



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

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*):

(a) Report of the Council;

(b) Reports of the Secretary-General

1. Mrs. KODIKARA (Philippines): We have before us draft resolution A/38/L.16, which was introduced so ably at the 83rd meeting by the representative of Costa Rica. The draft resolution, entitled "International Year of Peace", brings to mind the many worthy causes for which, in the past, international years have been proclaimed by the United Nations.

2. On this occasion, let me invite the Assembly, in the name of men, women and children who have died and will die on the field of conflict, to take a moment to contemplate the familiar emblem of the Organization, which is suspended behind the podium of the General Assembly Hall. I ask members to look at the two olive branches which, like two strong hands, appear to cup our whole world—this fragile planet we call Earth—dearly and carefully. It is the eloquent symbol of peace, the symbol of the United Nations, a symbol we hold dear in this house, this house of all States.

3. It is that symbol of peace, that symbol of the United Nations, which is extolled in the draft resolution now before us. It is sponsored by my country and by other countries that believe in its importance and the need for it. We take pride in submitting it to the Assembly for approval.

4. It will be recalled that the International Association of University Presidents, at its Sixth Triennial Conference, held at San José from 28 June to 3 July 1981, took the initiative that led to the declaration of the International Year of Peace. In line with that initiative and on the strength of Economic and Social Council resolution 1982/15, the General Assembly last year, in its resolution 37/16, declared 1986 to be the International Year of Peace. The draft resolution now before us seeks to carry out the preparations necessary for the observance of the International Year of Peace. It also invites voluntary contributions for the Year's observance. The administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution are indicated in document A/38/658. The sum involved is a very small token for and in the name of peace.

5. My delegation submits that we must honour peace not only in 1986. Indeed, our efforts here must be unswervingly dedicated to the promotion and preservation of peace, not only for our time but also for the time of all human generations still unborn. Thus can we answer a poet's pained cry:

"Ah, when shall all men's good
Be each man's rule, a universal peace".

6. My delegation considers it most timely that in this month, when we celebrate peace to all men of good will,

the draft resolution before us is to be adopted by the Assembly by consensus.

7. Mrs. CARRASCO MONJE (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Bolivia has sponsored draft resolution A/38/L.16 with warm enthusiasm because we believe that there is no more noble or worthy cause than that of peace. The ultimate objective of peace is also the ultimate objective of the Organization. The General Assembly, recognizing the need to promote the cause of peace as one of the fundamental purposes of the United Nations, last year adopted resolution 37/16, declaring 1986 the International Year of Peace.

8. The delegation of Bolivia thanks the Secretary-General for his report [A/38/413 and Add.1 and 2], in which he clearly and precisely states that the preparations for the observance of the International Year of Peace must be expedited if substantial results in international co-operation to this end are to be achieved. The regional seminars envisaged in paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/38/L.16 can be a valuable contribution in giving the International Year of Peace the prominence and importance it deserves.

9. As is clear from the statement of administrative and financial implications [A/38/658], an effort has been made to keep the costs to a minimum. In fact, the appropriation of \$70,000 from the regular budget and the use of the conference services of the United Nations are entirely justified, not only because precedents exist in connection with the observance of other commemorative years, but also, and above all, because we are dealing here with the ultimate good: peace.

10. The delegation of Bolivia recognizes that the observance of the International Year of Peace will have to be financed in principle through voluntary contributions. Unfortunately, the General Assembly's appeal has gone unheeded, because those who could have contributed generously to the financing of a programme worthy of this cause have failed to do so.

11. For that reason, the sponsors of this draft resolution deem it essential that a modest sum be appropriated from the regular budget to finance the preparations for the International Year of Peace. Nevertheless, it is our hope that Governments will change their attitude and contribute generously in the next few months to the special fund set up for this purpose. If that does happen, there will be no need for any future requests for appropriations from the budget.

12. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before speaking on the item under consideration, I should like, on behalf of the Government of Costa Rica and my delegation, to express our deep grief at the death of Mr. Bernardo Zuleta, Under-Secretary-General and Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Law of the Sea. Mr. Zuleta was a distinguished citizen of Colombia. Through you, Mr. President, we express our condolences to the bereaved family, to the Government of Colombia and to the Secretary-General on this irreparable loss.

13. Turning to the item on the agenda, I have the duty of informing the Assembly that, despite our sincere desire

to reach a formula acceptable to all, this has not proved to be possible, since the proposal I submitted orally [83rd meeting] on behalf of my delegation to revise paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/38/L.16 did not meet the requirements for achieving agreement on the elimination of the amendment contained in document A/38/L.41.

14. After holding various consultations, we have decided to withdraw our oral proposal and to vote against the amendment because its effect would be to reverse the decision adopted by the Fifth Committee at its 55th meeting, on 5 December, and contained in document A/38/658. Under that decision, the Fifth Committee accepted the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to approve an additional appropriation for the International Year of \$70,000 under section 2A of the programme budget for the biennium 1984-1985.

15. This means accordingly that the increase for 1984 is only \$35,000, and the same sum for 1985. I would like to recall that this additional appropriation is primarily for travel costs to various destinations where the regional seminars will be held. As I said the other afternoon, Costa Rica has offered to act as host to the seminar for Latin America and consequently the costs will be lower than the estimates because the distance between New York and San José, the capital of my country, is shorter than that between New York and Santiago, the headquarters of ECLA.

16. For all these reasons, and because of what has just been said by the representatives of the Philippines and Bolivia, I should like cordially to urge, on behalf of my delegation and on behalf of the other sponsors, the adoption of draft resolution A/38/L.16. We urge all delegations which want the seminars to be financed in the way decided upon by the Fifth Committee to oppose the amendment contained in document A/38/L.41 and to support our draft resolution in its original form as it appears in document A/38/L.16. We sincerely believe that this would make a modest contribution towards reaching one of the important milestones which has to be passed in the search for peace—the one to which we all aspire, a dynamic peace based on freedom, justice, and human solidarity. We are still optimistic and hope that this draft resolution will be adopted by consensus.

17. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/38/L.16 and on the amendment contained in document A/38/L.41. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications appears in document A/38/658.

18. In accordance with rule 90 of the rules of procedure, I shall first put the amendment to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guinea,¹ Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mali,¹ Netherlands, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Burundi, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Kuwait, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Swaziland,

Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Austria, Barbados, Benin, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Malawi, Mauritania, Mongolia, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

The amendment was rejected by 64 votes to 16, with 35 abstentions.¹

19. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): A separate vote has been requested on paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/38/L.16. If I hear no objection I shall put that paragraph to the vote first. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Brazil, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, Turkey.

Paragraph 4 of the draft resolution was adopted by 110 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions.²

20. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/38/L.16 as a whole. It is my understanding that the Assembly is ready to accept the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly adopts the draft resolution.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted (resolution 38/56).

21. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on representatives who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

22. Mr. DOMBALIS (United States of America): My delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/38/L.16 to reiterate once again our profound

commitment to world peace, our hope that the International Year of Peace will contribute towards that end, and our friendship and respect for Costa Rica. We welcome Costa Rica's offer to act as host to the Latin American regional seminar on peace as yet another demonstration of Costa Rica's unflagging efforts to attain peace in this world.

23. We also appreciate the fact that, as pointed out earlier by the representative of Costa Rica, costs for the seminar should be lowered considerably by holding it in Costa Rica. We expect that the Secretariat will honour this example and do everything in its power to finance the other regional seminars in keeping with the Secretary-General's commitment to maximum budgetary restraint.

24. Finally, we should like to re-emphasize our firm belief that all costs incurred in celebration of this Year, and every other international year, should properly come from a voluntary trust fund set up for that purpose, according to guidelines laid down by the Economic and Social Council in the annex to its resolution 1980/67. Fiscal responsibility must be adhered to in this as in all other endeavours of the United Nations.

25. Mr. BRAUN (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/38/L.16 notwithstanding its reservations on the financial implications of paragraph 4.

26. The declaration of 1986 as the International Year of Peace, which would commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, requires that efforts be made by all nations. However, my delegation has serious reservations about paragraph 4, which envisages regional seminars for the preparation of that Year. We believe that the expenses of such seminars should be met from the existing resources of the regular budget or from the voluntary funds to be established under this resolution. Consequently, we voted against paragraph 4.

27. My Government has always taken a clear stand on questions regarding the financial implications of resolutions here in plenary meeting as well as in the Committees of the Assembly. We have frequently pointed out that, under the existing economic and financial conditions, we are against expanding the regular budget to allow increased expenditures.

28. Mr. TROUVEROY (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): Belgium fully supports the objectives of the International Year of Peace as described in the report of the Secretary-General [A/38/413 and Add.1 and 2]. It welcomes the fact that the international community will thus have an opportunity during the Year to take a fresh look at the problems concerning peace in the world.

29. As the Secretary-General pointed out in his report, my delegation believes firmly that activities organized nationally must constitute the key element in the programme for the International Year of Peace. For that reason, my delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/38/L.16 as a whole but was obliged to abstain on paragraph 4, since it considers that the major effort should not be devoted to very costly regional seminars.

30. Mr. GEORGE (Canada): My delegation fully supports the objectives of the International Year of Peace and welcomes its connection with the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations.

31. In our view, one of the more substantive ways of observing the Year might be to hold the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament during 1986 if circumstances are favourable, and we hope this possibility may receive consideration at the appropriate time.

32. My delegation also strongly supports the guidelines for international years adopted in 1980 by the Assembly [*decision 35/424*] and the Economic and Social Council. In view of the urgency and importance of peace, we agreed previously that this International Year warranted that certain exceptions to the guidelines be made, notably in advancing its timing. However, we are not prepared to set aside the guideline that provides that "financing should in principle be based on voluntary contributions". While Canada does not rule out all recourse to the regular budget, we have difficulty with paragraph 4, the financial implications of which, including conference costs, may exceed half a million dollars merely for preparatory activities. It undermines the preambular reference to the guidelines and prejudices paragraph 5, providing for consideration of financial arrangements next year. We would expect that contributions to the voluntary fund for the International Year of Peace would reflect widespread interest in it. Therefore we supported the United States amendment to paragraph 4 [A/38/L.41], by which the fund would be used to finance preparatory activities in the regions. Since it was not adopted, we were obliged to abstain in the vote on the paragraph, while maintaining our support for the draft resolution as a whole.

AGENDA ITEM 34

The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General

33. Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Secretary-General has expressed his pessimism about the possibility of reaching a solution to the problem of the Middle East. In his report on this subject, he states:

"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 . . . Preoccupation with the events in Lebanon has tended to overshadow the consideration of major aspects of the Middle East problem . . ." [See A/38/458, par. 39.]

34. These remarks are correct both in their pessimism and in their affirmation of an important fact concerning the paralysis which afflicts efforts to reach a comprehensive solution to the problem of the Middle East. Since the report of the Secretary-General was published, in September 1983, we have undoubtedly witnessed, and we are still witnessing, new events which demonstrate the exacerbation of the crisis and the deterioration of the situation to a point at which dire consequences are threatened, and there seems to be no justification for hope regarding the solution of the problems referred to by the Secretary-General in his report.

35. The Secretary-General has drawn our attention to the situation in Lebanon. We see unfolding there consecutive chapters of a bloody tragedy, certainly not a mere sectarian or civil war as it would at first seem, which has been pointed out on many occasions by the Lebanese authorities. This tragedy, with all its ramifications, is in fact the natural result of a series of carefully calculated Israeli military and political measures and arrangements within the framework of a comprehensive strategy aimed in the long run at the elimination for ever of the Palestinian question.

36. Through its invasion of Lebanon, Israel has achieved more than one objective. The development of events since that barbaric military invasion has served one purpose—it has distracted the attention of the international community from the new *faits accomplis* which the Israeli Government is working hard to consolidate—or perhaps has already consolidated—in the Arab territories

occupied since 1967, and from escalation of the explosive situation in Lebanon through its persistent refusal to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations, in particular Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), which demand that Israel withdraw forthwith and completely from Lebanon. Israel has thus pushed the Lebanese crisis to the brink of internationalization, with the threat of a confrontation between the two super-Powers. While the question of Palestine is the core of this problem, the real difficulty preventing the achievement of a just and comprehensive settlement is that this is not considered in the national historical, social and humanitarian context of the Arab-Israeli conflict but rather in the context of the traditional rivalry between East and West, or between the United States and the Soviet Union, for spheres of influence. Such a concept, unfortunately, runs counter to all the achievements in the development of international relations; it takes the world back once again to the tension of the cold war and the policies of brinkmanship. In the case of the Middle East, in particular, it also entails the unjust denial of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, recognized by the international community, and of the justifiable aspirations of the other peoples of the Arab region to live in peace and security, free from the danger of Israeli military expansion.

37. The danger in adopting this narrow concept concerning international crises and, in particular, the major political problems which have resulted from decolonization after the Second World War and the replacement of the old colonizer by new colonizers—as is the case regarding South Africa, Namibia and Palestine—is that it gives rise to a clear confusion between the so-called Soviet influence and the efforts to achieve social and national liberation in the countries which aim at consolidating their independence.

38. This oversimplification of the understanding of the conflict in the Middle East—at least on the part of the super-Power which has almost monopolized all efforts to find a comprehensive settlement of the problem in the past decade—has led to the exacerbation of the problem and the deterioration of the situation to the point where the region is like a powder-keg surrounded by fire.

39. There is no doubt that a direct result of dealing with the Arab-Israeli conflict from this perspective was the postponement of the settlement for an extended period when the international community had already determined the rights of all the parties to the conflict in accordance with the historical facts and international law. This postponement, in turn, enabled Israel to prolong its occupation of the Arab territories and to proceed with its expansionist scheme through the annexation of Arab Jerusalem and the Syrian Golan Heights, and the expropriation of the land of the West Bank through the establishment of settlements and its gradual Judaization, in total disregard of any moral or material deterrent, since it is confident that the international community is totally unable to punish it.

40. Israel decided to carry the falsification of reality to absurd lengths. It managed to convince the United States—which is the super-Power monopolizing the mediation role in the efforts for peace in the Middle East—that the problem of the Middle East is linked to the threat of Soviet influence; therefore, the United States must cooperate with Israel to confront this common enemy threatening the security of the region, so Israel claims. This understanding took the form of the strategic co-operation decided upon recently between the two parties in order to face—as President Reagan said when announcing this news—“the danger threatening our mutual interests,

which is the increased Soviet involvement in the Middle East”.

41. More clearly, the Prime Minister of Israel confined this danger to the Syrian Arab Republic, which he said constitutes a major threat to peace in the region through its occupation of 60 per cent of the territory of Lebanon and its stockpiling of Soviet weapons, as well as through the presence of Soviet experts in its territory.

42. The United States commentator James Reston reported that Yitzhak Shamir had said that the purpose of the new agreement was to deter any reckless adventure by Moscow or Damascus.

43. With this twisted logic, in addition to the flagrant and inexplicable disregard of the Palestinian question, which we have always maintained is the crux of the conflict in the region, we wonder whether the United States, or any other State that might accept this perverse logic, would consider any attempt by the Syrian Arab Republic to recover its territory, the Golan Heights, occupied since 1967 by Israel, to which it was then illegally annexed, as a reckless adventure threatening world peace and security.

44. We wonder how there could be common interests between the United States and Israel, which arrogates to itself the right to bomb the nuclear facilities in Iraq, to invade Lebanon, and to use lethal United States weapons such as cluster bombs without restraint or human or moral deterrent, and uses the West Bank as it wishes, so as to Judaize it through terrorism and mass killing.

45. We wonder how there could be common interest between a super-Power and a State the behaviour of which implies contempt for the will of the international community, as expressed in resolutions of the United Nations, and for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

46. Israel is the real material danger undermining the security of the whole region and thereby threatening international peace and security. Consequently, the problem of the Middle East is confined to the continued occupation by Israel of the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, Arab Jerusalem, the Syrian Golan Heights and Lebanon, from which it refuses to withdraw.

47. Proceeding from this fact, the State of Qatar reiterates its support for the Geneva Declaration on Palestine,³ adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, for the resolutions of the United Nations and for the Arab plan for peace in the Middle East,⁴ adopted on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez, as they all express the will of the international community which has consistently called for Israel's unconditional withdrawal from the Arab territories occupied since 1967 and from Lebanon. It has also urged that the Palestinian people be allowed to exercise their national rights, including the right to self-determination and the right to establish an independent State in the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip, including Jerusalem. The Security Council must take measures to guarantee implementation of the relevant resolutions and ensure peace between all States of the region.

48. The solution to the Middle East question depends on implementation of United Nations resolutions. Unless we proceed to solve this dangerous conflict in a manner acceptable to the international community, it will undoubtedly take us into the area of international rivalry, and that can only lead to catastrophe.

49. Mr. BHATT (Nepal): The Middle East has remained a priority area of concern of the United Nations for more than three and a half decades. Regardless of the many

efforts that have been made in addressing the problems of the region, the situation has remained as intractable as ever. Past experience has already shown us that there are no simple answers to the enormous problems facing the region. At the same time, however, it has also become evident that unless the instability of the region and its chances of escalation into a broader conflict can be checked, the dangers to international peace and security will become greater than ever.

50. In this sense, it is disheartening to note that today, when the situation in the region demands a more vigorous approach to a solution of the problems, rising tensions appear to preclude peaceful solutions. In the view of my delegation, the momentum for negotiation, which has lately diminished, urgently needs to be revived so that a comprehensive and just settlement may be found for the region.

51. Any framework for a lasting peace in the Middle East will not be complete unless it takes cognizance of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) still continue to provide an equitable balance on which the fundamental points of negotiation can be based. Among its salient principles, it is imperative, in our opinion, that there be withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied Arab territories, respect for the rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to a State of their own, and that the right of all States to live within secure and recognized boundaries also be respected. Insofar as the recent International Conference on the Question of Palestine supports these essential principles, my country welcomes the initiative taken at that Conference as a step in solving some of the inherent problems facing the region.

52. A comprehensive settlement of the Middle East question is also not possible without creating an environment conducive to negotiation. Any attempt by the parties to obstruct efforts needed to move in this direction cannot but be deplored by my delegation. The Israeli practices in the occupied territories designed to change their legal and demographic character are not only illegal and in defiance of United Nations resolutions, but also serve as a hindrance to the overall settlement required for the region.

53. The ensuing turmoil in the Middle East has also made Lebanon a victim of foreign intervention. The presence of foreign forces and the internecine warfare which, even to this day, envelops the country, continue to tear at the fabric of stability. Any move to restore peace must begin with the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Lebanon. Although there has been partial withdrawal by some forces, we remain hopeful that eventually all foreign forces will be withdrawn in respect for the sovereignty of the country and in order to restore peace and stability within Lebanon.

54. The United Nations, in our view, offers the best forum for the settlement of problems facing the Middle East. As is most evident, the role of the United Nations in dealing with the situation remains as indispensable as ever. The United Nations peace-keeping initiatives have played a useful and constructive role. This role must be further strengthened with the co-operation of all concerned parties in the region.

55. The lack of a large-scale conflict at the present moment should not lull us into a false sense of security and complacency in face of the possible eruption of conflicts that may be brewing. New cycles of violence are complicating the situation, thus making the solution of the complicated problems facing us today more difficult than ever. While there is still time, my delegation considers it important that concrete measures be taken to

start a serious dialogue with a view to averting the dangers that may lie ahead.

56. Mr. NATORF (Poland): Only a few weeks ago, during the general debate, we listened to numerous voices expressing grave concern over the most dangerous trends of the development of the situation in the Middle East. Only a few days ago, during the debate on the question of Palestine, we heard speakers pointing out the dangers stemming from the tensions in the region and their serious implications for international peace and security. Today, the attention of the General Assembly is once again focused on the political and military situation in the area.

57. In his report on the situation the Secretary-General said, *inter alia*: "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". [*Ibid.*] Regrettably, one cannot but agree with that statement. For today, as so often before, we are facing a rapid deterioration of the situation in the Middle East. There is no need to point to its explosiveness. It has already reached an alarming stage. At any moment it could become a pilot light for conflagration on a broad scale, beyond the regional limits.

58. As a result of the Israeli policy of stepped-up armed aggression and escalated expansion in the occupied Arab territories, the general political situation in this most sensitive region has worsened dramatically. Tensions have been heightened to the point where there is the direct danger of a flare-up, while international efforts in search of a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict are at an impasse which becomes ever more impassable. Such developments carry the grave danger of the outbreak of a new armed conflict in the region. Consequently, the prospects of a settlement of the problem are becoming more and more remote. Thus, the real threat to international peace is growing and becoming more alarming.

59. At the root of the present dangerous destabilization of the situation in the Middle East is the policy of global confrontation being pursued by the United States, a policy which is also directly affecting the region. Israel is playing the instrumental role in its implementation. This policy is aimed at promoting United States strategic interests. Within the framework of its objectives, actions are being taken to secure for the United States a monopoly in finding a solution to the Middle East conflict which will suit its interests and enable it to dominate fully the process of negotiations, with total disregard of the interests of the people of Palestine and the other Arab peoples of the region. These schemes and designs are being carried out through military assistance and political support for Israeli aggression in the Middle East, through large-scale deployment of United States military forces in Lebanon and elsewhere in and around the region and through the direct use of force, as proved recently by the combat sorties of the United States Air Force aircraft on bombing missions, as well as the policy of interference in the internal affairs of Lebanon, pursued in the guise of a so-called peacemaker.

60. One of the objectives of the United States and Israeli forces is to break the backbone of the Palestine Liberation Organization [*PLO*] in order to eliminate it from participation in the settlement of the conflict, the main core of which is the question of Palestine—that is, the attainment by the Palestinian people of its legitimate inalienable rights, including the right of return, the right to self-determination and the right to establish its own independent State in Palestine. Both military and political means are applied in the pursuit of this objective. The operations of the Israeli war machine are accompanied by the so-called autonomy formulas, which include non-

recognition of the inalienable Palestinian right to self-determination and to establish a Palestinian State, and *de facto* acceptance of the Israel policy of *faits accomplis* and the deliberate annexation and colonization of Arab territories.

61. Israel's policy of naked aggression, expansionism and diktat towards its Arab neighbours, combined with the recent stance of the United States, including the armed attacks on Syrian positions, has the most destructive impact on the efforts to bring the region closer to a comprehensive, just and lasting peace. Such a policy has for years made it impossible to find a solution to the crisis. It is obvious that such a policy could not be pursued by Israel with such ruthless determination and arrogance but for the unrestricted support and assistance of its strategic ally, the United States.

62. The United States-Israeli partnership has recently been relaunched in an expanded form. The strategic and political ties of these two States have been broadened and strengthened. A joint military committee to arrange for co-operation in such areas as combined planning, joint manoeuvres and the stockpiling of United States equipment in Israel has been created. Further steps in the combined efforts to gain total control of the region include an increase in United States military aid to Israel, resumption of the shipment of cluster bombs and artillery shells made in the United States and the use of United States funds for the development of Israel's armaments.

63. Being sure of Washington's unfailing support, the Israeli authorities can conduct their policy of creeping annexation and the construction of new Israeli settlements on the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. It is irrefutable that these settlements are designed to change demographically the character of those territories. There is no need to prove that only further inflammation of the situation can result from piecemeal and separatist approaches—be they the so-called Camp David process, a peace plan resulting directly from the Israeli aggression in Lebanon last year and based on the assessment of its outcome, or the agreement between Lebanon and Israel, which takes into consideration neither the sovereignty of Lebanon nor the security of the Syrian Arab Republic, but Israeli interests alone. Such approaches only provide further evidence that giving privileges and open favours to the aggressor and neglecting the security considerations of its victims is doomed to lead sooner or later to failure.

64. Poland's unswerving support of the cause of peace in the Middle East has been marked by its consistent stand on the issues of the utmost urgency related to the region. When it served on the Security Council, my country participated in urgent actions aimed at bringing about a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. In the past we have spared no effort to bring about the achievement of the goal of restoring peace and security in the region, and our efforts continue. October 1983 marked the tenth anniversary of the service of Polish soldiers under the United Nations flag. Their soldierly toil provides yet further proof of Poland's strong commitment to the cause of strengthening peace and security in the region and in the world at large.

65. For years, Poland has been firmly and unequivocally presenting its consistent position on the grave situation in the Middle East. For years, we have been pointing to the necessity of taking decisive steps towards the solution of the Middle East issue, which is so crucial for international peace and security. For years, we have been emphasizing that the policy of advancing one's own strategic goals at the expense of the peoples of the Middle East can lead only to a further aggravation of the situation

and that it can be highly detrimental to international peace and security. We have been stressing that, in accordance with the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, there is a need to put an end to Israel's occupation of the Arab territories and, consequently, a need to secure Israeli withdrawal from the territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. We have always rendered our strong support to the Arab peoples, particularly those which, like the Syrian Arab Republic, the PLO and others, are today in the forefront of the struggle against aggression and for the solution of the Middle East conflict.

66. Our stance on Middle East issues has always been derived from the fundamental premises of Poland's foreign policy. It has always stemmed from our concern for our own future and for that of the world. It has always flowed from our active involvement in efforts to find just solutions to acute political problems and to reduce and extinguish the flames of tension.

67. We have always considered that the only path towards the establishment of a lasting peace in the Middle East runs via the search for a comprehensive settlement. That path leads through the recognition of the legitimate interests of others and through the realization that the solution of the Middle East conflict must be based on realistic foundations. Such realistic foundations constitute the essence of the constructive plan of the Soviet Government concerning the settlement of the crisis.⁵ The major provisions of that plan are well known; they are furthermore in agreement with the principles of the solution adopted by the Arab countries at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held last year at Fez.⁴

68. In the process of the joint negotiations which should be started in the search for a comprehensive settlement of the conflict in all its territorial and political aspects, we also see a constructive role for the United Nations, which can promote such a settlement.

69. In conclusion, let me express our hope that this debate and any resolutions adopted will serve well the cause of attaining a viable and peaceful solution for the region, by contributing to the realization that the sharp turn for the worse which is now taking place in the situation is extremely dangerous and requires the intensification of all efforts, so that the forces of peace may prevail over those of aggression and intervention before events get out of control and before it is too late.

70. Mr. FISCHER (Austria): For many decades, the Middle East region has witnessed destructive wars, human suffering, and violence. Over those years, it has developed into one of the most dangerous crisis areas of the world. The implications of the Middle East conflict transcend by far the confines of the region and constitute a direct threat to international peace and security.

71. At the same time, the Middle East conflict clearly shows the limitations the United Nations comes up against in its efforts to help in the search for peace and justice. There is no doubt that the Middle East has been at the centre of concern of the Organization for more than 35 years. During that period, five major wars have been fought between Israel and its Arab neighbours. The United Nations has helped to negotiate armistice agreements. The Security Council and the General Assembly have dealt in many resolutions with various aspects of the Middle East problem, and the United Nations has on several occasions tried to develop blueprints for a peaceful solution. It has dispatched peace-keeping troops to the area and has organized large-scale relief operations. All these activities have certainly been useful.

72. However, in spite of these constructive efforts towards peace, today, as in previous years, we can only

state once more that a comprehensive solution to the Middle East problem and its core issue, the question of Palestine, is yet to be achieved. More than that: developments in the region this year have rendered the attainment of that goal even more difficult. As in other similar cases, however, it would be wrong to blame the United Nations for the lack of results in its efforts directed towards peace. The Organization is an instrument of peace, but it can only operate with the full co-operation of all parties concerned. As we all know, that co-operation can by no means be taken for granted.

73. The main purpose of the General Assembly's annual debates on the Middle East and on the question of Palestine must be to increase international pressure for a solution of the conflict while revealing the basic issues and underlying causes in order to facilitate such a solution.

74. In this connection, it should be clearly recognized that the territorial aspect, as reflected by competing claims to the same piece of land, constitutes the central question of both the Middle East problem and the Palestinian problem. Hence, any effort to reach a solution must first and foremost address this issue. It is for that reason that the future status of the territories occupied by Israel must be the main element of any negotiated solution. Austria therefore fully endorses the repeated call, contained in numerous United Nations resolutions, for the withdrawal of Israel from the occupied territories, including Jerusalem.

75. While fully aware, of course, of the manifold complexities involved in the search for a solution of the Middle East conflict, we remain firmly convinced that the basic point can be put in very simple terms: any settlement formula must be based on Israeli withdrawal in return for peace and the recognition of Israel as a sovereign and independent State. Israel will have to convince itself that restitution of the occupied Arab territories and recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination would be the best investment in the future of the State of Israel. At the same time, Israel, like every other State, has the right to be recognized and to exist within safe and secure boundaries. The realization of that fact by all parties concerned will have to be part of any agreed settlement.

76. Against this background of an urgently needed change of basic perceptions, the current state of affairs in the region can only give rise to serious alarm. Peace efforts in the Middle East have now reached an ominous stalemate, which creates a dangerous atmosphere of drift in the Middle East. Many of those involved seem to pursue short-term, narrowly defined national interests, with dangerous implications for overall developments in the region.

77. In this context, the crisis in Lebanon and the continuing acts of brutal violence occurring in that country give rise to the most grave preoccupations.

78. Israel's invasion of Lebanon has not only resulted in the occupation by Israel of a broad strip of southern Lebanon, it has also diverted attention from the continuation of its settlement policy with regard to the West Bank and the urgent necessity of solving the Palestinian question. This fact—in addition to the very detrimental consequences for the situation and future developments in Lebanon itself—should serve as further impetus for the most rigorous and rapid efforts to find a lasting solution to the crisis in Lebanon. Such a solution must include the restoration of full sovereignty and territorial integrity to Lebanon. No foreign troops should remain in the country without the consent of the Lebanese Government. All efforts must be made in Lebanon in order to achieve national reconciliation by bridging existing internal divisions.

79. For those reasons, Austria welcomed the conclusion of a cease-fire in Lebanon—although precarious and often broken—which, as the events of the last few weeks have shown, must be followed as soon as possible by a political settlement agreed upon by all parties concerned. We therefore hope that efforts to bring about a national reconciliation will soon yield positive results, on the basis of which it will prove possible to rebuild a peaceful and independent Lebanon.

80. Such a reconciliation, however, can last only if a lasting and just solution can be found for the Palestinians living in Lebanon. Thus the crisis in that country exemplifies once more the fact that the Palestinian question is at the centre of the Middle East conflict. There can be no lasting peace in any part of the region without the achievement of the national rights of the Palestinian people. Repression of one people by another can never constitute a viable solution. Hence, a Middle East settlement, if it is to be of a lasting nature, will have to do justice to the Palestinians, a people that has been denied its basic rights for many years. Israel is therefore called upon to reverse its policies in the occupied territories and to respect the duties of an occupying Power defined in the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.⁶ The continued expansion of Israeli settlements, the expropriation of land for this purpose, the eviction, displacement and harassment of the local population are clear violations of international law. These measures also give rise to grave preoccupations of a humanitarian nature which are shared by the international community at large. They are leading towards a silent annexation of the occupied territories by Israel and are seriously jeopardizing any chance for a negotiated settlement.

81. In his statement before the International Conference on Palestine, the Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Erwin Lanc, outlined the principles and concepts which in the view of the Austrian Government need to be observed in the search for a solution to the Middle East conflict. These considerations had first been presented to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session, in 1979 [49th meeting], by the then Federal Chancellor, Mr. Bruno Kreisky. They are based on the following fundamental facts: first, the State of Israel is a reality and has the right to exist within safe and secure boundaries; secondly, the existence of the Palestinian people is also a reality; like every other people, the Palestinian people has national rights, including the right to its own State; thirdly, the PLO is the representative of the Palestine people; fourthly, the use of force is not a legitimate means for the acquisition of territory; Israel must therefore withdraw from the occupied territories.

82. Recent events underscore dramatically the necessity for the PLO to find the way back to unity. This is of paramount importance, because unity is an essential prerequisite for a truly effective representation of Palestinian rights. We are convinced that with regard to the Middle East conflict—as with all other international conflicts—only negotiations between the parties directly involved can bring about a genuine and lasting solution. Any formula imposed upon them from outside cannot but fail, owing to the lack of consent by those concerned. Austria therefore continues to advocate the initiation, without any pre-conditions, of exploratory talks between the PLO and Israel.

83. Starting from the *status quo*, such talks would aim at taking stock of all problems involved as well as of the respective positions of the two parties. In spite of the existing psychological and political obstacles, these exploratory talks could generate a potential of confidence-

building, which has so far been left unexplored, and could reveal the shape of a possible negotiated solution. Thus, the exploratory talks would indicate the right direction and encourage the parties to commence formal negotiations.

84. We know, of course, how difficult it will be to reverse the process of mutual fear and distrust which has built up over the last decades. Therefore, the dialogue we are advocating requires of both sides, Palestinians and Israelis, that they rise above the shadow of old and deep-rooted resentments, prejudices and sad experiences. It would, however, be a highly dangerous illusion for any party to the conflict to assume that a lasting solution can be obtained by force rather than by negotiations.

85. The vicious circle of violence which has cast the Middle East region into turmoil for so long must finally be stopped. This requires a fundamental change in the political consciousness. Ultimately, the solution must come out of a new mental, political and psychological attitude of those, on both sides, who bear political responsibility.

86. The history of the Middle East conflict is to a large extent also the history of opportunities for peace that have remained unused and of peace initiatives that have not been reciprocated and implemented in time. Only meaningful dialogue can provide the necessary harmonization of attitudes and views to facilitate the process towards peace in the Middle East. Austria remains convinced that the United Nations, as the only world-wide forum open to all parties to the conflict, where all interested Powers can make their contribution, offers unique possibilities for progress in the search for a peaceful solution to the Middle East conflict. Let us take up this challenge and let us here at the United Nations combine our efforts to advance a constructive exchange of views and pave the way for serious negotiations.

87. Mr. KORHONEN (Finland): The situation in the Middle East is often perceived as a regional conflict. This belittles the pivotal political, economic and strategic importance of the region, which transcends the regional confines of the conflict. Global interests make the Middle East a scene of global competition and confrontation. The use of force in the area is on the increase again and it is assuming new and ever-more-alarming dimensions. The cycle of violence fuels a continuous arms race. It has made the Middle East an area with one of the heaviest concentrations of sophisticated weapons in the world.

88. Finland remains committed to a political settlement of the Middle East conflict through negotiation in accordance with the basic documents of the United Nations—Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973)—governing the achievement of a solution.

89. In our view, the basic principles of a peaceful settlement remain immutable. The acquisition of territory by force is inadmissible. Israel must withdraw from the Arab territories it has occupied since 1967. It is imperative that the right of existence within secure and recognized borders of all States in the region, including Israel, be guaranteed. Provision must be made for the legitimate rights of the Palestinians, including their right to national self-determination. The Palestinians and the PLO, as their most significant representative, have the right to participate in all negotiations on the implementation of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians in the context of a comprehensive solution to the problem of the Middle East.

90. My Government has given and will continue to give its support to all proposals and initiatives that aim at a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. During the last few years, we have seen some promising departures from previously-held rigid positions. A process

towards a negotiated settlement should finally get under way, slow and painful though it may turn out to be. It is essential that such a process be encouraged. In this connection, the United Nations has an essential role to play.

91. In accordance with its policy of neutrality, Finland has taken an impartial and conciliatory position on the various controversial issues in the Middle East. We have thus maintained good relations with all the nations concerned, including the most immediate parties to the dispute. It is our intention to continue this policy and thereby preserve the confidence of all parties to the conflict. Thus, we have been able to render such peaceful services as are required to all concerned. One tangible expression of this is the contribution which Finland has made to all United Nations peace-keeping activities in the area from the very beginning. At the moment, Finland maintains a full battalion in both the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, and it also has a contingent in the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine.

92. Steps towards a comprehensive solution in the Middle East seem to have met with insurmountable obstacles. A major obstacle has been—and is—the settlement policy of the Government of Israel in the occupied territories. The *de facto* annexation of the Golan Heights has been condemned by the entire international community. Unilateral actions designed to change the status of Jerusalem, the Holy City of three great faiths, are universally considered illegal and have been declared as such. There is growing frustration and despair in the occupied West Bank and in Gaza. Israel's actions are also in contradiction with its obligations under Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

93. The tension thus created has spread throughout the region. In particular, it is affecting Lebanon. My Government has followed the tragic events in Lebanon with growing concern. Lebanon has become a hapless victim of all the different disputes and conflicts resulting from the unresolved basic problems in the Middle East. This has taken place at the cost of the suffering of the civilian population, indigenous as well as Palestinian refugees. We appeal to all parties to refrain from any further acts of violence and border violations and to respect the independence, territorial integrity and national sovereignty of Lebanon, which is a prerequisite for the restoration of Lebanese authority over its own territory within internationally recognized borders. Conditions should be created for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanese soil.

94. There is no region in the world where the need for peace is more urgent than in the Middle East—not only for the peoples who live there but for all nations. Although the final success of any solution depends on the parties concerned—including those so far neglected during the negotiations—the leading military Powers, and also those occupying the major part of Lebanese territory, have a special responsibility to act in the interest of peace. The use of force and violence, whatever the justification claimed for it, negates peace. The only way to peace is through negotiation and compromise. That is what the Charter of the United Nations enjoins nations to do.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.

NOTES

¹The delegations of Guinea, Mali and Nicaragua subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote against the amendment.

²The delegation of Nicaragua subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

³See *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.

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

⁵*Ibid.*, Supplement for July, August and September 1982, document S/15403.

⁶United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973, p. 287.