



CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 126:

Recent illegal Israeli measures in the occupied Arab territories designed to change the legal status, geographical nature and demographic composition of those territories in contravention of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, of Israel's international obligations under the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and of United Nations resolutions, and obstruction of efforts aimed at achieving a just and lasting peace in the Middle East (*continued*) 889

President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).

In the absence of the President, Mr. Molapo (Lesotho), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 126

Recent illegal Israeli measures in the occupied Arab territories designed to change the legal status, geographical nature and demographic composition of those territories in contravention of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, of Israel's international obligations under the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and of United Nations resolutions, and obstruction of efforts aimed at achieving a just and lasting peace in the Middle East (*continued*)

1. Mr. BOYA (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of the People's Republic of Benin supported the inclusion in the agenda of the question covered by item 126 relating to recent illegal Israeli measures in the occupied Arab territories for two fundamental reasons. First of all, the People's Republic of Benin is fundamentally opposed to any policy of occupation or annexation of territories belonging to other States because such a policy is tantamount to an act of aggression that we must, at all costs, condemn and combat. The policy of Israel in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, like all similar policies that my country has denounced, is an act of aggression fraught with danger to the peace and security sought by all States in the region.

2. The second reason underlying our support of the Egyptian initiative is the fact that the international community is being given a new opportunity to take cognizance of a new and imminent danger threatening the peoples of the Middle East. The systematic colonization of territories, part of a global policy which the new, reactionary leaders of Israel seek to pursue, is tantamount to a policy of annexation of the Arab territories. Such annexation is undoubtedly an integral part of the panoply of arrogant and threatening acts to which the Zionists have accustomed

us. What is striking and even shocking, though, is the fact that this policy is being carried out at a time when every effort is being made to achieve a peaceful settlement of all problems related to the Middle East crisis.

3. Why, then, this intransigence and this reckless policy precisely at a time when all efforts are being made to convene the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East? Why does Israel obstruct every attempt at a peaceful settlement?

4. To reply to these two fundamental questions, my delegation will not beat about the bush but will speak frankly. The People's Republic of Benin has stated again and again and has denounced openly the two-faced game of the reactionary, imperialist forces in this question of the Middle East crisis.

5. The reactionary imperialist forces talk a great deal about peace; they propose plan after plan and make countless declarations of intent, in order to make the world believe that they want peace, that their protégé, the State of Israel, wants peace, when in actual fact they are engaged in a well-organized scheme to deceive the Arab leaders and stifle the determination of the Arab nations to free themselves from the Zionist yoke and from imperialism.

6. Logically, when we speak of peace, all acts should be honestly placed in that context. But the imperialists obstinately refuse to match their words with deeds. Are we not therefore entitled to speak of deception?

7. If the supporters of Israel and the Israeli leaders want peace, it is now that they must take the opportunity to act accordingly. The supporters of Israel, the Western Powers, must understand the severity of our judgement of their actions vis-à-vis the State of Israel. We ask them to stop deceiving us.

8. If the Western Powers, and particularly the United States, are sincere in their peace initiative, in their various declarations of intention, then we ask them not only to denounce this policy of annexation—the establishment of Jewish settlements in the occupied territories—but to loosen their ties of solidarity with Israel and to condemn it not only on paper but by taking appropriate measures in order to exert pressure on Israel to induce it to renounce a policy that will certainly lead to further suffering for the Arab and Palestinian peoples.

9. My delegation is a sponsor of draft resolution A/32/L.3 and Add.1 and 2. The contents of this very well-balanced draft resolution submitted by the Egyptian delegation is further proof of the goodwill for peace of the Arab States.

10. My delegation would have wished for a stiffer resolution on Israel, for the reasons of principle we mentioned at the beginning of our statement. However, we support the Egyptian draft as a draft consensus which takes into account the positions of all concerned.

11. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): When in the past the Arab delegations denounced from this rostrum Israel's policy, its expansionism and its annexation of the occupied Arab territories and the establishment of settlements as a tactical measure and as part of this strategic expansionist plan devised by world Zionism, represented by the Government of Israel, the representatives of Israel denied that it was government policy to establish these settlements.

12. That is a thing of the past because Begin has assumed power and he himself has confirmed what the representatives of Israel previously denied. Shamelessly and unscrupulously Begin and yesterday his representative here, have disclosed what his predecessors tried to conceal. He has arrogantly begun to state and execute an Israeli policy designed to annex Arab territories by force. Yesterday we had an example of this policy when the representative of Israel spoke [47th meeting].

13. Successive Israeli Governments since the aggression of 1967 have without exception included in their plans the implementation of a Zionist scheme to implant settlements. The only difference has been the timing and approach chosen. Since 1967 there have been five Israeli Governments: Golda Meir's first government in March 1969 her second government in December of the same year; her third in March 1974; the Rabin Government in June 1974 and finally the present Begin government. All of them, without exception, carried out a single plan, approved by everyone, a plan designed to establish more settlements in the occupied Arab territories in order to annex more territory, to impose a fait accompli and to prevent any initiative to establish a just and lasting peace in the area.

14. Begin's recent reply to the charge that his Government was establishing and legitimizing settlements—namely that the settlements had been authorized by previous Israeli Governments—confirms what we have just said and what Israel has denied in the past. Israel is hurling another challenge at us today, for it is neither denying nor concealing its illegal acts. It defies world opinion and even the advice of its close friends by trying to annex land and sabotage all peace efforts.

15. The Israelis claim that they are not annexing any occupied Arab territory because, according to them, these are not Arab territories or occupied territories, but rather their liberated territories. Over these territories they arrogate to themselves rights which have no basis in law, claiming that international law and the fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, particularly its article 49,¹ do not apply to the occupied territories. They deny that they are annexing these territories. They use a strange logic by saying that they are not annexing anything, merely liberating the territories. They claim that the Jews have the

right to establish themselves wherever they please in the Arab territories. A Jew from the Soviet Union, for example, has the right to live in any part of Arab territory, while the right of return is denied to the authentic inhabitants of these territories for reasons based on differences of religion and race. They even avoid naming the occupied Arab territories by their true names, calling them instead at times "liberated territories" and at times "administered territories" and sometimes, rarely, when ashamed, just "territories", or they even use the old religious names. But never do they call them occupied Arab territories. They claim that the new settlements are not being created in territories belonging to the Arabs. The representative of Israel said this yesterday, and I do not want to try to refute in detail his allegations and his claims. What we should do is to refer to the members of Knesset who have rejected this thesis, as was reported by Jason Morris in the *Christian Science Monitor* on 20 July last.

16. The Begin Government persists shamelessly in defying the world by its choice of time to announce such a policy and to reaffirm it whenever attempts are renewed to bring about the convening of the Geneva Peace Conference in order to thwart every new endeavour to prevent the scourge of war in that region and in the world.

17. The number of Israeli settlements in the occupied Arab territories known so far are just the tip of an iceberg covered by waves of Israeli propaganda. In addition to those settlements announced publicly by the Israeli Government there are others set up by the Government in order to execute a secret plan, all the details of which have not yet been revealed. Furthermore, Israel's Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Ariel Sharon, has confirmed this. He is the Minister who presides over the ministerial committee concerned with the establishment of the settlements in the various Arab territories. In a statement to the newspaper *Ma'ariv*, he refused to reveal the exact number of these new, secret settlements. He reaffirmed what was said by *The New York Times* on 11 September last, namely, that many of these settlements have been established last month on the West Bank and that the time has not come to announce their existence. I have no doubt that this will be announced when new measures are taken to try to achieve peace.

18. What the Foreign Minister of Israel, Mr. Dayan, said during this session [27th meeting] about the settlements, when he claimed that they were not a factor in the delimitation of frontiers, was nothing but a contradiction of what he had affirmed on other occasions, namely, that when Israel establishes settlements, it does not plant seeds in movable pots, but it plants trees whose roots run deep and cannot be pulled out. Do such facts agree with Israel's claim that everything is negotiable? According to Israel, the occupied Arab land is liberated land; Jerusalem, it believes, is a unified city; the return of the refugees and the establishment of a Palestinian national homeland, according to the Israeli plans, can never be realized and the settlements are there to stay. I really wonder what it is that Israel has omitted from its calculations and what it considers to be negotiable.

19. Mr. Mordechai Zipori, member of the ministerial committee on settlements, declared on 10 October—having chosen a time when the world press was announcing the

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75 (No. 973), p. 287.

possible resumption of the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East—that it had been decided to establish six or seven settlements in which a group called Gush Emunim could settle within the next few days. He added that an agreement had been reached between the Prime Minister and the heads of that group on the establishment of other settlements and assured its announcement before the end of the year. This was reported in *The New York Times* on 11 October 1977.

20. As will be seen by the vote on the draft resolution submitted by Egypt yesterday [A/32/L.3/Rev.1], the world is unanimous in denouncing the expansionist policy of Israel and its efforts to block peace, as well as in requesting Israel to stop establishing settlements in the occupied Arab territories. Everyone has denounced this policy, even the press that is friendly to Israel. Israel has chosen to stand alone and to defy the world, but there is no doubt that this challenge and violation of the law is being supported, for I do not believe that any nation, regardless of its power or strength, could continue such defiance for so long.

21. What is encouraging Israel in its defiant attitude, even though such an attitude is dangerous for the world? Israel can accept these denunciations so long as it continues to receive economic and military aid and voluntary gifts from its friends despite all the efforts made to prevent this and to prevent Israel from pursuing this policy.

22. I should like to comment on what the representative of Israel said yesterday. I do not know how he can be so arrogant as to talk in this way and to defy the world from this rostrum. We will not descend to the same level of fabrication and use the same words as he did. He accused the Arabs of being anti-Semitic because they claim their rights and want United Nations resolutions implemented. With his strange logic he accused those who do not agree with him of being Nazis. Has the representative of Israel forgotten that Ben-Gurion accused Begin of being a Nazi? To accuse the Arabs of being anti-Semitic is pure demagoguery because the Arabs are Semites themselves and it is Israel that is practising anti-Semitism against the Arabs.

23. Faced with this constant challenge to international law, world public opinion and to all the values of world civilization, I wonder whether we should not take measures to put an end to this banditry and demagoguery practised at the international level.

24. Mr. YANKOV (Bulgaria): The Government and people of Bulgaria have followed with increasing attention and concern the development of recent events in the Middle East. This is quite natural bearing in mind the fact that my country, situated in close geographic proximity to this area of conflict, is keenly interested in the establishment of a just and lasting peace there.

25. The general debate at the current session has shown unambiguously that it is high time that the present stalemate in the Middle East conflict which has lasted beyond all measure was ended and the matter was put on the road towards a comprehensive political settlement. Such a policy line has received favourable endorsement by the overwhelming majority of Member States. Furthermore, there is a propitious political momentum at hand in this

respect. I have in mind the joint Soviet Union-United States statement on the Middle East of 1 October.

26. Quite regrettably, however, not only does Israel not co-operate in the search for a solution to the present impasse but is apparently interested in perpetuating the existing situation. This conclusion is substantiated by reports coming in that Israel has embarked upon actions and measures leading to the establishment of Israeli settlements on the West Bank of the River Jordan and in the Gaza Strip and has extended its laws and oppressive practices over that area. This is an escalation of the illegal occupation of the Arab territories and constitutes a further violation of international law.

27. These actions demonstrate the attempts of the Israeli authorities, through the tactics of "faits accomplis", to prepare the ground for affirming the annexation of the Arab territories and to consolidate their domination there. As a matter of fact, Israel in all arrogance does not even bother to conceal its expansionist intentions. In his statement yesterday the Israeli representative surpassed himself in his efforts, through legalistic fallacies and the theory of the so-called "defensive conquest", to prove that Israel's presence in the occupied Arab territories was allegedly in conformity with international law. He tried in vain to find arguments both from history and as security considerations to prove his case. He tried in vain to convince us that the fourth Geneva Convention was not applicable to the occupied Arab territories. Claiming that delegations were either not interested in the facts or were ignorant or confused on the legal aspects of the matter, the Israeli representative spared neither time nor effort to enlighten the audience by abundant references to article 49 of the said Convention. But in his zeal for legal arguments he somehow indulged himself by one omission, namely to quote the last paragraph of article 49 which stipulates that: "The Occupying Power shall not deport or transfer parts of its own civilian population into the territory it occupies." This provision speaks for itself and does not need the learned interpretation of the Israeli representative. So far as the facts are concerned there is no doubt whatsoever that the Israeli Government, in overt violation of international law, including the Geneva Convention to which Israel is a party, has taken all legislative, administrative and other practical measures to change the demographic character and institutional structure of the occupied territories through the establishment there of Israeli settlements which in some instances would qualify as a colonization of those territories. The Israeli Government itself has unequivocally recognized these facts.

28. It is a generally recognized moral and legal tenet that there could be no legitimate recognition of territorial gains obtained as a result of the threat or use of force. Such acquisition of territory constitutes a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the principles of international law. This fundamental principle was further reaffirmed in such important instruments of the United Nations as the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [resolution 2625 (XXV), annex] and the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 2734 (XXV)].

29. Any deviation from this principle is also in direct contradiction with well-known resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on the situation in the Middle East. It is hardly necessary to prove that illegal occupation does not entitle the occupying State to carry out any changes whatsoever which could affect the status of the inhabitants and the demographic character and legal status of the occupied territories themselves.

30. The illegal measures enforced by the Israeli Government in the Palestinian and the other occupied Arab territories with the objective of changing their demographic, economic, cultural and other characteristics are yet another proof of the intransigence of the Israeli Government and its defiant refusal to comply with the overwhelming view of the international community and with the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations. It constitutes another inadmissible manifestation of Israel's failure to live up to its fundamental obligations which it assumed when it was admitted to the United Nations. Consequently, there are good reasons why this attitude of the Israeli Government should arouse such widespread condemnation.

31. The provocative behaviour of the Israeli Government, substantiated by the establishment of Israeli settlements in the occupied Arab territories, not only is an expression of its aggressive and expansionist strategy but is further evidence of its policy of obstruction with regard to the peaceful settlement of the existing international conflict. This is all the more regrettable at this moment when significant efforts are being made to convene the Geneva Conference on the Middle East. In our view, it is the duty of the United Nations to take the necessary political actions in order to avoid any further obstacles for the just solution of the Middle East crisis.

32. In our submission draft resolution A/32/L.3/Rev.1, while expressing deep concern about the situation created by Israel through its policy of establishing settlements in the occupied Arab territories, contains the appropriate political measures to be undertaken by the United Nations.

33. The draft resolution as it stands corresponds to the consistent policy of my country with regard to the situation in the Middle East. In his statement on 30 September in the general debate at the current session, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bulgaria stated:

“The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria remains convinced that genuine peace in the Middle East is possible only under the following conditions: the complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967; the exercise of the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to an independent State; and respect for the independence, existence and security of all the countries in the area. We believe that the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East should be reconvened, without any further procrastination, with the participation of all interested parties, including from the very outset, and with equal rights, the Palestine Liberation Organization as the sole legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine.” [14th meeting, para. 180.]

34. In line with this policy, my delegation will lend its support to the draft resolution and will vote for it.

35. Mr. GHEORGHE (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): The concern of the United Nations with the situation prevailing in the Arab territories occupied by Israel at the end of the 1967 war stems from a number of fundamental reasons.

36. First, the Arab territories occupied at the end of the 1967 armed conflict do not belong to Israel and cannot be annexed. In the end they must be restored to their rightful owners. In this connexion, there are well-established and generally recognized rules of international law which proclaim the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and the obligation flowing therefrom to restore all territories occupied by such means. Those rules were recognized in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [resolution 2625 (XXV), annex] of 24 October 1970, in which the General Assembly solemnly proclaimed that:

“The territory of a State shall not be the object of military occupation resulting from the use of force in contravention of the provisions of the Charter. The territory of a State shall not be the object of acquisition by another State resulting from the threat or use of force. No territorial acquisition resulting from the threat or use of force shall be recognized as legal.”

37. Romania considers that the occupation of foreign territories is in complete contradiction with the principles of the United Nations Charter and with the provisions of other fundamental documents of this world Organization. In addition, as the evolution of the situation in the Middle East bears out, the occupation of foreign territories engenders a state of tension, is fraught with danger of new conflicts and constitutes a permanent source of violation of fundamental human rights. That is why my country has always emphasized the need for the evacuation of the occupied Arab territories and a just settlement of the question of the Palestinian people which would enable that people to decide its own destiny, to establish its own free and independent state and to enjoy all the rights flowing therefrom.

38. Secondly, the concern of the United Nations with what is happening in the occupied Arab territories is due to the fact that the occupying authorities have taken measures that are contrary to the obligations incumbent upon them under the conventional and customary rules of international law. Thus, the Israeli Government announced last July and August that it was authorizing the creation of three new Israeli settlements on the West Bank of the Jordan, and that it was granting legal status to the settlements already established in the Arab territories occupied after the 1967 war. At the same time, the Israeli authorities have stated their decision to apply Israeli laws and regulations in the occupied Arab territories.

39. It is obvious that such measures are in contradiction with the stipulations of the fourth Geneva Convention. In our view, those measures represent acts having the most

serious implications which represent new obstacles on the road to a peaceful political settlement of the Middle East conflict. Romania considers that the measures advocated by the Israeli Government aimed at perpetuating the occupation of foreign territory are incompatible with international law. Such measures do no more than feed from a new source the conflict in the region, while increasing mistrust and seriously damaging the interests of the peoples in the region.

40. We must not forget that the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council themselves, which enunciate the fundamental principles on the basis of which the Middle East conflict must be settled, lay down, *inter alia*, the obligation on Israel to evacuate the Arab territories occupied after the 1967 war. Now, it is difficult to maintain that the measures we are discussing are compatible with such an obligation. Quite the contrary, those measures and any other measure of the same kind clearly show that an attempt is being made to promote a policy of fait accompli, something that is far from advancing the cause of the establishment of a just and durable peace in the region.

41. My country has always denounced acts and measures aimed at changing the status of the occupied Arab territories because it considers that neither Israel nor anyone else has the right to change the situation in those territories by force. We consider that the Israeli authorities must respect the United Nations resolutions by virtue of which it is inadmissible to change the demographic characteristics of the city of Jerusalem. My country speaks out firmly in favour of the implementation of the United Nations resolutions relating to respect for human rights in the occupied Arab territories.

42. Of course, respect of the status of the occupied Arab territories can scarcely become an end in itself. Foreign occupation, even if it is exercised with the most rigorous respect for the rules of humanitarian international law, still remains an illegal, unjust situation which runs counter to the fundamental principles of the Charter.

43. That is why we believe that the fundamental objective of the United Nations must be to decide upon an over-all settlement of the Middle East conflict which would lead to the restoration of legality and the restitution of the territories that belong to other peoples. In this connexion I should like to recall that my country considers that in order to achieve a political settlement of the Middle East conflict it is necessary that Israel withdraw its troops from the Arab territories occupied after the 1967 war; that the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination be recognized, including their right to establish or constitute their own independent State; and that the existing territorial integrity and the right to the free and independent development of all States in the region be guaranteed.

44. The Palestinian people being one of the fundamental parties involved in the Middle East conflict, we are of the opinion that a just and durable peace could not be negotiated without the participation of its legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization.

45. It is in the light of these considerations that the Romanian delegation supports the draft resolution put

forward by a number of delegations in document A/32/L.3/Rev.1, as well as any other proposal based on the desire to maintain and increase the chances of a just and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict.

46. Mr. ABE (Japan): Regarding this specific item which has been added to the agenda of the current session at the request of the Government of Egypt, my delegation would like, first of all, to reaffirm the basic view of the Government of Japan towards the peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem, which can be summarized as follows.

47. The basis for attaining peace in the Middle East lies in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), plus the realization of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people under the Charter of the United Nations, particularly their right to self-determination.

48. The acquisition and occupation of territories by force cannot be allowed and, accordingly, Israeli armed forces should be withdrawn from all the territories occupied in the war of 1967. At the same time, the political independence and territorial integrity of all the countries concerned, including Israel, should be guaranteed. It is just as necessary that the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people be recognized and fulfilled in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

49. These points were underlined by a great number of delegations in their statements in the general debate at the current session, and it would not be an exaggeration to say that they constitute an international consensus on which the solution of the problem should be based.

50. An early reconvening of a Geneva Peace Conference is a focal point of the various moves related to current peace-seeking efforts. As a result of intensive consultations made during the last several weeks by the Governments concerned, the dawn of a Geneva Peace Conference begins to appear.

51. My Government highly appreciates the painstaking and serious efforts of those Governments and sincerely hopes that the remaining obstacles to reconvening the Geneva Conference will be surmounted in a spirit of mutual accommodation among the parties concerned and that this Conference will become an important break-through towards the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

52. From this basic point of view, we cannot but express our concern over the situation created in the occupied Arab territories by the measures and actions of Israel designed to change the legal status, geographic nature and demographic composition of the territories. It should be recalled that such measures of the Government of Israel have already been disavowed by the Security Council in November last year. In his statement on 27 September this year in the general debate of the current session the Foreign Minister of Japan specifically stated that

“... the Government of Japan considers most regrettable the measures which the Government of Israel has been taking with regard to settlements on the West Bank of the

River Jordan. We strongly urge the Government of Israel to refrain from any measures which may alter the *status quo*, thus rendering the solution to the problem even more difficult.” [8th meeting, para. 74.]

53. It is therefore most deplorable that according to press reports the Israeli Government still persists in carrying out the establishment of new settlements in the areas concerned.

54. Since what is now at stake in the Middle East is to create conditions which would make possible the earliest reconvening of the Geneva Peace Conference aimed at achieving a just and lasting peace, it is to be deeply regretted that one of the parties concerned has taken measures and actions which may obstruct those peace endeavours.

55. My Government would like strongly to appeal anew to the Government of Israel to desist from taking such measures and actions. Draft resolution A/32/L.3/Rev.1, which was introduced by Egypt and is sponsored by a number of delegations, goes along with our view. My delegation is ready to support it, if it is put to the vote.

56. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) (*interpretation from French*): For three decades now the question of the Middle East has been a source of concern to the United Nations. Four destructive wars and a permanent state of tension have been the predominating characteristics of the situation prevailing in that region for more than 30 years.

57. In the present debate, it should be noted that after the 1967 hostilities Israel has not only continued to occupy territory of three States Members of our Organization but has, moreover, taken steps designed to change the character and structure of those territories.

58. The General Assembly and the Security Council have repeatedly considered this aspect of the question. That means that the question is not new to us; however, it has now acquired another dimension with the recent proliferation of settlements in the occupied territories. Those settlements are properly the subject of agenda item 126.

59. In this connexion my country's position has been clearly stated on many occasions. Very recently, speaking in the General Assembly on 27 September 1977, our Foreign Minister specifically stated the Iranian Government's position as follows:

“Recent moves by Israel in imposing its laws on the inhabitants of the West Bank and authorizing new Jewish settlements in the occupied Arab lands have created new obstacles on the road to peace. We hope, however, that genuine efforts will be made to put an end to this uneasy and precarious situation.” [9th meeting, para. 220.]

An alarming situation has thus been created in a region which was already marked by great tension. But what alarms us even more is that the above-mentioned steps have been taken by Israel at a time when efforts to achieve a just and equitable settlement of the question are seriously under way. In the circumstances, we cannot fail to point out a certain contradiction between the professions of faith by Israeli authorities to avoid everything which might jeopardize the prospects of a definitive solution of the conflict

and the steps which they have continued to take to change the geographic and demographic nature of the territories concerned.

60. The illegal nature of these steps is clear. First of all, the Charter of our Organization does not recognize the acquisition of territories by the use of force. Furthermore, the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, which Israel has signed, together with many other States Members of our Organization, prohibits the occupying Power from transferring part of its civilian population into territories it occupies. Finally, the Security Council and the General Assembly have repeatedly requested Israel to refrain from taking such measures. All this clearly shows that this is a serious situation.

61. We believe that it is in the interest of Israel itself to respect its own international obligations and to comply in particular with the recommendations of the United Nations.

62. During this year's general debate, Israel maintained that the settlements would not prejudice its final frontiers with the neighbouring Arab countries and will not impede the efforts to find a just and lasting peace in the region. Such a statement is surprising, because the least that can be said is that the establishment of these settlements in the occupied Arab territories, accompanied by other equally illegal steps such as the expulsion of the inhabitants of these territories and the extension of the occupying Power's laws and regulations to them, creates serious obstacles on the road to peace.

63. These measures are also out of keeping with the recommendations of the main bodies of the United Nations with regard to the preservation of the legal status and demographic nature of the occupied territories.

64. It is not enough to affirm the will to respect international law; it is also necessary to refrain from committing acts which compromise the prospects for a just and lasting settlement of the question. By the recent measures taken on the West Bank of the Jordan, Israel has disregarded the decisions of the United Nations. Faced with that situation, we must clearly reject all measures designed to change the legal status and demographic character of the occupied territories. Our Organization must remind Israel of its international obligations and strive to create conditions that will facilitate the establishment of a just and lasting peace throughout the region.

65. It is in this spirit that my delegation, together with more than 60 other delegations, has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/32/L.3/Rev.1. We hope that it will receive the unanimous approval of the General Assembly.

66. Mrs. GBUJAMA (Sierra Leone): The policy of the Sierra Leone Government on the Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East has constantly been based, firstly on the inadmissibility of Israel's acquisition of Arab lands by force and the restoration of those Israeli-occupied territories; secondly, on the recognition of the right of the Palestinians to a homeland of their own; and, thirdly, on the right of each and every State in the area, including Israel, to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

67. Fully recognizing that those elements together must form the basic ingredients for any peace in the area, my Government not only has actively supported all United Nations resolutions affirming those principles but has followed with keen interest all the developments tending towards a peaceful settlement in the area. One fact among others has always loomed large in our observations, namely, Israel's recalcitrance in not respecting the decisions of even the highest body of the Organization, to which it owes its very existence, as well as its contemptuous disregard of the pressures from the international community, as demonstrated by the hundreds of pleas made to it from this rostrum to give up those lands, and by free Africa's breaking off of diplomatic relations with it.

68. Outside this Assembly several untiring efforts have been made towards peace in the area by our own Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, and his representatives, by African leaders, by the United States and the Soviet Union jointly, and by the United States alone. The latest efforts of the United States towards the convening of peace talks in Geneva with the appropriate participants have, again to world disappointment and dismay, been prejudiced by the action of Israel's new Government of Prime Minister Begin in deciding not only to recognize and legalize existing Jewish settlements but to establish new ones in the Israeli-occupied Arab territories.

69. Of that act the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sierra Leone and leader of its delegation to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, Mr. Abdulai Conteh, had this to say:

"... we regard the establishment of Jewish settlements on the West Bank and other areas of Israeli-occupied territory and the recently disclosed Sharon plan for further settlements in those areas to be not only patently illegal... but also a real impediment to the efforts now being undertaken to bring peace to that area..."

"We therefore call upon Israel to discontinue plans for the establishment of new settlements and to dismantle those already established." [17th meeting, paras. 127-128.]

70. In the general debate during the thirty-first session of the General Assembly also, Mr. F. M. Minah, then Minister for Foreign Affairs and leader of the Sierra Leone delegation, said:

"The Middle East continues to present a problem of grave dimensions. Israel continues to occupy Arab lands and, contemptuous of public outcry, is going ahead with its plans to build Jewish settlements on those lands. The continuing presence of Israel in the Arab territories it acquired by force, and its violation of the sacred rights of the Palestinian people must clearly be regarded as a grave threat to peace and security in that region. We advocate full compliance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), as we feel sure that a lasting solution can only be found through compliance with the provisions of these resolutions."²

71. It is not enough for Israel to evade the issue by justifying its presence in the territories by reference to an absence of "tension and revolt" or talk of "growing prosperity" and "coexistence", or by discussing the action of other States, which has now become history. What is the issue? The issue which Israel is trying to evade is peace, and what the 69 sponsors, including the Sierra Leone delegation, of draft resolution A/32/L.3/Rev.1, which we hope will receive the unanimous support of this Assembly, are trying to say to Israel is that peace will be impossible as long as it continues its policy of expansion aimed at presenting the world with a fait accompli through unilateral measures designed to change the legal status, geographical nature and demographic composition of the occupied Arab territories. Israel's latest action clearly contravenes the United Nations Charter, United Nations resolutions on the subject and Israel's international obligations under the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, article 49 of which states: "The Occupying Power shall not deport or transfer parts of its own civilian population into the territory it occupies".

72. Sierra Leone has joined the sponsors in requesting the General Assembly to determine Israel's action as constituting a serious obstruction of efforts towards a lasting peace, because Israel's action can only be intended to retain permanent control over Arab lands, thereby prejudging what may be the outcome of any negotiations in Geneva or elsewhere. Israel cannot want peace and at the same time infuriate the opponent. My delegation joins the other sponsors in deploring this act and calls upon Israel to desist forthwith from any further such action.

73. Israel has often posed as an outpost of human rights in the Middle East, battered left, right and centre by Arab nations whose sole aim, it thinks, is to annihilate it completely. This posture has not failed to win Israel world sympathy, as evidenced by statements even of representatives who have no diplomatic relations with it reaffirming Israel's right to exist within secure and recognized boundaries. And, among other things, it has also guaranteed Israel a steady flow of United States arms, money and goodwill, not to speak of emotional support from the large Jewish community of the United States, all of which, it would seem, it has not used wisely.

74. The sympathy and support Israel has thus received has been used only to grab extra territory in support of a plan which we suspect is inspired by a Jewish *lebensraum*, as was stated in my Minister's statement in the general debate. Thus Israel's latest move in the occupied territories is a clear indication of who is the real oppressor in the Middle East: it is the many millions who have been dispossessed, if not displaced, that are the victims who have lost their human rights.

75. The statement of Israel to this Assembly invites all members to visit the territories to investigate conditions for themselves. Well, an account of one such recent visit by Mr. T. D. Allman of the University of California at Berkeley provides useful information. Allow me to read just a few excerpts from that account. It states:

"In Tel El Beida and Al Berdlah, the long Arab-Israeli conflict is a daily problem afflicting human lives. The situation there is one that few Israelis will even admit

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Plenary Meetings*, 12th meeting, para. 127.

exists. It is also a human dilemma that the Arabs, preoccupied with ideology and rhetoric, have largely ignored.

"Only a few years ago, the most significant thing about villages, with their mud brick houses, some of them sprouting television aerials, was not that they lay atop the fault line of one of modern history's most perplexing problems. It was that in spite of four Arab-Israeli wars the villagers of these two cities had made some progress. At Tel El Beida, a modern irrigation system had doubled crop yields. At Al Berdlah, the villagers had constructed a municipal water system that piped drinking water to each household.

"Today, the two villages are much changed. The irrigation system is now a ruin of dusty culverts. The pipes are also dry, and the village women must fetch water from a distant well; the round trip, down and up a rocky hillside, is nearly a mile.

"Not that either village has suffered a drought. Rather, the inhabitants are afflicted by something which for them has assumed all the characteristics of a permanent natural calamity. The source of their misfortune is the nearby Maydah co-operative farm, a new Jewish settlement. One of nearly 100 such settlements Israel has established in the occupied territories, Maydah is a cluster of modern buildings surrounded by high fences where thirty Jewish families now live.

"A year after Israeli forces originally swept through the area, just west of the Jordan River and south of the Israeli town of Beit She'an, Israeli engineers surveyed the two Palestinian villages. Then, in violation of Jordanian water law—which even official Israeli publications say that Israel is obliged to respect—the Israelis drilled a new and deeper well only a few yards from the Palestinian well.

"Since then, the Palestinian water supply has steadily diminished. But the Israelis not only have forbidden the villagers to drill an artesian well, they also refuse to sell them water. The thousand Palestinians of Al Berdlah and Tel El Beida formerly consumed 270 cubic metres of water an hour, but the 30 Jewish families at Maydah now consume 1,500 cubic metres of water an hour and the two Palestinian villages are slowly dying of thirst.

"The Israeli co-operative has become an island of Jewish affluence which has created around itself a sea of Palestinian desolation. When, as planned, Maydah doubles in size, the nearby Arab villages may be left with no water at all."

That is the account of somebody who has been to the area. Now that I have read that account, allow me to say that the peace we desire in the Middle East—or, should I say, the peace in the Middle East which means so much to my Government and has inspired us to sponsor the draft resolution presented by the representative of Egypt—is a real and lasting peace for all States in the region, peace and security for Israel too, and for the world. There can be no doubt that the Arab-Israeli conflict has had serious repercussions far and wide.

76. We therefore cannot support any obstruction by Israel that would make this impossible. The world cannot tolerate it, and this time even the United States, Israel's staunchest supporter in the past, cannot accept it either if public pronouncements by the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Cyrus Vance, who has worked so hard recently, are anything to go by—which indeed we know they are—and if United States policy on the matter recognizes the testimony of Mr. Alfred L. Atherton Jr., the Assistant Secretary of State for Near East and South Asia, before the Subcommittees on International Organizations and on Europe and the Middle East of the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress.

77. Israel must therefore take the hint and act now.

78. Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand): The New Zealand Government's general position on the Palestine question has very recently been explained by my Minister of Foreign Affairs in the general debate [26th meeting]. Our overriding concern at this rather critical juncture is that nothing should be done by any of the parties or by any other State or entity that would prejudice the chances of bringing about an early resumption of peace talks in Geneva. It is from that point of departure that my delegation approaches this item.

79. New Zealand believes that a peace settlement in the Middle East should be in accordance with, *inter alia*, the terms of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). That resolution envisages the provision in a peace settlement of secure and recognized borders for Israel and at the same time withdrawal from the territories occupied by Israeli armed forces in 1967. The establishment of Israeli settlements on the West Bank at a significant distance, in some cases, from the pre-1967 borders is clearly incompatible with that requirement. It seems to us especially regrettable that additional settlements are apparently being planned or created at this time.

80. I reiterate our earnest hope that, during the current negotiations directed towards the early resumption of the Peace Conference in Geneva, all the parties will refrain from any action which might make those negotiations more difficult or which could prejudice the implementation of resolution 242 (1967) as part of a definitive peace settlement.

81. My delegation would have preferred the present item to have been considered under a simpler and more neutral title. We would not necessarily have wished draft resolution A/32/L.3/Rev.1 to take precisely the form in which it has been presented. We appreciate that it addresses only one aspect of a complex problem. Nevertheless, it raises an urgent and legitimate issue. We agree with the basic thrust of the draft resolution. We shall vote for it as it stands, and we hope it will meet with a positive and early response.

82. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka): The General Assembly has before it today draft resolution A/32/L.3/Rev.1 of 26 October 1977.

83. As a former Chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of

the Population of the Occupied Territories, I can speak with some inner knowledge of what has been happening in these occupied territories. The Israeli policy of Jewish settlements in the occupied territories is not one of recent origin; it has been going on for many years in a systematic way and is designed to surround the Arab population in the occupied territories with settlements which are little more than armed camps and whose occupants have on occasion terrorized the people in the occupied territories. I challenge the Israeli representative, who is a master of sophistry, to question those facts.

84. It has therefore come as no surprise to us that such preposterous arguments as those presented to this Assembly by the Israeli representative should have been urged here to justify their Jewish settlement policy.

85. It was many years ago that a former Prime Minister of Israel pronounced the dictum: "The Palestinians—they do not exist." By *diktat* of the a former Prime Minister of Israel, these Arab peoples—and their rights, acquired over centuries—were unceremoniously cast into oblivion. And that is the position that the Israeli representative expects this Assembly to accept seriously.

86. The present position, taken up in the draft resolution, is described as a falsification of history. History for the representative of Israel means only the Bible and not those other acts and facts by which, under any system of law, a people acquire the right to live in a territory and call it their own.

87. If we were to accept this Israeli claim seriously as a principle of international law, there would have to be a cataclysmic movement of populations which would transform this world completely and perhaps lead to the greatest holocaust in history.

88. The argument should be dismissed summarily as a harebrained theory, founded on and sustained by a fanaticism that is more appropriate to the Dark Ages than to the enlightened twentieth century.

89. I once described Israel as the most undutiful child of the United Nations, to which it owes its existence. Despite the fact that my Government and people have no quarrel with the Jewish people and bear them no ill-will but, on the contrary, have the friendliest feelings towards them, as we have to all other peoples, I am constrained to observe that it would have been better for this world if the United Nations had on that occasion suffered an abortion.

90. The representative of Israel has quoted a previous permanent representative of the United States of America who in this Assembly described the United Nations as a "theatre of the absurd". It is in this very theatre, I should like to remind the representative of Israel, that the Israelis produced the present farce.

91. We must make it clear that we do not question or challenge the right of Israel to exist as a State and the right—which is the right of every State—to live in security and peace. But we recognize this as a right acquired under a United Nations resolution which also called for an Arab State of Palestine—the famous partition resolution of the second session [*resolution 181 (II)*].

92. We must insist, however, on Israel's showing a proper respect for United Nations resolutions and for the obligations which it assumed under the Geneva Conventions of 1949, to which the Israelis are a party but which they have flagrantly violated in brazen defiance of the United Nations. Let them not forget that those Conventions were born of the harrowing experiences of the Jewish populations who came under Hitler's merciless occupation during the Second World War. I should like to advise my friend the representative of Israel that one cannot forget the past without bringing the future into jeopardy.

93. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Ecuador, a country that maintains friendly and cordial relations with the parties concerned in this serious dispute, would like to see Arabs and Israelis, similar peoples coming from the same region, both with age-old and noble traditions and both having made great contributions to the history of mankind, sitting as soon as possible at the negotiating table in Geneva and laying the bases for a peaceful and fruitful coexistence, which would be mutually beneficial for their peoples and which, in time, would become permanent.

94. Ecuador's position on the Middle East question has remained unchanged, as stated on repeated occasions by Ecuador's Foreign Ministers when they have had occasion to address the General Assembly.

95. If we are to achieve a just and therefore lasting solution to this problem, a number of fundamental factors must be taken into account. Among those elements specifically mentioned in his statement in the general debate by the Foreign Minister of Ecuador, Mr. José Ayala Lasso, are that:

"Occupation by force does not create any rights; therefore the territories held must be returned promptly, and the work done to establish Israeli settlement in the occupied Arab zones must be undone." [*9th meeting, para. 17.*]

Mr. Mojsov (Yugoslavia) took the Chair.

96. Such an assertion is in keeping with the cardinal principles of Ecuador's foreign policy, namely, the non-recognition of annexation or the acquisition of territory by the use of force. Moreover, this principle is of deep historical significance for my country. A century and a half ago, in the early years of our life as an independent nation, the most faithful and loyal collaborator of Bolívar, Marshal Antonio José de Sucre a man with a distinguished record in the liberation of several countries in South America, enunciated on a memorable occasion a thesis which bears his name, the "Sucre Doctrine", which was incorporated in various resolutions of our regional system and in the Charter of the Organization of American States, namely, "Victory does not give rights". This doctrine was later developed in article 17 of that Charter, in the following terms:

"The territory of a State is inviolable; it may not be the object, even temporarily, of military occupation or of other measures of force taken by another State, directly or indirectly, on any grounds whatever. No territorial

acquisitions or special advantages obtained either by force or by other means of coercion shall be recognized.”³

97. This doctrine not only has been taken up by American international law but has in fact become one of the cardinal principles of international law in its most universal manifestation, the United Nations Charter.

98. Ecuador, in its international action, has done no more than reflect fundamental norms of its constitutional law, which represent the major expression of its domestic law and which at all times has reiterated that:

“The Ecuadorian State proclaims peace and co-operation as the system of international coexistence and the juridical equality of States, condemns the use or the threat of force as a means for solving conflicts and repudiates the plunder of war as a source of right. It propounds the solution of international disputes through juridical and peaceful means and declares, therefore, that international law is the norm for the conduct of States in their mutual relations.”

99. The creation of Israeli settlements in the occupied Arab territories, in our view, runs counter to the very clear rules of international law. Their maintenance, as well as other measures and acts designed to change the legal status, the geographic nature and the demographic composition of such territories, as stated in draft resolution A/32/L.3/Rev.1, certainly do not contribute to the just and peaceful solution of the problem, which is the greatest desire of the international community for this explosive situation, which should no longer remain unsolved since with the passing of time its potential danger for world peace increased.

100. Mrs. KULKARNI (India): Mr. President, since for the first time I have the privilege to make a statement before this gathering of distinguished representatives from all over the world, let me say how happy I am to see you occupy the Chair of the President of this General Assembly. I know you from India and look upon you as a personal and a dear friend of mine and of my country, and that gives me a personal sense of pride that you have been chosen for such an honour.

101. My delegation is a sponsor of draft resolution A/32/L.3/Rev.1, because it stems from the well-established principle of non-acquisition of territory through military conquest. The logical corollary of this fundamental principle is that the fruits of aggression shall be denied to the occupying Power. Occupation as a result of military necessity does not confer on the occupying Power the authority to alter the legal status of the occupied areas, or to change their demographic character, or to administer such areas as if they are its own territories. Sovereignty over the occupied lands continues to remain with the indigenous people, who retain their right to self-determination. The fundamental rights of the people are in no way extinguished by the mere fact of military conquest or occupation. This principled position is based on the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, which holds that the interests of the people are paramount.

102. It is within the system of international peace and security established by the Charter and within the framework of its principles, purposes and provisions that we shall have to examine the actions of Israel in the occupied Arab territories. It is dangerous in this day and age to invoke outdated concepts and theories that belong to a bygone period, or to rely on ancient legends to maintain the position of any occupying Power. The fact that occupied territories may be well administered is entirely irrelevant. As the saying goes, “Good government is no substitute for self-government”. The illegitimacy of the occupying Power is well established as a principle of the Charter of the United Nations which is essential for the maintenance of international peace and security.

103. Furthermore, the occupied Arab territories were part of the former British Mandated Palestine. They do not form an integral part of Israel within the terms of the General Assembly resolution that first established the State of Israel. The British Mandate having lapsed, no subsequent occupying Power can claim any right that even preceding alien occupying Powers had not exercised. In other words, Israel has no right to annex or otherwise dispose of the occupied lands, such as by establishing settlements. The civil, political and religious rights of the Arab people of Palestine were expressly and specifically protected, and no occupying Power may take away or usurp those rights. In any case, the law of the Charter of the United Nations, which is what now prevails and binds us together in this common world Organization, stipulates respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. These fundamental freedoms include the right of every human being to an equal share in the political sovereignty and independence of his own country. There is no doubt that the Arab people of Palestine are entitled to these rights and freedoms and to their protection by the United Nations. The fourth Geneva Convention clearly applies to all territories occupied by Israel since 5 June 1967, and the establishment of Israeli settlements in the occupied area is a glaring violation of international law.

104. So much for the law on the subject. Practical good sense also would suggest that the policy of establishing settlements in the occupied zone is not calculated to facilitate the negotiating process for an enduring and just peace. On the contrary, the policy of Israeli settlements casts doubts on the *bona fides* and intentions of the occupying Power. It is also of questionable value to the security of Israel, as these settlements are a permanent source of provocation to the Arab people. Isolated islands containing a total of only 6,000 Israelis in a vast ocean of Arab population cannot be more than of symbolic significance to Israel. The overriding considerations of permanent peace clearly indicate that the policy of Israeli settlements is unwise and misconceived. We trust that on deeper reflection Israel would decide to follow the course of practical wisdom and dismantle its settlements in the occupied Arab areas. We also hope that the draft resolution will be adopted with an overwhelming majority, and thereafter the Secretary-General can undertake urgent contacts with Israel to ensure that this obstacle is removed from the road towards the negotiating table.

105. Mr. HASSANE (Comoros) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like here on behalf of my delegation to

³ See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 119 (No. 1609), p. 56.

express our great concern with regard to the dangerous situation prevailing at present in the occupied Arab territories and the unlawful Israeli measures which are designed to change the legal status, the geographical nature and the demographic composition of the occupied Arab territories, because this is incompatible with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of Israel's international obligations under the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and of the United Nations resolutions, and constitutes an obstruction to efforts aimed at achieving a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Israel's stubbornness and its continued violation of international law could lead to a new war in the region which would threaten international peace and security because recently Israel has taken new measures for the application of Israeli law to the Arab people of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. New settlements have been established in the occupied Arab territories and these are of course designed for the permanent annexation of these Arab territories. I should like to ask the following question here, Why, at this specific point in time, is Israel applying these illegal measures when it claims that it wants a just and lasting peace to be established in the region? The reply is quite clear. All Israel wants is to realize its dreams and expansionist designs. Whatever efforts Israel makes to mystify world public opinion will be doomed to failure because everyone is aware of the true nature of those acts.

106. The Israeli leaders talk about secure boundaries in that part of the world and the recognition of Israel. In 1967 a former Prime Minister, Golda Meir, said that Israel's secure frontiers would extend as far as the Jewish population lived. Now Israeli official documents determine Israeli foreign frontiers from the Nile to the Euphrates. Are these really secure boundaries that Israel wants to secure?

107. This is not the first time that this question has been considered. It has already been discussed in the General Assembly and in the Security Council many times and important resolutions have been adopted, but they have not all been implemented.

108. In view of the deterioration of the situation in the region, my country would like this question to be studied in the most detailed manner, and the resolutions emanating from the United Nations should be binding on all parties. We would even go further and provide for the application of strict sanctions against parties which do not scrupulously respect United Nations Charter and resolutions, because the state of neither war nor peace that prevails in the region can only serve the policy of annexation of territory by Israel and its expansionist designs. Israel is defying world public opinion by occupying Arab territories and by trying to change their legal status, geographical nature and demographic composition, in order to wipe the Islamic patrimony from that part of the world as it has done in the case of the Al Aqsa mosque. We must firmly denounce the establishment of Jewish settlements in the occupied Arab territories, and Israel must be compelled to respect its international commitments and the fourth Geneva Convention in all the occupied Arab territories.

109. We approve the efforts being made at present to achieve peace in that part of the world and my country is

convinced that any discussion on this topic should lead to the following consequences: Israel must withdraw from all the Arab territories occupied since June 1967; the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination to return to their lands and to create an independent State must be recognized.

110. My country has become a sponsor of the draft resolution introduced by Egypt and we fully support it because we are convinced that the conflict in the Middle East is not merely an Arab conflict but a problem for the whole world and all those who espouse the cause of international peace and security.

111. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): On the proposal of the Egyptian Government we are dealing with an item on illegal Israeli measures in the occupied Arab territories in contravention of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949.

112. We can say that for almost 10 years the situation in the occupied territories has been deteriorating dangerously. Repeatedly, either in the Security Council or in this Assembly, we have expressed our serious alarm and profound concern about the measures taken unilaterally by Israel to change the social, demographic and political nature of the occupied territories. Such acts, in addition to being an obstacle to the establishment of peace, constitute a flagrant violation of the rules established by the fourth Geneva Convention. That Convention states very clearly that no occupying Power is entitled to change the physical, demographic and legal nature of the occupied area. The international community cannot long tolerate the arrogant behaviour of the Israeli authorities, which continue to disregard the relevant rules and international conventions.

113. The condemned measures are too numerous to be analysed in detail here in this debate. I will limit myself to those which, in our view, are the most instructive. First of all, with regard to the Israeli decision to establish new settlements on the West Bank of Jordan on Palestinian land which quite clearly does not belong to Israel, Israel, to justify its true purpose which, in the end, is annexation, appeals to the dangerous expansionist doctrine of "Greater Israel", according to which the territories in question are part of the natural frontiers of the State of Israel and must not be considered as occupied territories within the meaning of international law.

114. By such arguments, which to say the least are fallacious, Israel thinks it can shirk its responsibilities under the fourth Geneva Convention.

115. On another level, our Assembly must bear in mind the various measures taken by Israel to change the institutional organization of the holy places in the city of Jerusalem, in particular the El Ibrahimi Mosque.

116. Very recently, when our Organization was striving to establish an atmosphere more conducive to negotiations for the establishment of peace, the Israeli Government, under cover of mere administrative considerations, tried to extend its legislation to the West Bank, clearly wishing to change the institutional framework of the occupied area.

117. We cannot believe that such acts are isolated or coincidental. They are a logical part of a broad strategy aimed at ultimate annexation, pure and simple, by gradual assimilation.

118. We are not the only ones to reach this shocking conclusion, because the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices has already reached a similar conclusion. Moreover, the Israeli authorities do not conceal the fact. Mrs. Golda Meir asserted a few years ago that frontiers were determined by the people that lived behind them and that if those people pulled back the frontiers would pull back with them. Recently an Israeli Minister, appealing to an aberrant notion of legal vacuum—which is supposed to apply to the West Bank—stated from this rostrum that Israel could not be reproached for establishing Jewish settlements on the land of its Biblical ancestors.

119. Thus, the declared purpose of Israeli policy in the occupied territories is to change the general nature of those territories and to create a social, economic and cultural environment which will produce an irreversible situation.

120. Therefore, in the foreseeable future we risk being confronted by a new fait accompli in which, in the

Judaized occupied territories, the Palestinian people will have become a foreign minority in its own territory and its own country.

121. We have the right and the duty to warn the international community that, without an urgent and comprehensive solution, we may find ourselves in the very near future embroiled in a new and terrible crisis with the threat to international peace no longer a hypothesis but a real danger.

122. My delegation has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/32/L.3/Rev.1 because it is convinced that this condemnation of the measures taken by Israel, which have already been disapproved of by world public opinion, will strengthen the isolation of the Hebrew State and force it to come to terms.

123. We hope that this condemnation by the world community will receive the maximum support so as to bring Israel back to the Geneva negotiating table with a view to the establishment of peace and the recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to its country.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.