

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**2012th
 PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 10 December 1971,
 at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 67:	
Question of Territories under Portuguese administration:	
(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General	
Report of the Fourth Committee	1
Agenda item 68:	
Question of Southern Rhodesia: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (<i>continued</i>)	
Report of the Fourth Committee (part III)	
Agenda item 22:	
The situation in the Middle East (<i>continued</i>)	5

President: Mr. Adam MALIK (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 67

- Question of Territories under Portuguese administration:**
- (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;
 - (b) Report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/8549)

AGENDA ITEM 68

- Question of Southern Rhodesia: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*continued*)***

**REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (PART III)
 (A/8518/ADD.2)**

1. Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia), Rapporteur of the Fourth Committee: I have the honour to present to the General Assembly for its consideration two reports of the Fourth Committee. The first report [A/8549] relates to the question of Territories under Portuguese administration, which the Fourth Committee took up under item 67 of its agenda.
2. During the Committee's consideration of the item, the majority of members noted with deep concern that the

Government of Portugal, in complete disregard of the relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, had continued to refuse to give effect to the principle of self-determination in the Territories under its domination. Concern was also expressed by members at the explosive situation created in those Territories by the continued intensification by Portugal of its military operations, including the use of chemical substances against the dependent peoples struggling for their freedom and independence. In this connexion, members deplored the policies of those States which, notwithstanding the repeated appeals of the United Nations, continue to provide the Government of Portugal with military and other assistance which it uses to pursue its colonial policies. They also expressed concern at the repeated acts of aggression which have been committed by Portugal against independent African States bordering its colonial Territories and which seriously disturb the peace and security of the region. Furthermore, members noted that the constitutional changes introduced by Portugal in 1971 were not intended to lead to the exercise of self-determination by the peoples of the Territories concerned, but were rather designed to perpetuate Portuguese domination.

3. It was the considered opinion of a large majority of members that the General Assembly should condemn the colonial war being waged by Portugal against the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) and, in particular, the indiscriminate bombing of civilians and the destruction of their villages and property, as well as the violations by Portugal of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of independent African States bordering its Territories.

4. Members also felt that the General Assembly should condemn the collaboration between the three régimes in southern Africa and the continued intervention of South African forces against the peoples of Angola and Mozambique. In view of the increasing seriousness of the situation, members called upon Portugal, as the first step, to recognize the right of those peoples under its domination to self-determination and independence; secondly, to cease forthwith all acts of repression, to withdraw its military forces and to eliminate all practices which violate the fundamental rights of the dependent peoples; thirdly, to proclaim an unconditional amnesty and to transfer all powers to freely elected representatives of the population; fourthly, to discontinue all aggressive acts against the neighbouring African States; and finally, to release all detainees and political prisoners as well as property held following Portugal's acts of aggression against those African States.

5. The majority of members were of the opinion that all Governments should withdraw all assistance to Portugal,

* Resumed from the 1991st meeting.

including, in particular, the sale or supply of any form of arms material, and should take immediate measures to put an end to all activities which help Portugal to exploit the peoples under its domination. Members also considered that all States and all specialized agencies within the United Nations system of organizations should extend to those peoples the moral and material assistance they required to continue their struggle for the restoration of their inalienable rights. In noting with satisfaction the progress made towards national independence by the national liberation movements, members agreed that the General Assembly should approve the arrangements relating to the representation of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), as associate members of the Economic Commission for Africa. In the same connexion, many delegations welcomed the intention expressed by the Special Committee of 24 to send a group to visit the liberated areas of those Territories to obtain first-hand information on the situation prevailing in these Territories.

6. Finally, in view of the continued deterioration of the situation in Portugal's colonial Territories, which seriously disturbs international peace and security, many delegations felt that the attention of the Security Council should be drawn to the urgent need to consider taking effective steps to secure the full and speedy implementation by Portugal of resolution 1514 (XV) and other relevant decisions of the United Nations.

7. These and other considerations are duly reflected in the draft resolution set out in paragraph 12 of the report which is recommended for adoption by the General Assembly [A/8549]. In the light of the extensive consultations among the various regional groups which preceded the formulation of the recommendations contained in this resolution, I am confident that the resolution will receive the full and unqualified support of Member States.

8. The second report [A/8518/Add.2] relates to the question of Southern Rhodesia under item 68 of the agenda. As will be recalled, the General Assembly has already adopted resolutions 2765 (XXVI) and 2769 (XXVI) on two specific aspects of this question. The recommendations of the Fourth Committee contained in part III of its report deal with the question of Southern Rhodesia as a whole.

9. During the Committee's consideration of this question, the majority of the members expressed grave concern at the continued failure of the administering Power to bring down the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and to transfer effective power to the people of Zimbabwe. Thus, the resultant further deterioration of the situation in the Territory continues to pose a serious threat to international peace and security. Furthermore, members noted with serious concern the refusal of the United Kingdom Government to co-operate with the Special Committee of 24 in the discharge of the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly. Several members pointed out that the responsibility for the current situation also lay with those States, in particular South Africa and Portugal, which continue to collaborate with the illegal minority régime and obstruct the efforts of the international community to put an end to it.

10. In view of these considerations, many members, in deploring the intransigent attitude of the Government of the United Kingdom, urged that Government to take effective measures without further delay to bring down the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and to transfer power to the people of Zimbabwe on the basis of the principle of majority rule. They also condemned the intervention and presence of South African armed forces in the Territory and called upon those Governments which continue to maintain political, economic, military and other relations with the illegal régime to cease immediately all such relations.

11. The majority of members also reiterated the conviction that the sanctions imposed by the Security Council will not bring the illegal régime to an end unless they are comprehensive, mandatory, effectively supervised, enforced and complied with by all States, particularly South Africa and Portugal. They accordingly urged all States to prevent any circumvention of the sanctions by their nationals and to refrain from any action which might confer a semblance of legitimacy on the illegal régime. Finally, they felt that the General Assembly should draw the attention of the Security Council to the urgent necessity of ensuring the full compliance by all States of the latter's decisions, and to the need to widen the scope of the sanctions against the illegal régime and to impose sanctions against South Africa and Portugal.

12. These and other considerations are duly reflected in the draft resolution herewith submitted in paragraph 7 of the report [A/8518/Add.2], which the Fourth Committee recommends for adoption by the General Assembly. Members are, of course, aware that the Security Council is currently considering certain specific aspects of the question. While the General Assembly has already pronounced itself on that particular matter by adopting resolution 2769 (XXVI) on 22 November 1971, the Fourth Committee, in accordance with the express wish of the General Assembly, continues to keep the question under active review.

13. On behalf of the Fourth Committee, I commend these two reports to the serious attention of the General Assembly.

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Fourth Committee (A/8549 and A/8518/Add.2).

14. The PRESIDENT: We shall take up first the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 67, [A/8549]. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

15. Mr. MBEKEANI (Malawi): The position of my delegation on this issue has been amply stated in the past, but I believe it will not do any harm to restate it here. As usual, we shall abstain in the vote on this draft resolution, because we do not believe it will have any real effect on the existing situation. In fact, it is the view of my delegation that the reaction of a colonial Power resulting in the tightening of its grip on its colonies varies in inverse proportion to the amount of condemnation the Power experiences.

16. From what I have said, you will no doubt appreciate that the abstention of my delegation does not mean that we

either condone or connive at colonialism. It is our belief that, if colonial countries were granted their right to self-determination, their relations with the metropolitan Powers would be much better than they are. Indeed the history of the last decade in Africa has gone a long way towards proving this. However, my delegation does not believe that the problems of colonialism can be solved by a slanging match in the halls of the United Nations, or any other halls for that matter. They cannot be solved by condemnation of countries and their governments and they cannot be solved by intemperate resolutions. We believe that the only solution that is workable is sane discussion either in private or across some conference table, calculated to convince the colonial Power that it has more to gain by granting self-determination than by withholding it.

17. To that end my delegation would like to request the many countries represented here at the United Nations that have diplomatic relations with Portugal to use those relations to bring some influence to bear on the Portuguese Government. If those countries that have diplomatic relations with Portugal are genuinely concerned about the lot of the people in the Portuguese colonies, they would be doing far greater service to the people in the Portuguese colonies if they used bilateral influence in Lisbon or in their own capitals than if they sponsored or voted for intemperate resolutions here. My Government for its part has taken the former course and we have pointed out and shall continue pointing out to the Portuguese that Portugal has nothing to fear by granting independence to its colonies. Therefore we appeal to those that have relations with Portugal to try our method rather than vote for futile resolutions that may in fact produce an opposite reaction.

18. Mr. VENEGAS TAMAYO (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to reaffirm our vote in the Fourth Committee in favour of the draft resolution on Territories under Portuguese administration and would like to reiterate Colombia's reservation on operative paragraph 12 of this draft for the legal, economic and political reasons which we explained at the 1960th meeting of the Fourth Committee.

19. My delegation wishes to reaffirm its support for anti-colonialist principles, for self-determination and for the pacific settlement of disputes among nations, for the conservation and preservation of peace, justice and international security.

20. Mr. OUEÐRAOGO (Upper Volta) (*interpretation from French*): This year, it happens that the General Assembly has before it a report of the Fourth Committee on territories under Portuguese administration [A/8549] at a time when Portugal is presiding over the group of Western European and other countries, in other words, a group which includes in its ranks the principal purveyors of guns who make it possible for the régime in Lisbon to pursue the dirty war in Mozambique, Angola and Guinea (Bissau) which it is waging to maintain its colonial yoke in flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

21. Of course there is reason to be pleased that a number of members of the group of Western European and other

countries have proved by their actions and their votes in the Fourth Committee that they were resolutely opposed to the colonial policies of Portugal and were determined to contribute to putting an end to them. We would like to mention in particular the Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands, Ireland, Austria and Australia, all countries which, despite their reservations, voted in favour of the draft resolution in the Fourth Committee, whose text appears in paragraph 12 of the document I have already mentioned.

22. If the countries I have just mentioned decided to join with others in the anti-colonialist course it is unquestionably because, in spite of the shortcomings of any draft of this kind, there was there a reaffirmation of the right of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) to self-determination and independence. This is very clear from the explanations of votes of the countries concerned and in particular from the statement of the representative of the Netherlands, who on 3 December said in the Committee:

“The Netherlands Government does not recognize the claim of Portugal that the Territories in Africa under their administration should be regarded as Portuguese provinces. They should be considered Non-Self-Governing Territories in accordance with Chapter XI of the Charter. In our opinion, the Portuguese Government is under the obligation to adhere to the provisions of the Charter and, as affirmed by the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, to endorse the right of the African peoples to self-determination.”*

23. It seems to be necessary to stress as well that if a larger number of delegations voted in favour of this draft resolution this year, it was because the Afro-Asian group did its utmost to accommodate the views of other regional groups, in particular the Latin American group and the Scandinavian group, who by their massive support have contributed to the fact that the draft resolution was adopted in the Committee by an overwhelming vote of 99 votes in favour to 6 against, with 6 abstentions.

24. The sponsors of the draft resolution on Territories under Portuguese administration have often been criticized for mentioning military and other assistance given to Portugal under NATO. The reason for the stubbornness of the sponsors in attacking NATO is due to the fact that the main suppliers of weapons for Lisbon are members of NATO. And here, the statement by the representative of Norway in the Fourth Committee is interesting on more than one count and calls for no comment.

“In the statement I made in the general debate in this Committee on the situation in southern Africa, I mention that the Norwegian Parliament has emphasized that special attention should be given to efforts to influence Western Powers who give military and economic support to Portugal, to cease any such support. I also reminded the Committee that the Norwegian Foreign Minister, at

* Quoted in English by the speaker. This statement was made at the 1961st meeting of the Fourth Committee, the official records of which are published in summary form.

the NATO Ministerial Meeting in Lisbon in June this year, raised the question of Portugal's colonial policies. It is our opinion that Portugal's policies are contradictory to the principles and purpose on which the NATO is based."

25. Another controversial point in the Committee was on the fourteenth preambular paragraph, and operative paragraph 12, on arrangements to ensure for liberation movements in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), status as associate members of the Economic Commission for Africa.

26. The intention of the sponsors in this connexion is clear and to some extent we are pleased that other delegations have understood their objectives in the Committee. In particular, the representative of Norway stated:

"With regard to the fourteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 12, my delegation wishes to emphasize that in view of the exceptional situation which exists with regard to the Portuguese colonies, a situation which for years has been recognized by the General Assembly, it must be regarded as a positive step that the liberation movements may be brought into regional co-operation within the ECA on an associate basis."*

27. We believe that the Afro-Asian group and the sponsors of the draft resolution have made a great enough effort this year to have everyone's position brought out clearly into the open. That is why it is a matter of regret for us that in the Committee a number of countries, in spite of the efforts of the sponsors, voted against this draft resolution as they did last year.

28. We for our part, are as determined as we were in the Committee to support this draft resolution, but in so doing we do not believe that we are in any way violating the principles of the Charter or certain practices of the United Nations. We would appeal to all delegations to give the complete and massive support to this draft resolution, which was adopted in Committee.

29. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 12 of its report [A/8549]. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

The Khmer Republic, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma,

* Quoted in English by the speaker. This statement was made at the 1961st meeting of the Fourth Committee, the official records of which are published in summary form.

Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya.

Against: Portugal, South Africa, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Brazil, Costa Rica, France.

Abstaining: Malawi, Argentina, Belgium, El Salvador, Italy.

The draft resolution was adopted by 105 votes to 8, with 5 abstentions (resolution 2795 (XXVI)).

30. The PRESIDENT: I will now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

31. Mrs. COLMANT (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): As we explained at the 1961st meeting of the Fourth Committee when this draft resolution was adopted, we wish now in the General Assembly to say that by, voting in favour of the draft resolution on Territories still under Portuguese administration, we do not mean to imply that we agree with the substance of operative paragraph 12. Although we understand that the Economic Commission for Africa has full jurisdiction to recommend representatives to take part in that Committee as observers, we do not wish the General Assembly to prejudge legal situations in a manner with which other regional commissions would not agree.

32. Mr. SOMERHAUSEN (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): Belgium abstained because the resolution contains paragraphs which we cannot accept. In particular, this pertains to paragraph 12, which is not in conformity with international law, and paragraph 13, which provides for the granting of material assistance for continuing the struggle of the people in the Portuguese Territories. We cannot accept this support of violence.

33. This in no way changes our position of principle in regard to Portuguese Territories. This position was repeated to the mission of the Organization of African Unity in Belgium on 3 and 4 December. Belgium considers that the Portuguese-administered Territories come under Chapter XI of the Charter. We believe that the people of the Territories administered by Portugal have the right to self-determination and independence. We regret that Portugal refuses to permit the exercise of that right.

34. Belgium abides strictly by the resolutions of the Security Council requesting States to cease providing Portugal with assistance which makes it possible for it to continue to oppress the people in the Territories which it administers, and urging them to take the necessary measures to prevent the sale and provision for this purpose of arms and military equipment to the Portuguese Government.

35. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to Part III of the report of the Fourth Committee on agenda item 68

[A/8518/Add.2]. The General Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Fourth Committee in paragraph 7 of that report. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland,¹ Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, France, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Ireland, Italy, Lesotho, Malawi, Norway, Spain, Sweden.

The draft resolution was adopted by 91 votes to 9, with 12 abstentions (resolution 2796 (XXVI)).²

36. The PRESIDENT: This concludes our consideration of the second item on our agenda this afternoon. I shall now call on representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote after the vote.

37. Miss MILAN-LUGO (Dominican Republic) (*interpretation from Spanish*) Historically the Dominican Republic has combated racial discrimination and colonialist policies, and on more than one occasion we have shown that we faithfully support the principle of self-determination. Accordingly, we have voted in favour of the draft resolution on the question of Southern Rhodesia. In spite of the fact that we fully agree with the principles set forth in this draft resolution, the Dominican Republic delegation has reservations about operative paragraphs 2, 4 and 12 because we believe that they are incompatible with our international policies.

38. My delegation wishes to say that it fully supports the people of Zimbabwe in their legitimate struggle to secure their inalienable right to self-determination, and we hope

that the indigenous majority of Southern Rhodesia will be given their rights again.

39. We wish to express our gratitude to the African sponsors of this resolution for having reflected the views of the Latin American countries.

40. Mr. MOLAPO (Lesotho): My delegation found itself forced to abstain in the vote on the last draft resolution because of its operative paragraph 12 which, among other things, calls for sanctions against the Republic of South Africa. The economy of my country is heavily dependent on that of the Republic of South Africa, and for that reason I cannot associate my country with any move that is aimed at undermining the economy of the Republic of South Africa.

AGENDA ITEM 22

The situation in the Middle East (*continued*)

41. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): The United Nations has, over almost a quarter of a century, been intimately concerned with the Arab-Israeli conflict and has agreed upon many constructive principles to guide the parties in its solution. Our support for the efforts of the United Nations and for Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which established the basic principles for a lasting peace in the area, is well known, as is our continuing endorsement of Ambassador Jarring's mission. Our efforts over the years in support of Ambassador Jarring's mission are too familiar to you all to need reiteration here today. Our policy is a consistent one: we favour a peaceful settlement based on agreement among the parties within the framework of the principles and provisions set forth in resolution 242 (1967). The differences over what that resolution means are properly a matter for negotiation, as are the possibilities for interim steps on the road to peace. We believe that all of us should today be focusing on ways of facilitating such negotiations.

42. Unfortunately, efforts towards an over-all peace settlement since 1967 have not produced the results all of us had hoped for. Since February of this year, the most promising avenue for progress has been the possibility of an agreement on measures of an interim nature, involving partial Israeli withdrawal from the Sinai peninsula and a reopening of the Suez Canal as a step towards final peace. Both Egypt and Israel, on their own initiative, expressed an interest in this concept, and both then asked the United States to assist them in pursuing negotiations on this matter. We agreed to undertake this role. We see an interim agreement as being to the potential benefit of all concerned, as a practical step toward an over-all peace settlement, as a way to test the intentions of the parties and develop much-needed confidence that a political arrangement could be implemented and observed by the parties, and as a means of promoting a resumption of Ambassador Jarring's mission.

43. Since February we have undertaken extensive discussions with the parties regarding an interim agreement. We have not laid down any requirement or blueprint of our own for an interim agreement. It is our conviction that the detailed terms must be worked out in a genuine negotiating process. Unfortunately, progress on an interim agreement

¹ The delegation of Finland subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as an abstention.

² The delegations of Morocco, Rwanda and the Syrian Arab Republic subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

has also run into difficult obstacles. A major difficulty has been that the parties have sought to introduce into the context of an interim agreement concepts which logically belong in an over-all settlement. We have maintained that, while an interim agreement should be a step toward an over-all settlement, there would be no need for an interim agreement at all if it were possible now to arrive at an agreement on the many complex issues which remain to be resolved with respect to territory, the shape of peace, guarantees, and other differences. The merits, in other words, of an interim agreement are precisely that it offers a prospect for practical on-the-ground progress, while leaving some of the most difficult issues for further negotiations at a subsequent stage.

44. Negotiations on an interim agreement are in suspense, we believe, only temporarily. We have proposed ways in which negotiations on an interim agreement can be intensified. We will review the prospects for such an agreement once this debate here in the General Assembly has been concluded. Both sides have put forward positive ideas; both sides hold firmly to key points; both sides will be required to make adjustments in their position if an interim agreement is indeed to be achieved.

45. It is our hope that all who rise to speak on this agenda item will bear in mind that in the last analysis it is the parties themselves that will have to negotiate the terms of a Middle East peace settlement. Peace can not be imposed on the area by outsiders. Security Council resolution 242 (1967) recognizes this principle by specifying that a peace settlement must be the result of "agreement" between the parties. Nothing must be done in this Assembly which seems to interpret Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in a different fashion—or, if you will, to reinterpret it, or which seems to alter the careful balance of that resolution. We hold to the view that quiet diplomacy is indeed the best format for world progress. We hope that all who are genuinely concerned about reaching a peace settlement will do their best to see that what is said and done here will not have the effect of stiffening the parties' positions rather than increasing confidence and encouraging flexibility. We hope the parties themselves will exercise care not to narrow or close their political options. Political-diplomatic options will be needed more than ever once the debate here is over.

46. At this stage, it seems unproductive to engage in polemics as to where the fault lies for the impasse reached in efforts toward an over-all settlement. After all, this impasse is not the result of a single diplomatic development. Instead, it is only symptomatic of the bitter and persistent conflict which dates back to 1948, and even before. The basic problem, in our view, remains one of finding ways to help both sides to overcome the deep suspicion and distrust they feel toward each other in this conflict.

47. One of the promising new developments in the search for a Middle East peace settlement was the recent visit by the mission of the Organization of African Unity to the area. The initiative undertaken by the Committee of African Heads of State of the Organization of African Unity to promote a narrowing of the difference between the parties is highly commendable. We hope that it will

prove to be a constructive element in our present deliberations.

48. I want to underline that our Government intends to pursue vigorously the search for peace in the Middle East by the means which appear most effective, most promising of progress. We continue in this spirit to stand ready to assist the parties to the conflict to resolve their differences as long as they desire our assistance.

49. Mr. KUI/AGA (Poland): Dr. Ralph Bunche has passed away. During my work with the United Nations I had come to know him. I had co-operated with him. I had come to esteem highly his great human qualities, his attachment to the United Nations. I consider it, therefore, a duty to express to his family my most sincere condolences as well as those of my delegation.

50. Turning to the question under consideration, I should like to say that rarely has a situation, such as the one in the Middle East which we are now considering, so overwhelmingly preoccupied the world community—this world Organization. Rarely has a situation provoked so much tension or so much danger as this, which springs from the grave injustice done to the Arab peoples and the defiance by one party, Israel, of all the accepted canons of international life and which poses a constant threat to peace and security in the Middle East and, consequently, to the world.

51. Rarely has there been a situation where the contexts and contents of a settlement have been so clearly drawn, the instrumentalities for achieving such a settlement so precisely worked out and the utmost urgency of a solution so univcrsally recognized.

52. Rarely have we witnessed so adamant, so arrogant, so ultimately short-sighted a refusal to accept anything but one's own objectives, one's own ambitions, one's own terms, as the only basis for a solution. Might, with a small "m", over Right, with a capital "R": that is Israel's stand, Israel's practice, Israel's case again at this session.

53. The long history of the problem in the Middle East is too well known to recount in detail. In response to the Israeli aggression of June 1967, a basic definition was decided upon with the necessary and indeed even indispensable components of a solution, together with the creation of a mechanism for the prompt implementation of the solution. I am referring, of course, to Security Council resolution 242 (1967). In anticipation of—but unfortunately, too often in response to—Israel's policy of consolidating the results of its aggression, a series of resolutions was adopted by a number of United Nations organs on the treatment of the population of Israeli-occupied territories, on the rights of the Arab people of Palestine, on the status of the City of Jerusalem. In reaction to Israel's intransigence, a French initiative was advanced to work out, amongst the permanent members of the Security Council, guidelines for Ambassador Jarring's mission. Numerous bilateral and multilateral initiatives were taken, the latest one being that of the African Heads of States. Attempts to solve the problem by stages within the framework of an over-all solution were made. The list is long, very long. The result is incommensurably small. The analysis of the reasons for that total lack of results should be the first task of the

present debate and the second, certainly imperative, part of our debate should be an enunciation of the measures to be urgently undertaken to resolve the problem peacefully.

54. If we admit, and the Polish delegation does admit, that Security Council resolution 242 (1967) is the corner-stone of United Nations efforts to find a peaceful and comprehensive solution of the Middle East question, let us look again at its contents. Its basis is the principle of the non-acquisition of territories by force, by aggression and of Israel's withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories. Each and all of its provisions are a function of that basic principle. There are means, defined, as we know, as a result of compromise, to implement that principle. Now, the best available balance-sheet of the efforts exerted to implement that resolution is the report of the Secretary-General on the results of the mission of Ambassador Jarring, his Special Representative [A/8541].

55. In that report the most salient, the most characteristic element, is the account of the initiative taken by Ambassador Jarring on 8 February 1971, his aide-mémoire to Egypt and Israel [*ibid.*, annex I], as well as the responses to it by both Governments [*ibid.*, annexes II and III]. The aide-mémoire itself was a bold attempt by Ambassador Jarring to inject new strength into his mission in order to overcome the dangerous stabilization of immobility—an immobility, I may add, desired and fostered by Israel as part of its strategy of *faits accomplis* in the service of its annexionist, expansionist policy.

56. The Egyptian reply is known. In the words of the report:

“On 15 February, Ambassador Jarring received from the representative of the United Arab Republic an aide-mémoire in which it was indicated that the United Arab Republic would accept the specific commitments requested of it, as well as other commitments arising directly or indirectly from Security Council resolution 242 (1967). If Israel would give, likewise, commitments covering its own obligations under the Security Council resolution, including commitments for the withdrawal of its armed forces from Sinai and the Gaza Strip and for the achievement of a just settlement for the refugee problem in accordance with United Nations resolutions, the United Arab Republic would be ready to enter into a peace agreement with Israel. Finally the United Arab Republic expressed the view that a just and lasting peace could not be realized without the full and scrupulous implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and the withdrawal of the Israeli armed forces from all the territories occupied since 5 June 1967.” [A/8541, para. 14.]

57. Thus, on the part of Egypt, the reaction was an acceptance of a peace agreement, acceptance of the commitments asked for by Ambassador Jarring and the commitments arising directly or indirectly from Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in exchange for Israeli commitments to withdraw its armed forces from Sinai and the Gaza Strip and for the achievement of a just settlement of the refugee problem in accordance with United Nations resolutions.

58. This was indeed a response widely, if not universally, acclaimed as statesmanlike, a response which opened the road to a comprehensive political settlement of the problem. What was Israel's response? Apart from, and independently of, the terms it was couched in, the fact that the Jarring mission has not been resumed is proof indeed that that response was negative. Thus the road to a settlement which Egypt, in response to Mr. Jarring had opened, was again blocked by Israel. This is no rhetoric. These are facts—indisputable, hard facts. No further efforts by Mr. Jarring could have been of avail; no appeals by the Secretary-General or by the permanent members of the Security Council were of avail. Israel had slammed the door on an initiative based upon and fully in conformity with a resolution which it professes to accept.

59. The road to a comprehensive settlement thus being barred, efforts were undertaken to effect a partial solution within the framework of and consistent with the over-all situation provided for in Security Council resolution 242 (1967). To a proposal to this effect by President El-Sadat of Egypt, to a similar concept advanced by the United States of America, the closest ally of Israel, to the expectations of many nations, including Poland, that the proposal for the reopening of the Suez Canal would be a useful partial first step, economically advantageous to all parties, towards an over-all solution of the conflict, the reply of Israel, when stripped of its rhetoric, was again negative.

60. To all decisions, recommendations, appeals and warnings to the effect that Israel is not allowed to take steps which would alter the present status of the occupied territories and that it must respect the rights of the Arab people of Palestine, the response of Israel has again and again been negative. I shall not recall all those decisions, recommendations, appeals and warnings. I should, however, like to refer to the latest example of Israel's arrogant disregard for the United Nations and for the Security Council in particular. I refer to the Secretary-General's report³ on the implementation—or rather non-implementation—by Israel of Security Council resolution 298 (1971).

61. We had in this particular case a unanimous demand by the Council that Israel should rescind all steps of a legislative, administrative and political character purporting to change the status of Jerusalem, and that it should refrain from taking any further such steps. A special mission of the Security Council, composed of Argentina, Italy and Sierra Leone, was designated for the purpose of visiting Jerusalem and reporting its findings. And what we had to face in this case was, once again, Israeli dilatory tactics, culminating in a new negative reaction.

62. What is shocking, what is unacceptable—and this must be realized by Israel—is its argument that nothing short of Israel's demands is either reasonable or just; everything else is biased, anti-Israeli, anti-Jewish. megalomania? Magnified superiority complex? Whatever it is, it runs counter to the overwhelming feelings of the world community. It runs counter to its demand for a just settlement of the problem

³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10392.

and to the cause of peace and security in the region and in the world. It may run counter to the best interests of Israel.

63. Of course, self-righteousness alone could not account for Israel's persistence in defying world opinion. Only powerful material, military and political assistance can enable it to maintain this fundamentally untenable attitude. Assistance and support by international Zionism is part of it—assistance and support unconditional in its allegiance, uninhibited in its forms and probably unrivalled in its short-sightedness. But of decisive importance is the assistance accorded to Israel by the United States. To the constant flow of capital and offensive weapons, to the constantly consoling and reassuring stream of statements and acts of political and moral support, must now be added the new and significant appropriation of \$500 million by the United States to Israel for arms purchases. That, indeed, is the basis for Israel's intransigence and arrogance. That makes the United States professions of support for the implementation of resolution 242 (1967) sound hollow, an impression which cannot but be sustained by the United States stand in the Security Council, in the General Assembly and in the four-Power consultations on the Middle East. That indeed would explain the total lack of results of the much-heralded "quiet diplomacy".

64. The oft-repeated Israeli argument concerning secure boundaries is but a thin veil for obstructing a settlement and a shield for territorial expansion coupled with economic exploitation of the occupied territories; for, when seen in its entirety, Israel's policy is directed at the consolidation of its occupation of Arab territories, at creating faits accomplis with the intention of making them irreversible, and at annexation. Such, in our view, is the meaning of the deportation of Arabs, the expropriation of their property and the destruction of their villages and refugee camps and of their material and cultural values. The facts are known. The latest debates in the Security Council on one aspect of this problem, Israeli "Judaization" of Jerusalem, are too recent in our memories to need to be recalled. The refusal of Israel to permit investigation of these facts, as mentioned in paragraph 229 of the introduction to the Secretary-General's report on the work of the Organization [A/8401/Add.1] has been additionally confirmed by Israel's rejection of the Security Council's decision to send a mission to Jerusalem to investigate the process of the "Israelization" of that city.

65. For us, Poles, this evokes the ominous memory of the *lebensraum* theory, the costs of which weighed so tragically upon so many peoples, Poles and Jews in particular, and we can assure our Arab friends that our support for their stand for their rights is indeed deep-seated.

66. For all of us, this immediately evokes a series of broken international agreements: The Hague Conventions of 1907, the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 1949, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, as well as international law and practice governing military occupation, the Convention and Protocol for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, signed at The Hague in 1954, and the relevant resolutions of the Economic and Social Council, UNESCO and the World Health Organization. We therefore fully concur in the view

that this is nothing less than an attempt at colonization, and Israel's arguments about its civilizing mission in the Middle East can only fortify such an assessment.

67. The Assembly has the duty to act, urgently and decisively. That duty derives first and foremost from its realization of the serious danger to peace and security in the Middle East which Israeli sabotage of a peaceful settlement creates and amplifies with each passing day, and from the realization also of the importance which the situation in the Middle East has for international peace and security. It derives from its own resolutions and recommendations, including resolution 2628 (XXV).

68. Israel must be made to understand that the United Nations will no longer tolerate its defiance; that it will no longer tolerate any of Israel's attempts at perpetuating its aggression.

69. The basis for a solution is the full implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), in particular its provisions concerning the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and the necessity of a full withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from all Arab territories. This principle is crucial. It constitutes the backbone of all United Nations legislation on the Middle East in particular. It constitutes the key to the solution, the only foundation of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

70. The mission of Ambassador Jarring is the instrument decided upon by the Security Council for the implementation of resolution 242 (1967). A positive response by Israel to the aide-mémoire of Ambassador Jarring of 8 February 1971 is the prerequisite for the reactivation of the mission. The Assembly should therefore demand such a positive response from Israel.

71. In urging once more that measures be taken by the Assembly to ensure the earliest implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), Poland is following a consistent principle of its policy: full support for and assistance to the just cause of the Arab peoples, with whom we maintain the closest relations of friendship and co-operation, in their fight for the total elimination of the consequences of aggression and for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. In this, we are together with other socialist countries. We are together with an ever-increasing number of States from all continents. This unity in the determination to achieve a peaceful and just settlement should result in the present twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly bringing a substantial contribution to the cause of peace and security in the Middle East and to a peaceful and just settlement of the problems of the Middle East in conformity with United Nations principles.

72. Mr. EL AWAD (Sudan): On behalf of the Sudan delegation, I would like to express our sincere condolences on the death of Mr. Ralph Bunche, who devoted his life to the cause of peace and to all that the United Nations stands for.

73. The General Assembly is, once more, seized of the question of the Middle East, a question that has never ceased to pose a real threat to world peace. The need for

quick and decisive action by this universal body on that question has never been as urgent and as vital.

74. Since 1947, when this problem emerged as a result of the occupation of Palestine by the Zionists, many resolutions have been passed by this Assembly and other organs of the United Nations. But they were all to no avail. The lack of effective implementation of all those decisions and resolutions had paved the way for the Israeli aggression on Arab countries in 1956 and again in 1967.

75. Internationally, the Middle East crisis can be seen to involve three vital issues. First, there is the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to freedom and self-determination, a right well enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. The people of Palestine were denied that right in the past by the British Mandate; and they are being denied it today as a result of the Zionist usurpation of their homeland. As long as we continue to turn a deaf ear to the suffering of millions of Palestinian children, women and men, languishing in the desert, all our efforts to solve this problem will be in vain. The Palestinian people, now being turned into a nation of refugees living in camps, with no freedom and no home, are driven through our apathetic default to take up arms in order to restore their rights and maintain their dignity.

76. Second, there is also the issue of aggression and conquest by a State Member of this Organization waging three wars within two decades with the help and connivance of some of the major Western Powers. In dealing with the last of those unjust wars, that of 1967, the United Nations Security Council emphasized in its resolution 242 (1967) the basic principle of inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by war. Yet, Israel, arrogantly encouraged by its military success, refuses to budge from Arab land. Being backed in this arrogant stance by the support it receives from the United States of America, the Israelis persist in perpetuating the fruits of their unlawful occupation.

77. Third, there is the question of the authority of this Organization. Israel has followed the path of South Africa and Portugal in defying this international body by constantly refusing to implement all the United Nations resolutions. Should the Organization stand, hands tied, in face of this humiliating attitude of a Member State?

78. Since the Israeli aggression of 1967, this Assembly has adopted six resolutions in addition to those adopted by the Security Council, including resolution 242 (1967), which is the corner-stone of the United Nations efforts to establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

79. Efforts by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative to find ways and means to implement that resolution were all frustrated by Israel. The recent report of the Secretary-General [A/8541] speaks for itself. The Secretary-General has told us in the report that until there has been a change in the Israeli position on the question of withdrawal, it would serve little purpose to attempt to reactivate the talks. Until today, there is no change in that position. In his statement before this Assembly on 6 December 1971 [2000th meeting], the Foreign Minister of Israel made it abundantly clear that Israel will not

withdraw from all the occupied Arab territories. This was the real sense of his statement, beyond the maze of witty words. What he said about his readiness now to resume talks to work out a Suez Canal agreement and a general peace agreement are mere delaying tactics, designed to prolong the illegal occupation of the Arab lands. On the other hand, both Egypt and Jordan gave positive answers to the questions put to them by Mr. Jarring as regards peace with Israel. This was again clearly demonstrated in the statement made by the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt in his speech before this Assembly on 3 December 1971 [1999th meeting] and in the statement made by the representative of Jordan in his speech on 7 December 1971 [2006th meeting].

80. It is very revealing to note that the statement delivered by the Foreign Minister of Israel sought to give the impression that the Middle East question is a conflict between Israel and Egypt. Not a single word in that lengthy statement was said about the other occupied territories. Does Israel intend to annex them forever? What about the occupied Arab territories in Jordan? What about the occupied Arab territories in Syria? And most important of all, what about the occupation of Palestine itself, the original sin and the root-cause of the so-called Middle East crisis? What about Jerusalem, the Holy City, which was illegally annexed by Israel in contemptuous defiance of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and of the millions of faithful of three great religions across the globe?

81. Israel stands today condemned by the whole world. All peace-loving countries are supporting the Arab cause. The Organization of African Unity adopted resolution AHG/Res.66 (VIII) on 22 June 1971, calling for:

“... immediate withdrawal of Israel armed forces from all Arab territories to the lines of 5 June 1967 in implementation of Security Council resolution 242 of 22 November 1967,”⁴

and deploring Israel's defiance of the initiative of the United Nations Secretary-General's Special Representative.

82. The Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Lusaka in September 1970, representing more than half of the population of the entire world, adopted a resolution on the Middle East in which it declared that “full respect for the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine is a prerequisite to peace in the Middle East”.

83. The majority of United Nations Members, including some of Israel's traditional friends, have condemned Israel. United Nations resolutions will remain meaningless so long as Israel continues to boast of its aggression, and so long as some forces within the American ruling establishment continue to advocate furnishing Israel with material aid and lethal weapons not only to commit aggression but also to enjoy the fruits of that aggression by maintaining its military superiority.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Supplement for July, August and September 1971, document S/10272.

84. War is war and aggression is aggression. No degree of wit or plays on words can change this sad reality. The issues in this crisis are simple. Israel must abide by the United Nations Charter and withdraw from all the occupied Arab territories. The inalienable rights of the people of Palestine must be restored. Only then can we hope for a lasting peace in the Middle East.

85. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): In my statement during the debate on the situation in the Middle East last year [1893rd meeting], I set out my Government's views on all the main elements of a settlement. Since that time, the situation in the area has not changed. Nor have the views of my Government. We continue to believe that the only basis for a settlement in the Middle East is Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which should be carried out in all its parts and provisions.

86. There is little doubt that the belief that resolution 242 (1967) should be the basis for any settlement of the problem is shared by virtually all the Members of this Organization. Certainly it is shared by the main parties to the conflict. Equally certainly it is shared by all the participants in the four-Power talks, a group which, incidentally, we still believe could make a useful contribution to the quest for a settlement. What, then, is the present disagreement about?

87. The present disagreement is, of course, about how to achieve this agreed end. That is to say, it is essentially a problem of means rather than of ends. I therefore propose to concentrate on means rather than on ends in what I have to say today.

88. Over the past year there have been three main attempts to bring about a settlement: first, the continued, and continuing, efforts of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Ambassador Jarring; secondly, the initiative of the United States, designed to bring about an interim arrangement providing for the reopening of the Suez Canal, and thirdly, the mission undertaken recently by the Organization of African Unity. All these efforts have had as their ultimate end the achievement of a settlement in accordance with resolution 242 (1967). All, therefore, have had, and will continue to have, the whole-hearted support of my Government.

89. Since the immediate aims of the United States initiative are more limited than those of the mission of the Organization of African Unity or of that of Ambassador Jarring, it may be appropriate to consider it first. As my Government has seen it—and the representative of the United States will doubtless correct me if I am wrong—the basic objective of the United States initiative was, and is, to achieve, as a step towards an over-all settlement on the basis of resolution 242 (1967), agreement on an arrangement which would permit the reopening of the Suez Canal and a measure of Israeli withdrawal. We have followed the progress of this initiative with interest. Such an arrangement would not, indeed could not, be more than temporary or interim. Nor would it be an end in itself. But, if successfully concluded, such an agreement would bring about a certain deconfrontation which, hopefully, would transform the atmosphere and pave the way for a comprehensive settlement. If those concerned consider that it

would be useful to persist in this quest, we shall naturally continue to hope for its success.

90. We have also followed with close interest the mission of the four African Heads of State. As the Foreign Minister of Senegal reminded us in his statement before this Assembly a few days ago [2002nd meeting], the mission was intended solely "to unblock the Jarring mission" and to achieve the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). This was clearly an extremely valuable initiative. We welcome the mission's report and very much hope that a means will be found to put it to constructive use.

91. As far as Ambassador Jarring's mission is concerned, the most important development in the past year was undoubtedly his initiative of 8 February. We have consistently supported Ambassador Jarring in his mission and we welcomed the aide-memoire which he addressed to the Governments of the United Arab Republic, now Egypt, and Israel on that date [A/8541, annex I], seeking certain parallel commitments, to be made simultaneously and reciprocally and subject to the eventual satisfactory determination of all other aspects of the problem, including, in particular, a just settlement of the refugee problem. On the one hand, Ambassador Jarring sought from Israel a commitment to withdraw its forces from occupied Egyptian territory to the former international boundary between Egypt and the British Mandated Territory of Palestine. On the other hand, he sought from Egypt a commitment to enter into a peace agreement with Israel and to make explicitly to Israel, on a reciprocal basis, various undertakings and acknowledgements arising directly or indirectly from operative paragraph 1 (ii) of Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

92. My delegation welcomed the constructive nature of the response which the Egyptian Government made to Ambassador Jarring's aide-memoire on 15 February [A/8541, annex II]. In its reply, the Egyptian Government indicated that it would accept the specific commitments requested of it, as well as other commitments arising directly or indirectly from Security Council resolution 242 (1967), if Israel would give, for its part, commitments covering its own obligations under resolution 242 (1967), including commitments for the withdrawal of its armed forces from the Sinai peninsula and the Gaza Strip and for the achievement of a just settlement of the refugee problem.

93. The Government of Israel has not yet replied directly to Ambassador Jarring's aide-memoire. We still hope that it will do so. It has, however, made clear its views on a number of occasions. In particular, it has made clear that, while it is unwilling at this stage to give an affirmative answer to the basic question which Ambassador Jarring put to it, its concern is not with territory but with security.

94. In his statement in the general debate earlier this session [2000th meeting], Mr. Eban said that Israel did not have a policy for expansion or annexation. He went on to say that in the negotiations on boundaries and withdrawals it would seek only those modifications which are essential to ensure its security and to prevent another war.

95. In these circumstances, if Mr. Eban were able in the context of the correspondence with Mr. Jarring to say that Israel had no desire to incorporate any Egyptian sovereign territory into the State of Israel, this might constitute the response which Mr. Jarring needs in order to resume the search for a peaceful settlement. I note that a similar idea was suggested earlier in this debate by the Foreign Minister of Senegal.

96. We believe that dialogue must supplant confrontation once Mr. Jarring's mission is resumed. As my Foreign Minister said in his statement before this Assembly on 29 September, "unless a mechanism of dialogue can be established, sooner or later—and maybe sooner rather than later—the fighting will start again" [1944th meeting, para. 97]. As Sir Alec Douglas-Home went on to say, we believe that "the tempo" of this dialogue "must be quicker than it has been until now, and it must be at closer range" [ibid., para. 98]. We should therefore hope that, at an early stage after the resumption of Mr. Jarring's mission, it would be possible to arrange some closer form of contact between the Egyptian and Israeli Governments under the auspices of Mr. Jarring, to agree on the basis of a settlement. A similar procedure might then be followed in the case of the other parties concerned. I have, as I said I would, concentrated on means rather than ends in what I have said. Ends and means are, however, intimately related, and it is my belief that, as is so often the case, we shall find the key to the ends by tackling first questions of means. In any case let me make clear that my Government is most anxious to see a peaceful settlement and that we are ready to do all in our power to help bring about such a settlement.

97. Mr. POLYANICHKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translation from Russian*): It has already been four and a half years since Israel invaded Egypt, Jordan and Syria, and the consequences of the Israeli aggression have still not been eliminated. Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, which is the basis for a political settlement and for the establishment of a lasting peace in the Middle East, still remains unimplemented. Israel is also disregarding General Assembly resolution 2628 (XXV).

98. As is clear from the report of the Secretary-General on the activities of his Special Representative to the Middle East [A/8541], the mission of Ambassador Jarring, which was to promote implementation of that Security Council resolution, is virtually deadlocked. The fate of hundreds of thousands of Arabs who have been forcibly driven from their lands by the Israeli annexationists remains as unsettled as ever. The Suez Canal is still inoperative, and this is doing considerable damage to international shipping.

99. Thus, despite all the efforts of the United Nations and despite its clearly expressed will, the cause of a political settlement of the Middle East crisis has in reality not been furthered. The situation in this region continues to remain extremely tense, and there is still a danger of a new outburst, which this time could threaten peace and security throughout the world.

100. The course of events has clearly shown that the responsibility for the situation belongs entirely to the rulers of Israel and their patrons. The Israeli aggressors are

flouting the United Nations Charter and defying the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly by continuing to occupy vast portions of Arab countries and to torpedo all efforts to restore peace in the Middle East.

101. On the other hand, anyone who is objective and who is familiar with the true state of affairs cannot fail to appreciate the constructive, peace-loving position of the Arab Republic of Egypt and the other Arab countries on the question of a Middle East settlement. The Arab Republic of Egypt which, as is known, has taken a whole series of peace initiatives—they were enumerated in the carefully reasoned statement of its Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Riad [1999th meeting]—has repeatedly stressed that it views Security Council resolution 242 (1967) as the basis for a political settlement of the Middle East crisis that was created by Israeli aggression.

102. The policy of the Arab Republic of Egypt convincingly demonstrates its goodwill and its sincere desire to obtain a political solution to the problem.

103. As is known, the Arab Republic of Egypt has always co-operated constructively with the mission of Ambassador Jarring and has made every effort to ensure its success. This is demonstrated also by the reply given by the Arab Republic of Egypt on 15 February [A/8541, annex II] to Ambassador Jarring's aide-mémoire, in which that country declared its readiness to make the concrete commitments proposed in the aide-mémoire as well as the other commitments from Security Council resolution 242 (1967). During the consultations with the mission of the four African heads of State, it was stressed once again that the Arab Republic of Egypt is fully and unreservedly prepared to co-operate with the mission of Ambassador Gunnar Jarring.

104. This realistic position of the Arab Republic of Egypt creates favourable conditions for a solution to the Middle East problem and prospects for peace in the region. What more is needed under these circumstances for a just political settlement? First of all, what is needed is a sincere readiness on the part of Israel to obtain a political settlement of the Middle East crisis.

105. Israel, however, has so far continued to take an obstructionist position on virtually every aspect of a settlement. Moreover, it has adopted, and continues to adopt an attitude of unconcealed hostility towards the decisions of the United Nations, the peace proposals of the Arab countries and every sincere effort to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in its entirety.

106. Let us take as an example the key question of the withdrawal of troops from the territories occupied as a result of the Israeli aggression of June 1967. Israel did not even commit itself to implementing this highly important provision of resolution 242 (1967). Israel has refused to reply affirmatively to Ambassador Jarring's aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971 and, in effect, has shelved the question of withdrawal of troops and replaced it by illegal territorial claims, stubbornly declaring its refusal to withdraw its troops to the 5 June 1967 line. The statement of the Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs [2000th meeting], which

contained an arbitrary interpretation of resolution 242 (1967), leaves no doubt that Israel is in practice refusing to acknowledge the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war. Unless that principle is complied with, any settlement in the Middle East will be impossible. Such actions also flagrantly violate and undermine the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 2734 (XXV)], adopted at the twenty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

107. By continuing its policy of expansion, Israel is openly acting as an aggressor and is blatantly defying the United Nations and international public opinion. The Israeli leaders are still hoping to earn dividends from the aggression they have committed against the Arab countries. With that purpose in mind, they have embarked on a course of obstructionism, dictating their own conditions, and are endeavouring to prevent a just political settlement.

108. One wonders where the Israeli adventurers get the arrogance to defy the United Nations and international public opinion. The political, diplomatic, economic, financial and military assistance given to Israel by the United States and by international zionism is the source of the arrogance, treachery and stubbornness of the Israeli militant reactionaries. In recent years the representatives of the United States have, more than once, spoken of what they call their desire for the restoration of peace in the Middle East and their so-called "friendliness" towards the Arab peoples, thus creating the appearance that it is making efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement. In actual fact, the United States is pursuing a policy of encouraging the aggressor, and is trying by diplomatic means to do what its partner was unable to do by military means.

109. All Washington's assurances about what it calls its desire to "influence" Israeli Middle East policy as well as all the old—and the new—"peace-making" initiatives of the United States should not create any illusions. In putting forward the recent "Rogers plan" the United States, in the first place, has proposed no concrete measures for meeting the most important condition for a settlement, the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab lands. In the second place, it is not halting its military deliveries to Israel, but on the contrary is adhering to its old position by maintaining the notorious "balance of power in the Middle East".

110. The true purposes of the Israeli extremists and those who support them are becoming clear in the light of the annexationist and colonizing measures that are being undertaken so feverishly by the Zionist Israeli leaders in the occupied territories. There is an eloquent *exposé* of this carefully planned programme of annexation in the report, submitted to the members of the General Assembly, of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories [A/8389 and Add.1].

111. The invaders are organizing the mass expulsion of the indigenous inhabitants of the Arab territories, creating Israeli settlements, "appropriating" Gaza, the Golan Heights and the West Bank of the Jordan and plundering the natural wealth of the occupied Arab lands.

112. The actions of Israel have, time and time again, revealed the true nature of zionism, which is the basis of the policy of the Israeli Government. It is becoming clearer and clearer to the peoples of the world that zionism, which goes hand in hand with colonialism, racism and *apartheid*, is inimical to the ideals of friendship and brotherhood among peoples, and favours the interests of the Jewish people alone. Zionism is one of the ways of undermining peace and security and exacerbating international tension, and a means of crushing the national liberation movements.

113. The essence of zionism is, in practice, displayed particularly clearly in the policy of aggression and expansion and in the Israeli version of *apartheid* with all its cruelties, repression, forced resettlements in ghettos and destruction of entire villages of those who do not belong to the "people chosen by God". Incidentally, even the "chosen people" are, in Zionist practice, divided into the "pure" and the "impure".

114. As it openly preaches its evil racist and chauvinist theories, zionism is trying, with these inhuman ideas, to provide a foundation for its doctrines of colonial expansion and seizure of "*lebensraum*". How strikingly this brings to mind another ideology that was based on equally reactionary myths, the ideology of nazism.

115. Recently the Zionist storm troopers have unleashed a frenzied campaign, accompanied by terrorist attacks, against the diplomatic missions of a number of States in an attempt to exacerbate relations between States and to divert attention from their crimes in the Middle East and complicate a settlement in that area.

116. We are sure, however, that the unswerving will of the Arab peoples and their desire for independence, freedom, peace and social progress will triumph, and that the plans of the Israeli aggressors and their patrons are doomed to failure. The occupiers will be forced to leave all the Arab lands they seized in 1967. It is inevitable that justice will prevail. Justice can be postponed but, in the final analysis, it cannot be escaped.

117. The position of the Ukrainian SSR on the Middle East question has always been, and continues to be, clear and based on principle. We consistently oppose aggression and the acquisition of territory by war, and we demand that the aggressor should not be rewarded. We support the unconditional and total implementation of all parts of Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

118. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR hopes that the discussion of this question at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly will make it possible, through the joint efforts to all States Members of the United Nations, to curb the arrogant aggressor and to bring about a speedy and just settlement, taking into account the legitimate rights of all peoples of the Middle East, including the Palestine people.

119. Our Organization must, therefore, take decisive measures, as provided for in the Charter, to eliminate quickly the hotbed of war in the Middle East and to bring about the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the occupied lands, the return of those lands, and the restoration of the

rights of the Arab peoples. That would make it possible to ensure peace and security, sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and the legitimate rights of all States of the region.

120. The sooner the United Nations achieves these ends, the sooner peace will come to the long-suffering Middle East.

121. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (*interpretation from French*): More than four years have elapsed since the Security Council vote on the resolution which set forth the principles for a settlement in the Middle East, and we are still at the same point. The same obstacles are our stumbling block. However, our responsibility remains the same—to bring about a peace that can be negotiated and established once and for all.

122. It is imperative that the international community, finally represented here almost in its entirety, should fully recognize this responsibility. Yet at the same time nothing could be more dangerous than for us to harbour illusions about the difficulty of a task which the Secretary-General described as "almost impossible" in his report on 30 November [A/8541], and I would like to underline the lofty inspiration and perfect clarity of this report. Although the risks of the present situation are apparent to us all and although prolonging it is obviously contrary to what is right and fraught with threats for the future, the search for a settlement is today, despite commendable efforts, once again at an impasse.

123. To be sure, it is over a year ago that fighting stopped. In the international circumstances of the moment, it is scarcely necessary to stress the merit of countries which have adhered to the path of wisdom, and governments which have helped in this respect should be congratulated. One can find in this effort not to do anything irreparable grounds for hope and some encouragement for our efforts. I am afraid, however, that this might be the only positive factor in the present situation. At the present time, in the area itself and in all kinds of ways the *de facto* takes precedence over the *de jure* in the Middle East, both in the occupation of territories which served as the theatre of war and in the fate of the Palestinian people, in political relations and economic exchanges between the parties and the rest of the world, and lastly in the issue of freedom of navigation.

124. Is it conceivable that such a state of affairs could continue for a long time to come? Injustice always provokes revolt, occupation and resistance. There is no momentary weakness that does not in the long run find the energy and the resources for revenge. These surprises and acts of desperation must be avoided for, regardless of the determination of governments, imponderable factors can create an incident with its only too predictable consequences: armed confrontation.

125. Given such a precarious balance, we should especially guard against thinking that time is on the side of peace.

126. Peace is the first and greatest obligation of the United Nations. We are bound to act by the Charter itself, which gives all countries the possibility of appealing to the

international organization to see to it that their sovereignty is respected and that the rule of law is restored. Nobody here can contest the fact that for the peoples of this region, prolonging the present situation is a denial of justice and a challenge to our Organization.

127. In observing that the search for a peaceful settlement is at an impasse today, I did not mean to underestimate the efforts made over the past four years. They have prevented more serious clashes. They have made it possible for us to see the situation more clearly and better define the elements and conditions of settlement; they have enabled us to explore certain avenues.

128. France, for its part, took the initiative of bringing the four permanent members of the Security Council together on this. We all know how and why these efforts are currently blocked. We have also started talks with the other countries of the European Economic Community and the applicant countries. Lastly, we have welcomed with hope the mission that the Organization for African Unity entrusted to four eminent Chiefs of State, presided over by President Ould Daddah, a man of great competence and wisdom. The ministers representing them here Mr. Amadou Karim Gaye in particular and Mr. Arikpo have set forth their conclusions and I would like to pay tribute to their valuable contribution.

129. Nevertheless, in spite of the wisdom, authority and tenacity behind these efforts, the cause of peace still comes up against the same obstacles.

130. I will briefly try once again to specify the nature of these.

131. The first of these obstacles results from the scope and multiplicity of problems which can only be satisfactorily and definitively resolved in the framework of an over-all settlement. This is the essence of Security Council resolution 242 (1967): peace can be lastingly established only if the settlement deals with all the problems and applies to all the countries concerned. However, to speak of an over-all settlement does not necessarily exclude—perhaps it even calls for—a settlement by stages, on condition that they are truly stages—that is, steps linked together in the implementation of an over-all solution.

132. The second obstacle, which is really at the very heart of our difficulties, results from the interpretation of the concept of withdrawal in relation to commitments to peace.

133. For us, the question of the withdrawal of occupying forces must be settled in accordance with one principle: that of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and, since the right of conquest is excluded, borders must coincide—except for minor rectifications agreed on by the parties—with the borders and the lines existing prior to the 1967 conflict, it being understood that respect for these borders, ensured by the peace agreement, will be strengthened by political and military measures taken by the parties as well as by international guarantees.

134. This is how we must understand the idea of secure and recognized borders. This is the only interpretation

which conforms to resolution 242 (1967), and particularly with the principle of non-acquisition of territory by force which its preamble reaffirms. By accepting the validity of this idea, the parties, committing themselves to peace conditions will solemnly agree to respect the inviolability of frontiers and undertake at the same time to recognize them *de jure*. This would be an element of vital importance in the settlement and would constitute decisive progress toward the establishment of lasting peace and toward a definitive normalization of the international situation in the Middle East. For true security lies in the mutually accepted recognition, guaranteed as necessary by other countries and by the international community, of the existence, independence and sovereignty of the States, within definitively agreed frontiers.

135. The third obstacle results from profound differences, with which you are familiar, concerning the solution to the painful problem of the Palestinian people. How can we be assured that the rights which the principles of the Charter and United Nations resolutions give them, in a general way and as refugees, will be respected? This problem is extremely complex, but unless it is considered and solved, any settlement negotiated by the States concerned might be jeopardized in the long run.

136. Our Assembly can make a useful contribution to this task by reaffirming the necessary principles, by inviting the parties to comply with them, by giving its approval to continued work in this direction by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Jarring, and by encouraging him to pursue his task. We believe that the best chance for a peaceful settlement still lies precisely in this action.

137. I will not reiterate the steps which Mr. Jarring took during the first months of the year. But I want to recall that by taking initiatives in his aide-mémoire of 8 February [A/8541, annex I] to present to the two parties concerned the basic questions that I have just mentioned, Mr. Jarring succeeded in isolating the search for a political solution from the secondary considerations which were obscuring it; he thus opened, up in our opinion, the only path which can lead to a settlement. Egypt, for its part, has responded largely in a positive manner to these questions by basically committing itself to signing a peace agreement with Israel which would include the mutual recognition of independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and borders, if the legitimate requirement of evacuation of the occupied territories is satisfied in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967). We are awaiting as positive a reply from the State of Israel.

138. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General deserves our gratitude. We owe it to him and to the cause of peace to confirm the support of the international community for the principles of the settlement which he is striving for as well as for the continuation of his mission. We also hope that he will soon receive the concerted support of the permanent members of the Security Council which approved resolution 242 (1967).

139. It is therefore up to the Assembly once again to express, on the Middle East question, the international community's desire to see the conclusion of the just settlement which the United Nations is awaiting; we are

convinced that the Assembly will deem it its duty to reaffirm this position. Our hope is that this appeal will be heeded.

140. My delegation wishes to reserve its right to speak later on the draft resolutions to be submitted. I should, however, like to declare here and now that the draft resolution submitted by 18 States [A/L.650], many of which are African States, is fully acceptable to us.

141. In the course of this debate, many of our colleagues who are justifiably preoccupied with the Indo-Pakistani conflict have drawn parallels and commented on similarities. I do not believe that we should, however, confuse the two situations. Comparison is not logic, and, as we all know, reasoning by analogy is not conclusive, and things can always be interpreted differently.

142. But from analysis of the situation, we would conclude one thing: world public opinion has often been legitimately indignant over the impotence of the United Nations—and, in particular, of the General Assembly and the Security Council. World public opinion is right; but what should be said—and this is perhaps the only lesson which we should learn from the present tragic events—is that, very often, the Security Council and the General Assembly are presented with situations which have already deteriorated, when the irreparable has already been done, or is on the point of being done. It is then too late to do anything about situations that have become hopeless.

143. We should, however, learn something from this lesson: we should not wait until things have got out of hand. There is now a chance for peace, as we have already said; time is not on our side. We should take this opportunity. That is why we believe that the General Assembly has an obligation to indicate in what direction efforts should be pursued, and that is why we believe that the General Assembly should encourage Mr. Jarring to resume his work for peace.

144. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): Kuwait, as an Arab State, is directly and profoundly concerned with the situation in the Middle East. Ever since the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly, my delegation has consistently participated in every debate on this question, or on any of its ramifications, and expressed our consistent position relating to it. The purpose of my statement is to emphasize two points which my delegation considers fundamental, in the literal meaning of the term.

145. First, the situation in the Middle East cannot be brought to normality without taking into account the inalienable rights and the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian Arab people, including its right to, and aspirations for, self-determination. This principle has at last been fully recognized by the General Assembly in several formal resolutions adopted at the twenty-fourth, twenty-fifth and the current twenty-sixth sessions. The General Assembly emphatically declared that:

“... full respect for the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine is an indispensable element in the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East” [resolution 2672 C (XXV)].

It is only when they are interpreted in this context that such phrases as "a just settlement of the refugee problem" can be authoritative, consistent with the Charter, and conducive to a just and lasting peace.

146. Secondly, the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by conquest is the cornerstone of a just and stable international order. It is a principle which should not, under any circumstances, be subject to bargaining or compromise. Whoever abrogates it must assume the responsibility for shaking the entire edifice of international order which the United Nations was created in order to build and protect. Nor can that principle be subject to erosion by equivocation or sophistry. No amount of causistry can transform the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by conquest into the counterfeit principle of the purported legitimacy of the annexation of conquered territory, whatever the label attached to the act of annexation, and whatever the pretext used in the attempt to justify it.

147. In all the patient efforts exerted over the past four years by several agencies, both within and outside the framework of the United Nations, in order to bring about a peaceful settlement of the problems resulting from Israeli aggression and the occupation of territories of Arab States, one constant factor—one constant obstacle to all peace-making efforts—has been Israel's rejection of the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by conquest, and its unswerving pursuit of the objective of territorial expansion by conquest. The semantic acrobatics and the legalistic sophistry used in attempting to justify and whitewash this total Israeli dedication to territorial expansion deceive no one. What Israel's words have endeavoured to disguise and even conceal, Israel's deeds have fully exposed; for, while peace-making efforts have been going on and on, with seemingly endless patience, Israel has been actively and energetically seeking to create what Israeli leaders have called "new facts" in the occupied territories, leading to their piecemeal and steady *de facto* annexation and to confronting the international community with yet another *fait accompli*. Even a partial catalogue of the various manifestations of this relentless process of "israelization" of the occupied Arab territories would take far too long to cite; suffice it to point to a few of the more glaring of those manifestations.

148. Israel has formally annexed occupied Jerusalem.

149. Israel has formally renamed the occupied west bank of the Jordan "Samaria" and "Judea".

150. Israel has formally come to call the "occupied territories" the "administered territories".

151. Israel has extended its laws to the Golan Heights.

152. Israel has linked the economy and the economic infra-structure of occupied Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip, the Golan Heights, and parts of the Sinai peninsula and the west bank of the Jordan to its own economy. Telephones, electric power, roads, and employment patterns in the occupied Arab areas have been inextricably linked to those of Israel.

153. Israel has helped itself without restraint to the natural resources of the occupied territories, freely exploiting them to its own advantage.

154. Israel has confiscated private and public property.

155. Israel has plundered the archaeological wealth of the occupied territories. So extensive has this cultural plunder been that General Dayan, the Defence Minister, has recently been tarnished by reports in the Israeli press and statements in the Israeli Parliament accusing him of illegal profiteering from the yields of the culturally-rich earth of the occupied Holy Land.

156. Israel has sought to bring about a total human, demographic transformation of the occupied territories by expelling indigenous Arabs, and preventing the return of those Arabs who fled during and after the hostilities, and replacing them by new Jewish *colons*, imported from abroad and settled in three dozen new Jewish settlements established in the occupied territories contrary to international law.

157. In the light of all those and similar policies and practices, what credence can one attach to the statement that Israel does not wish to expand its territory? Israeli leaders who publicly state that Israel would never, under any circumstances, return to the lines of 4 June 1967, and who energetically pursue all the aforementioned policies of *de facto* annexation, have forfeited any right to be believed when they disavow, so righteously, any expansionist intention.

158. I wish to conclude by restating what my Foreign Minister said before this Assembly on 8 October 1971 during the general debate at the opening of the current session:

"The international community has passed the stage of reaffirming its principles. It has passed the stage of investigating Israeli policies and practices and determining flagrant Israeli violations. It has passed the stage of declaring certain Israeli measures legally invalid. It has passed the stage of demanding that Israel rescind those measures and desist from taking similar ones in the future. It has passed the stage of expressing its regret and its concern. It has passed the stage of pronouncing censures, of deploring, of condemning. It has passed the stage of publicizing, and focusing the spotlight of world attention on Israeli policies. It has passed the stage of issuing warnings that are not accompanied by indications of its determination to put them into effect.

"It is now incumbent upon the international community, having passed all those stages, to embark upon the course of adoption of punitive measures in accordance with the Charter, in order to compel Israel to show respect for the rules of international law and United Nations resolutions.

"For, otherwise, the United Nations has only two choices: either to go on repeating what has been proved by experience to be unproductive, or to give up and acquiesce in the *fait accompli*, and accept Israel's intransigence as final and unchangeable." [1959th meeting, paras. 154-156.]

159. Mr. ČERNÍK (Czechoslovakia): First of all, may I be permitted to associate myself with those who have expressed their deep sympathy in connexion with the death of former Under-Secretary-General Ralph Bunche, whose qualities and talents as well as his devotion to the United Nations are very well known to the international community. I would appreciate it very much if my condolences, expressed on behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation, could be conveyed to the family of the deceased.

160. Peoples who are interested in the peaceful and progressive development of the world are deeply concerned over the situation in the Middle East, which is rightly a cause of grave apprehension. More than four years have elapsed since the armed aggression of Israel against the Arab Republic of Egypt, the Syrian Arab Republic and Jordan which resulted in an occupation of territories of those Arab States. The fact that the efforts exerted by the United Nations and a number of countries and aimed at resolving this crisis in the interest of a peaceful settlement have not so far yielded the least results speaks against the ruling circles of Israel, supported by forces of world imperialism. Peace-loving nations are rightly concerned over such a dangerous development of the situation. Nor are the peoples of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic indifferent to the developments in the Middle East.

161. Here we proceed from the principle that world peace is indivisible. Moreover, our people are linked with the people of Arab countries by long-lasting and traditional ties of friendship and co-operation. Therefore, we are deeply and sincerely interested in the early liquidation of that dangerous hotbed of war, which might create serious complications in the international situation as a whole. It is our belief that it is precisely those wider aspects of the Middle East crisis that should guide the United Nations General Assembly to support justice and the observance of international law as well as the principles of the Charter.

162. In his statement the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Mr. Riad [1999th meeting], assessed in detail the developments in the Middle East and shed an absolutely clear light thereon. In the last four years the Arab Republic of Egypt and the other Arab countries have shown great patience and goodwill. However, the obstructionist position of Israel, which has rejected all proposals directed towards a solution, including Egypt's initiative to open the Suez Canal, has prevented any progress on the road towards a peaceful settlement of the situation in the Middle East in the spirit of Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

163. The aggressive and expansionist policies pursued by the present Government of Israel, its endeavours to expand its territory through military conquest are the causes of tensions in the Middle East. The course of action taken by Israel has aroused deep indignation not only in the Arab people but also in the peoples of all countries in the world. Nor is the obstructionist policy of the ruling circles in Israel in the interest of the Israeli people itself.

164. There is no doubt that the current Israeli policy would be impossible if it were not for the political, military, economic and moral support that has been extended for many years by the United States of America and some other Western Powers.

165. The situation in the Middle East has been discussed every year in the forum of the United Nations, which has adopted not only a number of resolutions concerning the substance of the question but also resolutions of a humanitarian nature aimed at alleviating the consequences of the Israeli aggression, in particular in connexion with the fate of the Palestinian refugees and the violations of human rights and freedoms of the Arab population in the occupied territories.

166. It is a fact that Israel rejects not only Security Council resolution 242 (1967) but also other resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly relating to the same problem. Recently, we have witnessed several statements of leading Israeli representatives to the effect that if hostilities were resumed Israel would bring war to the western shores of the Suez Canal and even to the hinterland of the Arab Republic of Egypt. Declarations of a similar character have been made regarding the endeavours to incorporate the occupied Arab territories permanently into Israel.

167. It is easy to comprehend that the present state of affairs fully suits the Israeli Government, for both domestic and military-strategic reasons.

168. It is regrettable that Israel did not respond to the efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Jarring, who has for years patiently tried to contribute to a peaceful settlement of the crisis by political means, on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). The Czechoslovak Government has several times expressed full support for his mission, which may play a significant role in the settlement of the dangerous situation in the Middle East.

169. As is well known, in February 1971 Mr. Jarring made a serious attempt to bring closer to each other the positions of the two parties concerning fundamental questions of decisive importance for a peaceful solution of the conflict. The response of the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt to Mr. Jarring's initiative was unequivocally positive, while the Government of Israel has failed so far to reply. Such a position on the part of Israel, supported by the United States, has prevented any further negotiations concerning a peaceful settlement in the Middle East, and has thus created the new crisis which is confronting us at the present time.

170. This state of affairs is attested to also by the report of the Secretary-General [A/8541] which should, at the same time, be interpreted as a serious appeal to all States Members of the United Nations to try to get out of the impasse created by the obstinate position of the Government of Israel. It is not the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt which obstructs a political settlement of the crisis, but the Government of Israel, which is fully responsible for the present unsound state of affairs.

171. In this situation a group of African countries undertook an initiative aimed at helping Mr. Jarring's mission in the search for a political solution, and decided to send a goodwill mission to the Arab Republic of Egypt and Israel. Such an initiative, which should help get the Jarring mission out of the impasse in which it finds itself, is welcomed.

172. On the other hand, secret diplomacy and lobbying from pro-Israeli positions which circumvent the United Nations, the Security Council and Mr. Jarring's mission, as well as the efforts of the permanent members of the Security Council, cannot contribute in any case, in our opinion, to a peaceful solution of the situation in the Middle East.

173. It is unfortunate that, owing to the actions of some great Powers, the negotiations of permanent members of the Security Council concerning a peaceful settlement of the situation in the Middle East have been completely paralysed. Those negotiations should be resumed immediately in the interest of the revitalization of Mr. Jarring's mission.

174. In the opinion of the Czechoslovak delegation, the General Assembly should at its current session express its full support for Mr. Jarring's mission. At the same time it should urge Israel to respond positively to Mr. Jarring's aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971 [A/8541, annex I] and give a commitment to withdraw its forces from occupied United Arab Republic territory to the former international boundary between Egypt and the territory of the British Mandate of Palestine.

175. The Arab countries, particularly the Arab Republic of Egypt, have demonstrated many times their patience and goodwill in connexion with the solution of the Middle East crisis by political means and by negotiations. It is imperative that the United Nations should once again take a resolute stand and support the just struggle of the Arab countries and the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people for self-determination. We believe that a state of affairs in which the world is exposed to the danger of a catastrophe because of the selfish interests of the expansionist ruling circles of Israel should be brought to an end. We cannot but agree with the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Arab Republic of Egypt that it is necessary to act, and to act with courage and determination.

176. The position of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic concerning a solution of the crisis in the Middle East, which I have voiced here, is not a new one. On various occasions the Czechoslovak Government has emphasized the solidarity of the Czechoslovak people with the just struggle of the people of the Arab countries and the people of Palestine for the liberation of their country, and with the requirement of a complete withdrawal of the Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories. Likewise, the Czechoslovak Government has always reaffirmed its support for Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which we continue to consider as a basis for the solution of the crisis in the Middle East. We believe that use should be made, within our Organization, of all possible means conducive to a peaceful solution of this situation.

177. May I assure you, Mr. President, that in this spirit the Czechoslovak delegation is ready to contribute to an early attainment by the General Assembly of positive results which would promote a peaceful settlement of the situation in the Middle East, in accordance with the provisions of the Security Council resolution and the Charter of the United Nations.

178. Mr. MAGHRIBI (Libyan Arab Republic): The situation in the Middle East, which has been on the agenda of the United Nations for over four years, cannot be viewed as an isolated problem. It is a link in a long chain of Israeli acts of aggression against the people of Palestine and the Arab nation as a whole. In spite of the repeated resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly Israel persists in its occupation of Arab territories, the deportation of Arab civilians and the establishment of new colonial settlements in the Golan Heights, the Golan area, the Gaza Strip, the Sinai peninsula and the west bank of the Jordan. Needless to say, each and every one of those practices is in direct contravention of the Geneva Conventions and constitutes a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the concepts of international law.

179. Because of the adamant financial, military and political support that Israel has been receiving from the United States Government, the Israeli authorities have been persistent in their intransigence and their excessively arrogant activities. It is our belief that, had it not been for the unequivocal support that Washington has been giving to its sub-contractor in the Middle East, Israel could not have realized its expansionist aspirations over the Arab nation, nor could it have persisted in the violation of the precepts of international behaviour by flouting every effort of the international community to implement the principles of the United Nations Charter.

180. The situation in the Middle East is a corollary of a far-reaching problem that has been on the agenda of the United Nations for more than 24 years, namely, the question of Palestine. That question is the primary conflict in the Middle East. The real basis for the continuation of tension and turmoil in the Middle East is the Israeli determination to continue to violate, in theory and in practice, the inalienable rights of the indigenous people of Palestine and to deny the Palestinian people the right of self-determination, recognized in the United Nations Charter. My delegation feels that until the rights of the Palestinian people are fully respected, until they have been returned to their homeland and their land returned to them, it will be impossible to have a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

181. For the past three years the General Assembly has reiterated that full respect for the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine is an indispensable element in the establishment of a just and lasting settlement in the Middle East. Israel's rejection of this principle is hardly new to us. We know from past experience that unless the Israelis achieve what amounts to the surrender of the Arab countries, unless they sow the seed for the future political and economic domination of the Arab countries, they and their masters will not be satisfied. Indeed, their greedy appetite for more expansion, more territory and more domination knows no limits. The aggressors demand to negotiate with their victims but without so-called "pre-conditions"—that is, without the applicability of the United Nations Charter and international law concerning the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. But they do in fact insist on many pre-conditions—to name but one, the non-negotiability of Jerusalem. We submit that the failure of the Security Council in June 1967 to adopt a resolution in harmony with its past practices, based on the

principles of the Charter, and designed to couple a cease-fire with the immediate withdrawal of the aggressor State from the territories that it occupies was a result of American manoeuvring and commitment to the side of the aggressor. The United States Government, therefore, assumes the responsibility for the adulteration of the principles of the United Nations Charter and the dilution of the authority of the Security Council.

182. We also submit that the repeated endeavours by the Security Council, the Big Four and the General Assembly to reach some kind of a settlement were futile because of the organic links that exist between Israel as a client State and its metropolitan base in Washington. The United States Government has used Israel as a garrison base to be used in its monstrous design to prevent the realization of the aspirations of the Arab nation for progress, unity and liberation.

183. Under such circumstances, the situation cannot but deteriorate. While it is the prerogative of all States concerned to endeavour to reach a settlement between the aggressor and the neighbouring Arab States, it must be remembered, however that no agreement between any or all of those States is binding on the Palestinian people. In short, no State, regardless of its socio-economic ideology, no king or president, alone or collectively, is entitled to barter away the rights of the Palestinian people to their national homeland for the sake of political accommodation with the oppressor and aggressor.

184. In relation to this, my delegation would like to state the following. The Palestinian people, the primary party to the conflict in the Middle East and the aggrieved party, have declared unequivocally, at the United Nations and in other international conferences, that they alone speak on behalf of the Palestinian people. Consequently, any solution that may be envisioned which does not take into consideration the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinians and their inalienable right to their homeland, will be devoid of content and therefore no solution at all. The United Nations, in its endeavour to live up to its principle and to be the instrument of world peace based on law, must exert all the necessary means to force the aggressor to withdraw from all Arab occupied territories and to facilitate the implementation of the United Nations resolutions.

185. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Spain, participating today in this debate on the Middle East, wishes to express its serious concern over the continuation of a situation which is not only a threat to peace in the world but is also jeopardizing the effectiveness and very life of our Organization. If we are in fact in favour of peace based on justice, the international community must become clearly aware, at this dramatic hour for Asia and the entire world, that it is necessary to put an end to an injustice and permanent violence which is symbolized by the maintenance of territories occupied by force in opposition to the inalienable right of States to territorial integrity. Beyond all kinds of justifications and explanations, beyond all real or seeming difficulties and all genuine or false attempts at negotiations and at settlement, one fact remains in the Middle East: part of the territory of three States Members of the United Nations continues to be occupied militarily, and this makes the restoration of peace impossible.

186. The United Nations is aware of the existence of this inequitable situation in the Middle East and the dangers involved, and it has stated this on a number of occasions. But its efforts to resolve the dispute on the basis of justice and the legitimate interests of the parties, have not yet yielded positive results. Whereas the Arab countries have responded favourably to the peace initiatives undertaken by Ambassador Jarring and have declared that they are prepared to abide by Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in all its parts, Israel continues to maintain an inflexible attitude, indifferent to any argument that does not suit it.

187. Indeed, Israel not only rejects the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, but also denies the competence of these bodies to deal with this matter and accuses them of partisanship and ineffectiveness. A little more than two months ago, the Security Council met as a matter of urgency to consider the serious situation existing in Jerusalem, where the Israeli authorities, notwithstanding United Nations decisions, continue to pursue a policy of annexation and Israelization of the Holy City. The unanimous feeling of the Council was crystallized in resolution 298 (1971) reaffirming once again "... the principle that acquisition of territory by military conquest is inadmissible". Israel reacted with a declaration which appears in the records of the Council's 1582nd meeting, rejecting this and all the resolutions on Jerusalem and announcing that it would pursue its policy of *fait accompli* regardless of all decisions and appeals by the Council.

188. The last time that the General Assembly met to deal with the Middle East question, it adopted resolution 2628 (XXV), which reaffirmed once again:

"that the acquisition of territories by force is inadmissible and that, consequently, territories thus occupied must be restored".

What was Israel's reply in this case? It rejected that resolution and any others that might be adopted, on the pretext that this was the result of the working of "automatic majorities" favourable in principle to the Arab cause.

189. There is only one explanation for that attitude: the determination of Israel to remain in the occupied territories, taking advantage of the passage of time by trying to consolidate its position by bringing in imported populations to settle on lands which were obtained and are maintained by the force of arms. Israel does not conceal these expansionist plans and has stated from this rostrum that it does not intend to withdraw from all the occupied territories, but rather from parts of them, depending on conditions to be determined in direct negotiations with the Arab countries.

190. By means of a *fait accompli* an attempt is thereby made to impose a military occupation on the Arab territories in order to begin a limited negotiation from a position of strength on points which Israel considers to be essential to its interests. It is not seeking genuine negotiations, but rather capitulation. It is not seeking lasting peace, but rather the perpetuation of an inadmissible situation which would necessarily sow the seeds of further discord. It

is not seeking the restoration of justice, in a word, but rather the recognition of the fruits of conquest.

191. What arguments does Israel give to justify this conduct? On the one hand a partial and distorted interpretation of resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council and on the other hand the need to maintain certain occupied territories as a guarantee of its own security.

192. The delegation of Israel has been using an interpretation of the English version of resolution 242 (1967) to maintain and assert that it is not obliged to withdraw from all occupied territories but only from part of them, in a desperate attempt to cling to a play on words which allows it to avoid its obligations and justify its expansionist appetites. This argument is not convincing and all the Members of this Organization are aware of this, because neither the spirit nor the letter of resolution 242 (1967), either in English or still less in the other official languages—which are equally authentic—justifies such an interpretation. The Spanish text refers to the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from the territories occupied during the recent conflict. This is inevitable in the light of the second preambular paragraph which states as a general principle “the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war”. But above all, Israel’s arguments must be rejected because the principle of the non-acquisition of territories is a direct consequence of the fundamental right of a State to its territorial integrity, which is recognized in norms and instruments which are beyond any unilateral or one-sided interpretation of this word or that term in one language or another. Is it necessary to refer to the provisions of the Charter, the solemn declarations of the General Assembly, the resolutions of the principal bodies of the United Nations, the norms of international law and the ethical and juridical principles which govern relations among States in order to prove that the interpretation offered by Israel is not acceptable?

193. Nor are Israel’s arguments concerning security convincing to this Assembly. Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which contains the necessary elements for a political settlement to the conflict, recognizes that all States in the area have a right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries; but it is unacceptable that such boundaries should be set to the detriment of the territorial integrity of any State. If this were to be accepted, it would not be a genuine withdrawal but rather a case of expansion going so far as to give Israel part of the territories which it illegally occupies today, thus consolidating in law what is nothing more than a situation that has been brought about as a result of the use of force. Furthermore, in the world of rockets, of airborne divisions and supersonic aeroplanes, how can anyone believe that control of a bridge, a river or heights can provide adequate guarantees of security? The guarantees that are needed by all States in the area are covered in resolution 242 (1967) and these consist in the adoption of adequate measures, including demilitarized zones on both sides of the frontiers. These guarantees must be set forth in a general political settlement of the conflict, taking into account the interests of all the parties, including the rights of the Palestinian people, as is recognized in paragraph 3 of resolution 2628 (XXV) which was adopted by the General Assembly at its last session.

194. The events in Asia in this autumn of 1971 make the conflict in the Middle East appear particularly sombre. In view of the inability of this Organization to settle such major disputes, it would seem that countries have decided to use violence and force to assert their arguments. This course can lead only to a catastrophe. The only valid alternative remaining is once again to use the General Assembly to reactivate the Jarring mission and to prepare the way for negotiations in an attempt to restore peace and justice in this disrupted area of our planet before it is too late. The United Nations, consistent with the powers and responsibilities arising from the Charter, is obliged to make a further effort to induce Israel to respond favourably to Ambassador Jarring’s peace initiative and accept resolution 242 (1967) without reservation, pledging to evacuate all territories which it occupies illegally today and to negotiate in good faith the details of a genuine peace within the framework of the provisions of that resolution.

195. As long as there continue to be militarily occupied territories, there will be no peace in the Middle East because no one can expect that peoples will abandon the most just of claims: the restoration of land which has been taken from them by force. Only when all the provisions of resolution 242 (1967) have been fully accepted without reservation—and it was adopted more than four years ago—and only when there is a pledge to co-operate in good faith with the initiative of Ambassador Jarring can peace be restored in the Middle East. It is high time for the peoples of this area, the cradle of one of the oldest civilizations of the world, to see their right to live in peace become a reality. It must be a just and worthy peace which will lead to co-operation and coexistence among all the people of the area.

196. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translation from Russian*): The continuation of Israeli aggression against the Arab States, Israel’s stubborn refusal to withdraw its troops from the occupied Arab territories, its overt policy of annexing the seized lands, its open sabotage of United Nations decisions and its desire to avoid a peaceful political settlement and, finally, the support of the imperialist forces for Israel’s aggressive ambitions—all this forces the General Assembly once again to take up the question of the situation in the Middle East.

197. The absence of a political settlement in this region of the world, for which Israel and its patrons are to blame, is prolonging the tension in the area. This means that there is grave danger of a new outburst, which could have the most serious consequences for the cause of peace and international security.

198. Since June 1967, the Security Council, the General Assembly and other United Nations organs have taken dozens of decisions condemning the incessant acts of lawlessness and aggression by Israel and demanding the speedy attainment of a political settlement in the Middle East. The basis of these decisions is the well-known Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and General Assembly resolution 2628 (XXV), which indicate the only true path towards resolving the Middle East conflict and establishing a lasting peace in the area.

199. These decisions confirm the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, demand the return of the

occupied territories and the withdrawal from them of Israeli armed forces, and envisage other concrete measures involving various aspects of the Middle East problem. They also propose that Israel and the Arab States make use of the services of Ambassador Jarring, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, so as to achieve the speedy implementation of all parts of Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

200. Last year's General Assembly resolution [2628 (XXV)] assumed that two months later Ambassador Jarring would be able to report through the Secretary-General on the results of his efforts and on the implementation of the Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

201. One would have thought that the will of the General Assembly would have compelled the ruling circles of Israel and their patrons to heed the voice of reason and adopt a realistic approach to the question of a Middle East settlement. Initially, as a result of this decision, contacts were renewed through Ambassador Jarring. But then they were broken off because of the obstructionist position of Israel, which continues to pursue its stubborn annexationist policy and to respond with open expansionist ambitions to the just demands of the Arab countries and the world community for an end to Israeli aggression in the Middle East.

202. We all know that it was neither in two months nor in a year that the Secretary-General of the United Nations was able to report the readiness of Israel to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967). More than a year has elapsed and the course of events during that time is clear from the report of the Secretary-General [A/8541] and from the present discussion.

203. The Arab Republic of Egypt is in favour of full implementation of the Security Council resolution but Israel is opposed, stating that it is in favour of negotiations without pre-conditions—that is, paying no heed to the binding decision of the Security Council and disregarding the principle unanimously approved at the twenty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly “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, that the territory of a State shall not be the object of acquisition by another State resulting from the threat or use of force, that no territorial acquisition resulting from the threat or use of force shall be recognized as legal” [resolution 2734 (XXV)]. We view Israel's statement about so-called “negotiations without pre-conditions” as an attempt to evade its obligations under the United Nations Charter.

204. Egypt is co-operating with Ambassador Jarring, whereas Israel has paralysed his work.

205. Egypt has assumed all the commitments specified in Ambassador Jarring's well-known aide-mémoire, whereas Israel has not even answered the Ambassador's request, even though it was based entirely on the Security Council resolution. Moreover, the Israeli rulers have the audacity to state openly that Israel will not return to the boundaries which existed before 5 June 1967, and the Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs who spoke here [2000th meeting] even

asserted that he had dug up somewhere a “recognized principle” whereby the Israeli troops were not obligated to withdraw from any cease-fire lines. The principles proclaimed by the United Nations say precisely the opposite.

206. In the light of this, the Secretary-General of the United Nations quite rightly states in his report:

“I wish moreover to note with satisfaction the positive reply given by the United Arab Republic to Ambassador Jarring's initiative. However, the Government of Israel has so far not responded to the request of Ambassador Jarring that it should give a commitment on withdrawal to the international boundary of the United Arab Republic.” [A/8541, para. 21.]

207. The Secretary-General appealed to Israel to give further consideration to this question and to respond favourably to Ambassador Jarring's initiative, but Israel maintained a stubborn silence until 6 December this year. On that date, the Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs, in a speech to the General Assembly, virtually ignored Ambassador Jarring's initiative, called his proposal “an optional working paper” [2000th meeting, para. 102], and urged the Assembly not to support that initiative. In other words, he declined to agree to the continuation of United Nations efforts to achieve a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East.

208. The statements of the Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs that Israel's policy is not aggression and that Israel is fighting for “its own peace, its own freedom and its own security” [*ibid.*, para. 69] are therefore hollow words which are not confirmed and indeed are refuted by the concrete actions of the Israeli ruling circles.

209. The Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs, when he spoke here, attempted to create the impression that he agreed with the proposals of the mission of a number of African Heads of State, who visited Egypt and Israel on instructions from the Organization of African Unity. This idea was taken up in the Zionist imperialist press as a justification for the aggressive policy of Israel. But this is not the case at all. The Israeli statement selected a few of the proposals of the African countries and then rejected them, on the logic that “they propose one thing but I agree to something else”. But in making that statement, the representative of Israel said not a word about the most important point mentioned by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal, who spoke here on 7 December and stated:

“It is natural for the leaders of a country to place national defence in the forefront of their concern. But one must admit that States ordinarily resort, without territorial annexation, to a machinery offering sufficient guarantees to ensure their security. I think that neither side can arrogate to itself the right, for defence purposes, to seize territories of another sovereign State. I believe that, and I believe that is the feeling of our Assembly. However, it would be a good thing for this principle to be reaffirmed to allay the apprehensions which have paralysed Mr. Jarring's mission.” [2002nd meeting, para. 14.]

210. That statement supports the principle, already endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly, that the

acquisition of territory by force is inadmissible and that territories occupied by force must therefore be returned. In view of present circumstances, this principle should be reaffirmed by the adoption of an appropriate decision at the twenty-sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

211. It is now clear from the realistic position of the Arab Republic of Egypt, as set forth in the statement of its Minister for Foreign Affairs [*1999th meeting*], that there is no obstacle on the Arab side to the attainment of agreement on a political settlement of the Middle East conflict on the basis of implementation of all the provisions of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). The Egyptian position has exposed as fabrications all the Israeli statements alleging that the Arab Republic of Egypt is not seeking peace terms in the Middle East that are fair to everyone, including Israel. It now depends entirely on Israel whether it will be possible not only to eliminate the consequences of the 1967 war, which are dangerous for the cause of peace, but also to solve the Middle East crisis as a whole and to establish a lasting peace in that part of the world.

212. Israel's policy of expansionism and of obstructing all efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict would be unthinkable without the support which Tel Aviv receives from Washington and other patrons. Their policy in the Middle East is not one of assisting the victims of Israeli aggression or of endeavouring to contain the Israeli extremists but of quickly building up Israel's military potential. During the past year alone, the total value of United States military assistance to Israel was \$500 million. In the current financial year, the United States intends to appropriate another \$500 million for military assistance to Israel. Even now, at a time when the General Assembly has been searching for the way to a settlement of the Middle East situation by peaceful means, the Prime Minister of Israel has been travelling around the United States with her shopping bag and filling it up with new supplies of armaments for the continuation of aggression, and negotiations are being conducted one purpose of which, as a highly-placed official of the Israeli Foreign Ministry has stated, is the following, and I quote from *The New York Times* of 1 December 1971:

“We know that we can handle the Arabs, . . . but we have to know that the United States is ready to handle the Russians.”

213. This is a very dangerous policy. We hope that the politicians of the United States understand how dangerous this adventurer's policy is.

214. In order to carry out its expansionist plans, Israel has proceeded to appropriate openly the seized territories, and is boasting of the exploitation of the petroleum resources of the Sinai peninsula which belong to others, reselling the oil equipment of others to a firm with American financial participation and intends to continue to extract as much as 6 million tons of oil annually for the next 20 to 30 years with no additional outlay. The Israeli occupying authorities are resorting to tactics of mass terror and repression against the population of the Arab lands seized by Tel Aviv. Thousands of Arabs are being driven from their land into

special camps in the Sinai desert. Israel is flagrantly violating international agreement on the defence of human rights. The Arab population in the lands seized by Israel is being deprived of elementary political, economic, social and cultural rights. In its attempt to hide these crimes from the world community, the Israeli Government is doing everything it can to prevent United Nations representatives from gaining access to the occupied territories. Quite recently Israel refused to admit to Jerusalem the special committee of the Secretary-General, composed of three members of the Security Council, which was established in order to bring about the implementation of Security Council resolution 298 (1971) on the inadmissibility of changing the status of the occupied section of Jerusalem. It thus blatantly undermined the implementation of yet another Security Council resolution, thereby showing that it intends to continue flouting United Nations decisions.

215. The responsibility for the consequences of the reckless extremist policy of Israel and for the deteriorating situation in the Middle East belongs entirely to the ruling circles of Israel and to those who support their adventurers' policy. One wonders how long Israel will continue to flout openly the demands of the world community and of the United Nations, the body to which Israel owes its very existence. A situation in which the United Nations Charter and binding decisions of the Security Council are openly flouted can no longer be tolerated. The occupation of the seized Arab lands, which makes it possible for the criminal activities of the occupiers to be continued there, cannot be further tolerated. The General Assembly must take the most urgent and serious measures to compel the aggressor to submit to the demands of the peoples of the world.

216. The conclusion of a Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation between the Soviet Union and the Arab Republic of Egypt, signed at Cairo on 27 May 1971, was an important contribution to the cause of the struggle of the Arab peoples against Israeli aggression and for the normalization of the Middle East situation. The Treaty creates a long-term basis for co-operation between the two countries in all areas, promotes a just, peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict which would take into account the interests of all peoples of the region, and facilitates the elimination of the dangerous hotbed of war, thereby contributing to the reduction of international tension and to the strengthening of peace and international security.

217. The repeated, absurd references of the head of the delegation of the People's Republic of China to what he called the equal responsibility of the “super-Powers”—and I put that term in quotation marks—for the Israeli aggression and for the fact that its consequences have still not been eliminated compel me to say a few additional words.

218. As representatives will remember, in my statement of 11 October during the general debate [*1960th meeting*]—that is, even before the delegation of the People's Republic of China appeared—my delegation exposed and refuted the thesis of the “super-Powers”. In so doing, we showed that this thesis was unfounded, in particular, when applied to the Middle East situation. Even the Chinese, who like to distort historical truth, were and are unable to refute this. But this is not the task they have set themselves. Their purpose, like that of the out-and-out imperialists, is to

kindle anti-Sovietism, to break up the united front of the anti-imperialist forces and to introduce disorder into the work of the United Nations simply in order to prevent the easing of tension and the implementation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

219. But the Chinese representatives should remember that the United Nations was founded, and will continue to function, as an instrument for the strengthening of international security and the preservation of peace, whether the Chinese social traitors and super-adventurers and their one and only yes-man like it or not.

220. Mr. VAN USSEL (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): The fact that the General Assembly has once again had occasion to deal with the situation in the Middle East is a good thing to the extent that this discussion is a reminder of our Organization's duty, which it has not yet fulfilled, to see to it that a genuine peace is established in the area, and provide an opportunity for every Member State to make a contribution to the search for peace.

221. May I first say that I am pleased that, thanks to the patient efforts of those who have explored the matter in the past year, the road to peace is wide open.

222. My delegation would like to pay a tribute at one and the same time to Mr. Jarring, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, to Mr. William Rogers, Secretary of State of the United States of America, and to the heads of African States, who have been charged by the Organization for African Unity with a mission of good offices. Of course none of these missions has been completely successful but each one has contributed to a clarification of the outstanding problems. They have all shown that military threats and war, which on three occasions has taken its toll, can solve nothing. Continued attempts must be made to seek ways and means of establishing a political and juridical order in the Middle East which will turn the present confrontation into peaceful coexistence and will encourage the adversaries to establish understanding and co-operation between them. The experience of the past 25 years in the Middle East has clearly taught us that superficial settlements are precarious and generate increasingly dangerous conflicts. It must be our ambition to bring about a fundamental settlement which no one will question. Many things have been accomplished since 1967 in the direction which Belgium, together with so many other States, has advocated. The idea of a solemn settlement whereby States would enter into irrevocable peace commitments backed by international guarantees is inherent in resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council. It was subsequently developed by Mr. Jarring, particularly in his aide-mémoire of 8 February [A/8541, annex I] which Belgium, like the other States of the European Economic Community, supports. This objective, moreover, has been accepted by the Arab Republic of Egypt and Israel.

223. Furthermore, as we are all aware, territorial questions are still the subject of controversy which has prevented negotiations from really getting under way. My country unreservedly supports resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council. It is clear, then, that subject to minor corrections agreed upon by the parties, Israel, within the framework of this peace agreement, must give up territories

conquered as a result of war. We recommend that not too much effort should be applied to interpreting existing texts. At the present stage, our primary concern should be to create conditions conducive to the resumption of negotiations. With this objective in mind—and this is also the view of the Foreign Minister of Senegal [2002nd meeting]—the principle that the acquisition of territory by conquest cannot confer rights must be recognized unambiguously by the parties. If Israel confirmed its compliance with this rule, a sufficient consensus would exist to make possible a resumption of a dialogue which has now become indispensable and urgent. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General, who enjoys the support and confidence of the Organization and whose mandate is the consequence of a resolution which remains the only international act designed to settle the conflict, seems to us to be in the best position to resume the dialogue and, in accordance with appropriate procedures without excluding any particular procedure, he is in a position to bring about a resumption of talks.

224. For the dialogue to be resumed, it is indispensable that an agreement should be achieved on a few fundamental principles from which negotiations should then derive concrete consequences and translate them in terms of international treaties. Resolution 242 (1967) and the efforts of the Special Representative have already identified most of these principles which have been recognized as such by the Arab Republic of Egypt and Israel, namely the cessation of assertions or states of belligerence, respect and recognition of sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence, non-interference in internal affairs and so forth. This will not be enough to bring about a resumption of the negotiations because a stand will also have to be taken on occupied territories. That is why we would issue an appeal to the Government of Israel to confirm, in the context of principles for negotiation, its support for the principle of non-acquisition of territories by conquest, which would thus make it possible for the search to be resumed for a settlement under the auspices of Mr. Jarring, or would make possible an interim agreement which would be the first stage of a global settlement provided for in resolution 242 (1967).

225. The present objective is a resumption of active negotiations in compliance with all the provisions of resolution 242 (1967). My delegation hopes that this objective can be attained in the not-too-distant future.

226. Mr. KHATRI (Nepal): The views of the delegation of Nepal on the situation in the Middle East have been stated from time to time in various forums of the United Nations, and they are generally well known. However, in order that there may be a better understanding of our position, I think it necessary to briefly reiterate those views.

227. Before doing so, however, allow me to state that my delegation welcomes the consideration of this item concerning the Middle East by the General Assembly at this time. Many of us here may be sceptical of the utility or the effectiveness of the Assembly's consideration of the matter and of any resolution which may be subsequently adopted. My delegation, for one, does not take such a dim view, because the main thrust of the discussions now is the reactivation of the Jarring mission. I may recall here that

similar scepticism was expressed in the course of the consideration of this item by the General Assembly during its twenty-fifth session. We now know that General Assembly resolution 2628 (XXV), which was adopted then, became instrumental not only in extending the cease-fire which had been in effect since August of that year—due mainly to the strenuous efforts of the United States Secretary of State—but also in activating the Jarring mission and bringing the parties together for serious, business-like talks.

228. The second reason why my delegation welcomes the consideration by the Assembly of the Middle East situation at this time is that, in our view, the States Members of the United Nations should, under no circumstances, be conditioned to resigning themselves to any situation of challenge. Our search for peace, for a breakthrough, for ways to open the door to negotiations, should be constant. It is in this spirit that my delegation is taking part in these debates today.

229. We are fully aware that the Middle East situation represents a challenge of the greatest magnitude—a challenge that has been taxing the ingenuity of this Organization for many years now. This is a situation in which an atmosphere of grave injustice, deep-rooted hatred, violence and occupation of foreign territories prevails. Large-scale fighting has not occurred for nearly a year and a quarter now, but we find present on the Middle East horizon all the ingredients of fresh conflicts. The Middle East conflict is one in which the United Nations has been able to exercise its functions. When the war broke out in June 1967, the United Nations did exert itself well, and brought the actual fighting to an end by means of a cease-fire. Resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council went further than that: it attacked the central problem and set up the framework for an enduring peace settlement in the Middle East.

230. More than four years have elapsed since the adoption on 22 November 1967 of the resolution by the Security Council. My delegation regrets very much that despite that resolution, and despite the acceptance of that resolution by most parties concerned, it has not yet been possible to bring about a just and lasting peace in the war-torn area. During this period, as the Foreign Minister of Egypt stated on 3 December, [1999th meeting], Security Council resolution 242 (1967) has become the corner-stone of all United Nations peace efforts.

231. Those peace efforts have so far failed, not because of any intrinsic defect in the provisions contained in that resolution, but because the interpretations placed by the parties on those provisions have sharply differed. The differing and conflicting interpretations have their origin in the demand for physical security on the one side, and in the apprehension of foreign occupation and foreign expansion on the other.

232. It is not the intention of my delegation to try to reconcile the differing interpretations of the parties. Nevertheless, lest there be any ambiguity about our position, I wish to explain once again our understanding of resolution 242 (1967).

233. When it was adopted more than four years ago by the Security Council by a unanimous vote, resolution

242 (1967) represented the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict, and my Government welcomed and supported this resolution as such. The passage of time has not led us to change our position. We still believe that this resolution, more than any other resolutions or proposals, contains the most essential ingredients for a peaceful and acceptable settlement in the Middle East.

234. The greatest merit of the resolution lies in the fact that it has scrupulously sought to meet the legitimate concerns of the Israeli and Arab sides. It is based on a fundamental principle of the Charter, namely, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of foreign territory by means of the use of force. In its operative part, the resolution affirms that the fulfilment of Charter principles requires the establishment of a just and lasting peace which should include the application of the following principles:

- “(i) Withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict;
- “(ii) Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force”.

The resolution also addressed itself to the question of international waterways in the area and that of the refugees.

235. We support the resolution in all its parts and provisions. In our view, however, the resolution is not supposed to be self-implementing. It is meant to be implemented by means of agreement or agreements between the parties concerned. The onus of implementing the principles and provisions of the resolution has been placed squarely on the shoulders of the parties themselves. The role of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General is limited to establishing and maintaining contact with the States concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement.

236. What the Security Council has done is to create an essential framework for a peace settlement. It has established a mechanism of dialogue which alone can bring about peace. Furthermore, the United Nations has lent its good offices in the person of Ambassador Gunnar Jarring, under whose auspices this dialogue can take place. The machinery of the United Nations is at the service of the concerned parties. Whether or not this machinery is utilized is up to them. They have not fruitfully utilized it up till now. But it is high time they did so. Not only the peace in the area but the peace in the world depends on the degree of their willingness to arrive at a negotiated settlement on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

237. The leaders of the Arab and Israeli Governments owe it to themselves, to their peoples, to the hundreds of thousands of displaced persons, to the memory of their martyrs and to posterity that they should at least inaugurate a process of conciliation by means of dialogue rather than continue the policy of confrontation. The compelling trend of history points towards negotiations.

238. There was a time, not long ago, when the parties to the dispute did not find it possible even to accept the principles of negotiation. That seems no longer to be the case now. In recent months, particularly since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2628 (XXV), the Arab Governments, notably those of Egypt and Jordan, have shown the greatest eagerness to have discussions get under way under the auspices of Ambassador Jarring. This in itself represents, in our view, progress of no minor significance. Today, the issue concerning the termination of belligerency and recognition of Israel's territorial integrity remains no longer an issue of controversy. This has been made more than clear in the Egyptian aide-mémoire submitted to Ambassador Jarring [A/8541, annex II] in reply to his aide-mémoire of 8 February of this year [A/8541, annex I].

239. The question of withdrawal and the question of secure and recognized boundaries are the only two remaining questions that continue to remain crucial. Given a minimum of goodwill and a spirit of compromise and accommodation on both sides, there is no doubt in our minds that these questions will also be resolved.

240. Ambassador Jarring's aide-mémoire of 8 February addressed to the Governments of Egypt and Israel sought to break the deadlock in the discussions between the parties arising from their differing interpretations of the provisions of the November resolution. Ambassador Jarring requested those Governments to make certain simultaneous and parallel commitments of principle which will open the door to a negotiated settlement.

241. This bold, imaginative and necessary initiative of Ambassador Jarring proved to be the last initiative taken by him in his capacity as the Secretary-General's Special Representative. One of the replies to his memorandum caused the virtual lapse of his peace mission. It contained the words: "Israel will not withdraw to the pre-5 June 1967 lines" [see A/8541, annex III]. Apparently seeming to resist imposition of a pre-condition, these negative words in themselves represented a pre-condition of the most restrictive character.

242. Here I wish to quote the Secretary-General from his report. He says:

"... The problems to be settled have been more clearly identified and on some there is general agreement. I wish moreover to note with satisfaction the positive reply given by the United Arab Republic to Ambassador Jarring's initiative. However, the Government of Israel has

so far not responded to the request of Ambassador Jarring that it should give a commitment on withdrawal. . . ." [A/8541, para. 21.]

The Secretary-General goes on:

"I appeal, therefore, to the Government of Israel to give further consideration to this question and to respond favourably to Ambassador Jarring's initiative." [Ibid.]

I am sure that the entire Assembly joins the Secretary-General in this appeal.

243. The situation as it prevails at present has many elements of promise. Four eminent Presidents of African countries on behalf of the Organization of African Unity have recently tried their hand at bringing about a meeting of minds between the contending parties. Their initiative was widely appreciated, and was welcomed by both Arab and Israeli Governments. They have brought a fresh approach in their mission of peace, a mission which is of great value because of the profound dedication of those Heads of State to the principles and purposes of the United Nations, and also because of the lack of self-interest of their countries in the affairs of the Middle East, except for their interest in peace. This mission was designed to facilitate the resumption of the Jarring mission. We hope that the parties concerned will give the most serious consideration to any proposal or proposals emanating from them in this regard.

244. In these present debates, if there is anything that is most visible, it is this: a willingness on practically all sides to resume contact. My delegation is impressed with the moderate tone which has characterized the statements of the parties concerned, notably Egypt, Israel and Jordan. There is general recognition that time is running out. As far as my delegation is concerned, it is our opinion that our membership of the United Nations commits us all to certain principles contained in the Charter. We are obliged to abide by those principles and there is no escaping from them. Similarly, when we accept a particular resolution in all its parts, we also accept without any reservation the fundamental principle set out in clear language in that resolution. The commitment or the pre-condition is already there. In the light of that principle, the terms of a peace settlement must be worked out between the parties. A peace settlement is our objective. My delegation will be gratified if these debates could contribute in any way to the furtherance of that objective, through the reactivation in the first place of the Jarring mission.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.