene statement, which could have been printed verbatim in the Nazi literature of the 1930s and 1940s. The spokesman for Colonel Qaddafi told the General Assembly this morning:

“We shall not rest until the Zionist entity has been ousted from this Hall, as was the representative of Formosa.

“The time has come for the United Nations to strive to save the peoples of the world from this racist entity. It is high time for the United Nations and the United States in particular to realize that the Jewish Zionists here in the United States attempt to destroy Americans. Look around New York. Who are the owners of the brothels and the pornographic cinemas? Is it not the Jews who are exploiting the American people and trying to debase them? If we succeed in eliminating that entity, we shall by the same token save the American and European peoples.” [88th meeting, paras. 65 and 66.]

119. I could stop here. The obscenity and vulgarity of this statement speak for themselves. I will not compete with Mr. Treiki in his expertise in pornography. I readily concede that he is a much greater expert on these matters than myself or anybody else in this Hall. It is quite conceivable that having been told that the United Nations is on 42nd Street, Mr. Treiki lost his way and instead of turning towards First Avenue turned towards Seventh Avenue. Be that as it may, this so-called doctor is certainly not a doctor of divinity. He is a doctor of vulgarity and profanity. Accordingly, I sent a letter this afternoon to the Secretary-General [A/38/713] protesting not only this kind of language, but also the fact that obscene statements of this kind should have been tolerated in this building without any interruption also on the part of the Chair. Let me quote from my letter to the Secretary-General:

“Your Excellency will no doubt agree with me that racist and religious incitement of the kind contained in the said statement”—I am referring to the statement of Mr. Treiki—“as well as the mentality which it reflects, should have no place in our Organization. The United Nations, it should be recalled, grew out of the great war-time coalition that fought the evil of racism and religious intolerance and it would be a betrayal of the memory of the millions of victims of racism, as well as of the Charter of the United Nations itself, if obscene language of the kind used by the representative of Libya were permitted to be heard without any appropriate response.

“While I sincerely regret that the Chair should not have seen fit to interrupt this outburst of racist and religious incitement, I urgently appeal to Your Excellency on this eve of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the

adoption by the General Assembly of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to unequivocally condemn these vile manifestations of rabid anti-Semitism—one of the oldest forms of racism and religious intolerance—and to take all the necessary steps to ensure that such an outrage is not repeated again at the United Nations.”

120. What is at stake is the future of the Organization. I am not concerned about the possible effects of such outbursts on the Jewish people. It has outlasted many anti-Semites of worse calibre than Mr. Treiki, but if petty anti-Semites like him are permitted to speak in this manner in this Hall, this certainly does not augur well for the future of this Organization.

121. Mr. DOMBALIS (United States of America): I do not doubt that the Assembly was appalled this morning by the remarks of the representative of Libya regarding Jews. The United States wishes to register its disgust at those remarks.

122. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The arrogance of the representative of the Zionist entity does not even deserve a reply because this artificial entity . . .

123. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

124. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Mr. President, I must appeal to you that you see to it that representatives of Member States in the Organization are referred to by the proper reference to their States and that this outrageous behaviour is stopped. I think it is the duty of the Chair to ensure that proper parliamentary procedures are being observed here.

125. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to appeal to all delegations. My remarks are not addressed to any particular delegation but to all delegations in general. First of all, the President has to respect the sovereign right of delegations to express their views. He cannot impose his choice of vocabulary on individual delegations. It is therefore up to each delegation to see to it that the high dignity and standards which the public expects of the United Nations are maintained. If we were to comb through the speeches of delegations, we might find statements which are not offensive to individual delegations but which are offensive to the United Nations as a whole. As a part of the Organization, we have a basic duty to protect the dignity, the majesty and the influence of the Organization in its vocation of creating a spirit of understanding and dialogue and an atmosphere of reduced international tension. I wish to say again that I am not addressing my remarks to any individual delegations but to the Assembly as a whole.

126. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I have heard the representative of the Zionist entity without interrupting him. I believe that, as you have just said, Mr. President, there is nothing in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly or in the Charter of the United Nations which obliges any delegation, in this particular case my delegation, to speak in any way other than how it wishes. We listened to the representative of the Zionist entity speaking of the representative of Qaddafi. I did not interrupt him. Therefore, Mr. President, please attract the attention of the representative of the racist Zionist entity and request him to please be quiet and respectful so that I may make my statement. The lies and exaggerations which the representative of the Zionist entity has just uttered are well known by the United Nations as a whole . . .

127. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

128. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Mr. President, this is no longer a matter of mere courtesy. We all have names here. We have been admitted under certain names. Sometimes we change our names and then we inform the Secretary-General of those changes. For instance, Libya was not admitted under the name which it currently has, a rather long one. It has changed its name and is now known in the Organization by that long name. It is also socialist, among other things, we are told. But we all have names. It is improper to permit representatives who do not like a particular Member State to refer to it by names other than its official designation. This is my point. It has to do not only with dignity. It has to do with elementary parliamentary decency. I appeal to you again, Sir, to ensure that this elementary decency is observed.

129. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The President, once again, wishes to point out that this is not a national parliament. This is an international parliament which is functioning on the basis of the sovereign equality of States. It is impossible for the President to indicate to delegations what language they should use. But, of course, mankind, which places such high hopes in the Organization, expects every representative to honour his or her responsibilities and functions.

130. I would ask that if the representative of Israel wishes to exercise his right of reply a second time he do so following the statement by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, since what he has just said is strictly speaking an exercise of his right to reply to the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

131. I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

132. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Do I take it that from now on we are changing our customary practice and that everybody is entitled to refer to anybody else in the way he wishes?

133. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I repeat, the President cannot restrict the freedom of expression of representatives. I am here under the authority of the Assembly. If any representative—and that includes the representative of Israel—is not satisfied with the procedure that we are following, then I would ask that we should put the matter to the Assembly so that the Assembly can tell me whether I should act otherwise.

134. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Thank you, Sir. Please excuse me for the problems caused by the representative of that gang, which is no more than we can expect. I have been listening to what was said by the representative of the Zionist entity, to all his fallacious allegations. The representative of the Zionist entity accused me of anti-Semitism. I myself am a Semite. I do not hate the Jews, for the Jews are our brothers, but I hate the Zionists whom this racist represents here in this Hall. Who is the racist? Is it the one who claims to represent the Chosen People, the greatest people on earth? The one who claims that God granted him a land? Is God a real estate agent who distributes or sells land?

135. The Zionists can no longer use the dangerous weapon of anti-Semitism. It is impossible to accuse the Arabs of being anti-Semites because the anti-Semites and racists are the Zionists themselves. It is they who are killing the Palestinians, who are exiling them and driving them out of their own land. It is they who are dividing the Arab nation. What Hitler did is something that the Zionists are repeating today, although what he did is nothing compared to what Begin and Shamir have done. The Zionists are committing crimes worse than the crimes of the Nazis. That weapon they use against those who freely express their views in the United States or in the

West is obsolete. The Organization must decide. When the United Nations condemned zionism as a racist movement, was that anti-Semitic? When the international community says that Israel, the State of the Zionist entity, is not a peace-loving State, does it show itself to be anti-Semitic? No, of course not. It is the Zionists who are preaching prostitution, drugs, and corruption. I am not saying it is the Jews. Those who are here now do not represent the Jews but, rather, mercenaries and criminals who went to Palestine to dispossess the Palestinian people and to kill them. They and they alone are responsible for the destruction of peoples and of moral values. They speak of the victims of racism, but who are the racists?

136. Is it not zionism, a racist movement, which has committed massacres in Lebanon—in Sabra and Shatila—and which is collaborating with South Africa and providing it with information and arms so that South Africa can kill the people of Namibia? Those are the racists!

137. They are the racists, practising racism not only against the Arabs that are Semites—I am one myself—but against the Eastern Jews of Arab origin. *The New York Times* has discussed the matter clearly in many articles.

138. We tell those racist Nazi Zionists that they must leave this Hall, because Israel, that Zionist racist entity, does not represent the Palestinian people. The representatives of Palestine are the ones who should be in this Hall if we are to be consistent and logical.

139. I am talking about neo-nazism, neo-fascism. The people of the Jamahiriya, which sacrificed half its population to defend itself against the Italian Fascists, are familiar with that Israeli racist fascism, that Zionist racist nazism. We tell the world once again that the people of the United States must be aware of the danger that Fascist zionism represents to them. All the peoples of the world must be very wary of what zionism may mean.

140. We are not anti-Semitic, because we are Semites. We are against Zionist racism and against those who claim to be Jewish and destroy the world. Look at all the dens of iniquity in the world—the drug dens, the hashish dens. That is where we find the Zionists, those whose only value is money, murder and weapons. I speak in the name of all the peoples of the world. We must unite to eliminate the racists. I tell the representative of the Zionist entity that the language of gangsters, killers and mercenaries in Palestine will in no way frighten us. It will have no effect on us, because the United Nations is well aware who the aggressor is. It knows who the occupier is and who is violating the values of the Muslims, who arrested the Christian priests and who destroyed the Al-Aqsa Mosque.

141. We are not against the Jews as a people. Judaism is innocent of zionism. Jews must unite with us, with all other peoples, to put an end to this new zionism, which is both racist and Fascist.

142. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to exercise his right of reply for the second time. I remind him of the five-minute time limit.

143. Mr. MOJTAHED (Islamic Republic of Iran): Although the General Assembly is not a history class, I have to speak a little about the history of Semitism and Judaism, which the Zionist enemy represents, claiming that he is one of the advocates of Judaism.

144. First, all the people of the world should know that Judaism and Semitism, so far as their theological and historical connotations are concerned, have nothing to do with the Zionist entities which are occupying Palestine now. They should simply return to New York, London and Paris and reopen their shops and businesses.

145. In order to let the Islamic countries know the extent of the aggression of the Zionist entities, I should like to inform representatives that the Zionist enemy has gone beyond territorial invasion and is now in the stage of invading and massacring the theology and very cultural identity of Islam. I must read out something about the mutilated Islamic Holy Book, the Koran, which has been distributed in some Islamic countries by the Zionist enemy. Israel has reportedly distorted the Koran by making changes in the text. A magazine states:

“Reports from the office of the Lebanese Grand Mufti (*Dar-al-Ifta*) in Beirut have disclosed that several thousand copies are being distributed by Israelis all over the world.

“The mutilated copies, according to *Al-Fikr*, the office’s monthly bulletin, have a hundred and sixty verses deleted and some verses have been transferred to other chapters. The deleted verses concerned the Jews, their past history and persistent violation of their covenant with Allah.”

As all of us know, the monotheistic prophets are all of the Semitic race, mostly from the Arab peninsula. This mutilation of the Koran by the Zionist enemy shows the lack of respect and understanding of this enemy for the Muslim world. The magazine continues:

“According to *Dar-al-Ifta*, a Beirut publisher has printed the mutilated Koran for Israel. One million copies are now being distributed from Beirut to all parts of the world. The forged copy is said to have a silk-bound and gold-printed cover.

“*Dar-al-Ifta* states that 50,000 copies have been distributed in Pakistan, 150,000 in Malaysia, Afghanistan, Indonesia and Turkey, 150,000 in North Africa and 30,000 in Yemen and Kuwait.

“Observers recall that among the secret conditions of the Sadat-Israel peace treaty was an obligation to delete from Egyptian textbooks all Koranic verses and *ahadith* [traditions] condemning the Jews. This condition, it is believed, has been duly fulfilled by the Egyptian regime.

“*Crescent International*, a publication from Toronto, Canada, from its own sources in occupied Palestine, confirmed also that Israel has printed its own version of the Koran but refrained so far from distributing it inside the occupied lands, as that was likely to spark off mass unrest and possible uprising.

“Already, the Zionists are finding it difficult to contain the growing Islamic awareness of Muslims in the occupied territories. They seem to be aware of the fact that the fear of death does not deter Islamic workers in the path of Allah.”

146. I wonder why the Zionist enemy has mutilated the Islamic Holy Book, which mostly refers to Semitism and the historical phenomena of Judaism and Christianity, especially those parts related to the authentic history of Judaism and Christianity which trace the historic evidence of these three organized monotheistic religions—namely, Islam, Christianity and Judaism. That speaks for itself.

147. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall call on the representative of Israel to speak in exercise of his right of reply a second time, but I should like first to make a brief comment.

148. As President of the General Assembly, I am very concerned that on the eve of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights the impression might be given that the climate of international tension is in a very intense way reaching the Assembly, an Assembly that should be one of peace, understanding, dialogue and compromise, an Assembly that was conceived

as a means to establish conditions of peace and progress for mankind, where we, the Member States, should all promote respect for all ideologies, all religions, all races, both sexes, all nationalities and even all languages.

149. The position of the President is a very difficult one. I hope that representatives will understand that, and that what I am saying will not be misinterpreted in any way. We all want the Organization to maintain balance and its beneficial influence on all mankind. In the United Nations, all Members have the sovereign right of free expression, but we must always base ourselves on the purposes and principles of the Charter.

150. I apologize to the representative of Israel for having made these brief remarks before he begins his statement, but they are words that I am addressing to all, not to any State in particular. What I am really doing is expressing my own deep concern to ensure that we all make an effort to maintain the dignity of the Assembly.

151. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Mr. President, I indeed appreciate your words, because I think they were very appropriate in the light of the statements that we have just heard. I think it was very appropriate for the President to condemn, albeit in rather mild and moderate terms, the expressions of racial and religious intolerance which we heard from the two speakers who preceded me.

152. We were told that this is not a history class. I wish it were. The situation is that sometimes this seems to be much worse than a history class, and it is worse because certain representatives of the kind that have spoken before me have consistently disgraced this Hall and the Organization.

153. The representative who spoke immediately before me—of course, I exclude you, Mr. President—speaks for a State whose chief representative a few weeks ago proposed here in this Hall, without any objection being made, that the “final solution” be applied to my country. Let me remind the Assembly once again of the meaning of that term, “final solution”. It was the code word of the Nazis for the extermination of the Jewish people in Europe. So we are familiar with this kind of terminology . . .

154. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on a point of order.

155. Mr. MOJTAHED (Islamic Republic of Iran): The Zionist enemy shows his character of aggression and extravagance. He has asked three times to speak on points of order, and he is now exercising his right of reply with regard to my statement, but he is referring to a statement which was made two weeks ago. I wish to bring this to your attention, Mr. President, and ask you to order him to be a little bit honest.

156. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to say once again that it is not for the President to tell representatives how they should express themselves in their statements. The President is in a very difficult position.

157. I invite the representative of Israel to continue.

158. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I take it that the Iranian interruption will be deducted from the five minutes at my disposal.

159. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on a point of order.

160. Mr. MOJTAHED (Islamic Republic of Iran): The representative of the Zionist entity should be reminded that when he is referring to my country he should call it the Islamic Republic of Iran.

161. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have taken note of the statement of the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

162. The representative of Israel may continue.

163. Mr. BLUM (Israel): It is the sovereign right of every representative to make a laughing-stock of himself.

164. I am perfectly willing to abide by this request, on one condition—that the distinguished representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran refer in the proper manner to the representative, distinguished or otherwise, of the State of Israel. Let there be no mistake about this: I am very proud to represent a State which is the embodiment of zionism, the national liberation movement of the Jewish people, one of the noblest liberation movements in history. But my point is that the official designation of the country which I represent and under which it was admitted to the Organization is the State of Israel. That is my only objection to being called a Zionist, nothing else.

165. The logic and consistency of the argument of the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran are matters to be judged by representatives here, and I leave it to their intelligence to judge also the validity and the high moral standard of the statements made by the representatives of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Socialist Republic of the People's Libyan Jamahiriya—I hope I got it right. They have both confirmed what I had to say in my first statement in exercise of the right of reply.

166. So I will not call him, the representative of Libya, "the representative of the racist, terrorist entity known as Libya"—which he is—and I make him also the same offer as I made to our Iranian—Islamic Iranian—colleague. Let us abide by the parliamentary proprieties. What we have got to say about each other we can still say.

167. To conclude, indeed, on this eve of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it is an utter disgrace to the Organization that foul and obscene language of the kind that we have heard here, be it from the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran or from the representative of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, should have been permitted without any obstruction.

168. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, who wishes to exercise his right of reply a second time. I remind him that this statement is limited to five minutes.

169. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): We have just heard a statement which constitutes another insult to the Organization. The United Nations considers zionism to be a racist movement and a form of racism, while the representative of the Zionist entity considers it to be a liberation movement. That shows his respect for the United Nations and its resolutions.

170. The attempt made by the representative of the Zionist entity to distract us from the main question under discussion—the question of the Zionist entity's aggression in the Middle East, its occupation of Lebanon and its annexation of the Golan Heights and Jerusalem—cannot make us forget that the artificial racist entity is an expansionist entity and that what we should be considering is the fundamental question of the Middle East.

171. They try to justify their position on the grounds that the Nazis killed Jews. Well, of course the Nazis killed Jews, and we condemn nazism. But the Nazis also killed about 20 million Russians and 10 million Czechoslovaks and Poles. Why do we not talk about that? Were they

not human beings also? Are they not entitled to be spoken about here?

172. The attempts made by Zionism to exploit accusations of anti-Semitism cannot concern us.

173. This artificial entity, which represents fascism and nazism, must be called to order; it should not be here among us; it should be with its friend and ally, South Africa. But we must prevent it from continuing to expand and to commit the crimes of which it is guilty. This weapon of accusations about anti-Semitism, with which they silence free voices in Europe and America, cannot silence us. We are not anti-Semites, as I have said; we are anti-Zionists and we will continue to be anti-Zionists. That is why we wished to reply to that man who has just spoken—but in fact we should not even call him a man because his morality does not warrant that characterization. I should like to conclude, and not waste precious time. I will not reply to the representative of the Nazi, racist entity even if he speaks again.

## AGENDA ITEM 15

### Elections to fill vacancies in principal organs (*continued*):\*

#### (b) Election of eighteen members of the Economic and Social Council

174. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): As representatives will recall, at its 40th and 65th plenary meetings, the Assembly elected 17 members of the Economic and Social Council for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1984.

175. Because the third unrestricted ballot taken at the 65th plenary meeting was inconclusive, we must, in accordance with rule 94 of the rules of procedure, proceed to a first restricted ballot in the third series of restricted ballots. Since one seat remains to be filled from the Group of Latin American States, we shall proceed to a ballot restricted to the two States that obtained the largest number of votes in the last ballot, namely, Haiti and Nicaragua. This is in accordance with rule 94.

176. Ballot papers will now be distributed. I would request members to write the name of only one State. Ballot papers containing the name of a State other than Haiti or Nicaragua and those containing more than one name will be declared invalid.

*At the invitation of the President, Mrs. Pinto de Casap (Bolivia), U Ko (Burma), Mr. Földeák (Hungary), Mr. Barrios (Spain) and Mr. Kitikiti (Zimbabwe) acted as tellers.*

*A vote was taken by secret ballot.*

177. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The meeting will be suspended while the ballots are being counted.

*The meeting was suspended at 6.40 p.m. and resumed at 6.50 p.m.*

178. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The result of the voting is as follows:

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	147
<i>Number of invalid ballots:</i>	1
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	146
<i>Abstentions:</i>	6
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	140

\*Resumed from the 65th meeting.

Required majority:	94
Number of votes obtained:	
Nicaragua .....	76
Haiti .....	64

179. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): As neither State has obtained the required two-thirds majority, the General Assembly will continue the voting and will hold a second restricted ballot. As in the last ballot, the only States whose names may be included in the ballot papers are Haiti and Nicaragua. Any paper containing the names of other States or of more than one State will be declared invalid.

At the invitation of the President, Mrs. Pinto de Casap (Bolivia), U Ko (Burma), Mr. Földeák (Hungary), Mr. Barrios (Spain) and Mr. Kitikiti (Zimbabwe) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

180. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I propose to suspend the meeting while the ballots are being counted.

The meeting was suspended at 7.05 p.m. and resumed at 7.10 p.m.

181. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The result of the voting is as follows:

Number of ballot papers:	137
Number of invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	137
Abstentions:	5
Number of members voting:	132
Required majority:	88
Number of votes obtained:	
Nicaragua .....	72
Haiti .....	60

182. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): As neither of the States has obtained the required two-thirds majority, the General Assembly will continue the voting and will hold a third restricted ballot. As in the last ballot, the only States whose names may be included in the ballot papers are Haiti and Nicaragua. Any paper containing the names of other States or of more than one State will be declared invalid.

At the invitation of the President, Mrs. Pinto de Casap (Bolivia), U Ko (Burma), Mr. Földeák (Hungary), Mr. Barrios (Spain) and Mr. Kitikiti (Zimbabwe) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

183. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I propose to suspend the meeting while the ballots are being counted.

The meeting was suspended at 7.20 p.m. and resumed at 7.25 p.m.

184. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The result of the voting is as follows:

Number of ballot papers:	140
Number of invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	140
Abstentions:	6
Number of members voting:	134
Required majority:	90
Number of votes obtained:	
Nicaragua .....	76
Haiti .....	58

185. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): As the result of the third restricted ballot has also been inconclusive, we must, in accordance with the rules of procedure, proceed to an unrestricted ballot.

186. I remind the Assembly that members have the right to vote for any State from the Group of Latin American States except, of course, those which are already members of the Economic and Social Council. To make this clear, I shall give the names of those States which cannot be voted for in the present balloting: Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Mexico, Saint Lucia, Suriname and Venezuela.

187. Ballot papers will now be distributed. I ask members to write the name of only one State. Any ballot paper bearing more than one name will be declared invalid.

At the invitation of the President, Mrs. Pinto de Casap (Bolivia), U Ko (Burma), Mr. Földeák (Hungary), Mr. Barrios (Spain) and Mr. Kitikiti (Zimbabwe) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

188. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The meeting will be suspended while the ballots are being counted.

The meeting was suspended at 7.35 p.m. and resumed at 7.50 p.m.

189. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The result of the voting is as follows:

Number of ballot papers:	136
Number of invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	136
Abstentions:	4
Number of members voting:	132
Required majority:	88
Number of votes obtained:	
Nicaragua .....	73
Haiti .....	54
Bolivia .....	4
Grenada .....	1

190. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Since no candidate has received the necessary majority and in view of the late hour, I believe, after consultation with the delegations concerned, that it would be appropriate not to continue the balloting today, but to postpone it until a later date in the hope that an understanding may be reached between the States concerned.

The meeting rose at 7.55 p.m.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> See *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*, Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1982, vol. 18, No. 35, p. 1081.

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1982*, document S/15403.

<sup>3</sup> See *Report of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Geneva, 29 August-7 September 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21), chap. I.

<sup>4</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1982*, document S/15510.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, Supplement for July, August and September 1982, document S/15317.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, Thirty-seventh Year, 2461st meeting.