



CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 22:
The situation in the Middle East (*continued*)..... 1

President: Mr. Edvard HAMBRO (Norway).

AGENDA ITEM 22

The situation in the Middle East (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before calling on the first speaker I should like to make one or two announcements. First, I hope that the debate on the situation in the Middle East can be completed tomorrow, Tuesday, and that we can proceed to the vote tomorrow afternoon. Secondly, I would remind members that we agreed that speakers should be asked to limit their statements to fifteen minutes if possible and that rights of reply will be limited to ten minutes under a General Assembly decision.

2. Mr. SOW (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): After everything that has been said about the human suffering resulting from the bloody and cruel tragedy which has afflicted the Middle East and the peoples of that region for more than 20 years, it would be useless for me to review further the genesis of that tragedy. Furthermore, the constant position of my Government on this thorny problem, a position which was reaffirmed by the Special Envoy of the Head of State of Mali during the commemorative ceremony for the twenty-fifth anniversary of our Organization [*1873rd meeting*], is well known. Therefore, I shall make a brief statement. In this respect, Mr. President, I am also taking into account your appeal that we abide by the decision of our Assembly to limit the time of our statements from today onwards. Our attitude in no way indicates—and I should like to make this clear—that we are paying less attention to this important item on our agenda, and it in no way affects our determination to work in our Organization, and wherever else it is possible to do so, for the restoration of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, in the interests of the peoples of that area.

3. I should like to take this opportunity to stress how impressed my delegation was by the following statement of our Secretary-General at the closing meeting of the session commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, I quote:

“There are two alternatives before this Organization: one is that there will be no moral force

in this world, there will be no declaration of intent to abide by the Charter nor profession of faith in and commitment to its principles and purposes, and no change in our outmoded procedures and policies. The other alternative is for the Organization to receive stronger and heartier support from all its Member States, especially from the mightier ones; to become rapidly universal in its membership; and for its Member Governments to act and behave in such a way as to make steady progress towards a just, peaceful and prosperous human community so that this planet may be a safe place to live in.” [*1883rd meeting, para. 72.*]

4. That message, which reflects the most courageous and realistic elements of the international conscience, as well as its most lofty elements, should win our total support and be heeded as it so justly deserves. That valiant and moving message has encouraged us, and we would add to it the words of our President from which we can derive renewed strength: “But it is clear that even the best of declarations are not enough, if we do not act on the inspiration we derive from them.” [*ibid., para. 77.*]

5. At the present stage of the situation in the Middle East, therefore, it is not a question of making long speeches any more. What we must do is act—and act as soon as possible—to put an end to a tragic situation: we must implement all the provisions of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967; the Security Council, in particular its four permanent members, must reactivate consultations so that Ambassador Jarring, Special Representative of the Secretary-General, can resume his work as quickly as possible; and, finally, Israel must put an end to its delaying tactics and accept Security Council resolution 242 (1967). It also should agree to the resumption of negotiations through Ambassador Jarring, as the Arab States concerned have constantly done.

6. Because, after all, what does a well-balanced nicely weighed resolution which has never been implemented mean to the martyred Palestinian people? The Palestinian people is well aware of this and has taken up arms in order to win its legitimate rights.

7. For Syria, the Kingdom of Jordan and the United Arab Republic, whose territories have been occupied for more than three years now, and for peaceful Lebanon, a country where different communities live together in perfect harmony, which sets a marvellous example to the world but which, in spite of all this, is constantly attacked by the Israeli Army—what is the meaning to all those countries of a well-balanced, but never implemented, resolution?

8. Finally, for us Africans, what is the meaning of this balanced but unimplemented resolution when, following the Israeli aggression of June 1967, the Suez Canal was closed and, using this as a pretext, imperialism, in furtherance of its exploitation and domination in the Middle East, has been arming South Africa, Portugal and the rebellious régime in Southern Rhodesia, the enemies of the African people, in order—we are told—to defend the Cape route?

9. The United Nations itself should pull itself together and understand that it is dangerous to leave unchanged a situation fraught with such grave dangers for peace and security. It should demand from Israel, for whose birth as a State it was responsible, that it abide by the Charter and implement its decisions if Israel is to continue to deserve the guaranteeing of its existence by the United Nations.

10. Those are the reasons for our profound concern. Those are the reasons why we believe that—contrary to some statements—three years after the unanimous adoption of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, supported by the vast majority of States Members of the United Nations, and bearing in mind the failure of the *démarches* as well as the secret and the public negotiations to implement it, this debate is extremely important. Israel and those who support it in its intransigence are placing more stress on the balance in resolutions, on balance of power and situations, than on the total, rapid and just implementation of the measures adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly for the restoration of a lasting peace in the Middle East.

11. This attitude of Israel leads us to believe that the leaders of that State have no intention of withdrawing their troops from the occupied territories, territories which have been occupied by force. What is more, irrefutable facts prove that Israel is entrenching itself there and has already begun the exploitation of the natural resources of the region. The new procedure contemplated by Israel, thanks to a prolongation of the cease-fire which it desires, would only perpetuate its illegal occupation of Egyptian, Jordanian and Syrian territories.

12. The representative of Israel is still talking to us about an imbalance in the situation—the situation brought about by the Rogers Plan—the United Arab Republic, according to Israel, not having abided by its commitments. Israel reproaches the United Arab Republic for strengthening its defence potential on the West Bank of the Suez Canal. We are perfectly well aware why the present balance of force is in favour of Israel; but we are more aware that the west bank of the Suez Canal and the East Bank and all Sinai, which are occupied by Israeli forces, are an integral part of the national territory of the United Arab Republic. Unfortunately, we are also aware that Israel is continuing to acquire enormous quantities of offensive weapons to consolidate its military positions in Egyptian territory.

13. This, in the view of my delegation, is the balance of the situation after the cease-fire to which the rep-

resentative of Israel referred and which he wants us to sanction. It is contrary to all the principles and objectives which are set forth in the Charter, in resolutions, and in declarations, and my delegation cannot subscribe to that. To follow the representative of Israel in his reasoning would mean sanctioning territorial conquests. After having spoken to us for three years of the balance of a resolution, Israel will be speaking to us for a long time still about the balance of situations and, by these delaying tactics, acquire a taste for a new expansionist adventure.

14. By our lack of firmness and determination to apply and to have applied our decisions on the Middle East we have disappointed the Arab peoples. While there is still time let us not allow that disappointment to become general disillusionment, which would be a source of rebellion and violence.

15. My delegation, which has continuously supported resolution 242 (1967), believes it is still a valid instrument for the restoration of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. However, we must state once again that any solution of the Middle East problem must take account of the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people.

16. It is a matter of the responsibility of all States Members of our Organization to search for peace in the Middle East. The Security Council acts on our behalf in application of the principles of our Charter. We must, all of us, do everything we can to help those Members to carry out their tasks, particularly the four permanent members which we would ask to take account primarily of the legitimate interests of the people of the region and of international peace and security.

17. In this respect the draft resolution contained in document A/L.602 and Add.1, presented by the representative of Nigeria, which my delegation co-sponsors, is a realistic approach to a resumption of consultations among the four great Powers and the resumption of the Jarring mission with the best possible chance of success. We recommend that it be unanimously adopted therefore by our Assembly.

18. As for the draft resolution contained in document A/L.603, all we find here, unfortunately, is a concern that there should always be a balance of words in resolutions and of situations, and this gets us bogged down in an interminable process where we just keep on deferring endlessly the consideration of the question. In our view it deserves no attention from our Assembly which should vigorously reject it.

19. Sir COLIN CROWE (United Kingdom): A great deal of emotion and much passion have been expressed in the course of this debate, as indeed is bound to happen in any debate on the Middle East. Hard things have been said, but what is so interesting and encouraging is that practically everybody agrees on what we should be trying to do, both in the short term and in the long. There is virtual unanimity. We all agree on the same immediate objectives—to enable Mr. Jarring to make progress in his mission and to extend the observance of the cease-fire meanwhile. We all agree,

too, on the longer term objective: to establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

20. There is virtually unanimous agreement that resolution 242 (1967) is the only basis for such a settlement. After the dinner which the Secretary-General gave for the Foreign Ministers of France, the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom on 23 October, he issued a statement. It has been referred to before in this debate, but I think it is worth reading out in full:

“The four Foreign Ministers had a useful exchange of views with the Secretary-General and Ambassador Jarring on the situation in the Middle East. They agreed to exert their utmost efforts: (a) to enable Ambassador Jarring to resume his mission at the earliest possible date; (b) to search for possibilities through agreement of the parties directly concerned to extend the observance of the cease-fire for a period to be determined; and (c) to find a peaceful solution on the basis of resolution 242 of the Security Council.”

The statement went on: “The four Powers will continue their consultations and their Permanent Representatives will meet again in New York on 28 October.” The points made in that statement are covered in the two draft resolutions we have before us. Both drafts call for resolution 242 (1967) to be carried out in all its parts; both call for the early resumption of the parties’ discussions with Mr. Jarring.

21. The draft resolution contained in document A/L.603 calls for the extension of the cease-fire. Although the draft resolution contained in document A/L.602 and Add.1 does not mention the cease-fire, we understand from consultations in the United Nations that the sponsors may be prepared to include a paragraph calling for the temporary extension of the cease-fire to facilitate Mr. Jarring’s mission.

22. We all agree that implementation of resolution 242 (1967) still eludes us. We seem unable to break through the miasma of distrust, of charge and countercharge. For three and a half years we have been talking without success but we must not, we cannot, give up. We must make further efforts to achieve a breakthrough, to reach success. It may help us to move forward if I set out the issues as my Government sees them. In doing this, I am not saying anything new. I am merely bringing to this wider forum some of the ideas which are within the range of those which the United Kingdom has been urging or supporting during many months of discussions between the representatives of the four Powers, permanent members of the Security Council, here in New York.

23. Let me make it quite clear at the outset that we have never believed that a settlement should or could be imposed on the parties. We think it right, however, that the Assembly should know the sort of ideas which we believe the parties and Mr. Jarring could work on to lay the basis for a just and lasting peace in the area, taking account of the legitimate interests of all con-

cerned. From the very beginning it has been clear that the settlement will have to be a package deal and that this will have to be embodied in an agreement or agreements which will be binding on all the parties in international law and endorsed by the Security Council.

24. The two main elements in the package, as in resolution 242 (1967), are commitments to peace on the one hand and withdrawal and boundaries on the other. These elements are of equal importance and one cannot be taken without the other.

25. First, let me consider commitments to peace. The Arab States on the one hand and Israel on the other must agree to establish a genuine state of peace between them. It is not sufficient for them merely to undertake to terminate all states or claims of belligerency which exist between them, though they must certainly do this. They must also undertake to refrain from all acts inconsistent with a state of peace. In particular they must respect and recognize each other’s sovereignty, territorial integrity, inviolability and political independence without resorting to threats or the use of force. They must ensure that no act of belligerency or hostility originates within their respective territories. They must settle their international disputes by peaceful means and refrain from interfering in each other’s domestic affairs for any reason.

26. Turning to the second main element of the package, the objective, again as set out in resolution 242 (1967), must be to establish secure and recognized boundaries. In doing this we must be guided by the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war. This principle has been restated in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [*resolution 2625 (XXV)*], which we all adopted by acclamation here a mere ten days ago. Thus there must be Israeli withdrawal from territories occupied in the war of 1967, but this should not preclude the possibility of minor rectifications of the frontiers to be agreed between the parties.

27. In the case of Jordan the lines which existed before June 1967 were not boundaries and had never been recognized as international frontiers; they were only armistice lines. In some areas they were impractical, dividing villages from their fields and even houses from their gardens. What is required is agreement on a definitive boundary.

28. We believe that this should be based on the lines existing before 5 June 1967, but that there could be minor rectifications to these lines. The criteria for determining such minor rectifications might be the suppression of anomalies which make difficult the maintenance of local security or impede interior surface communications or normal surveillance of the boundary.

29. In the case of the United Arab Republic, we consider that the international boundary of the former Mandated Territory of Palestine should constitute the frontier between Israel and the United Arab Republic.

except for the Gaza area, for which special arrangements will have to be made and embodied in the agreement.

30. The frontier between Israel and Lebanon should be the international boundary of the former Mandated Territory of Palestine.

31. As for the boundary between Israel and Syria, we believe that the general principles governing the remainder of the settlement should also govern the settlement between Israel and Syria, once Syria has accepted the Security Council resolution.

32. There is one special problem which in some way symbolizes the Arab-Israel problem as a whole: I mean the problem of Jerusalem. The problem is so complex and feelings run so deep that it is difficult to see what compromise could emerge. But some agreement on the status of the city, some agreement providing for freedom of access to the Holy Places and for their protection, will be an essential part of a settlement.

33. I turn now to guarantees. The best guarantee of a settlement would, of course, be its acceptability to all Governments and peoples of the area. However, the probability is that more concrete guarantees will be required for some time to come. We believe that the Security Council should endorse the agreement. As an internal guarantee we favour a United Nations presence both to supervise withdrawal and to remain in the area thereafter.

34. Another important element might be the formation of demilitarized zones as provided for in resolution 242 (1967). These might be supervised by the United Nations. In addition, consideration should be given to any forms of external guarantee which might be suggested.

35. Another important element of the package is freedom of navigation. Security Council resolution 242 (1967) speaks in paragraph 2 (a), of the necessity for "guaranteeing freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area". We recognize that necessity. We believe that there should be freedom of navigation for the ships and cargoes of all countries through the Suez Canal, the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran. This freedom of navigation should be guaranteed as appropriate to each of those waterways, since we recognize that they do not all have the same status.

36. And then there are the aspirations of the Palestinians. Any settlement which is to be fair and lasting must take account of the views of all the peoples of the area, including the Palestinians. But it is impossible for the international community to engage in negotiations with those who reject a settlement in accordance with resolution 242 (1967) and who are determined to seek their objectives through the use of force and terrorism. It is for the Arab Governments concerned to enlist the support of the Palestinians for a settlement. We should certainly not wish to oppose any new political or constitutional arrangements freely worked out

by the Arab Governments and the Palestinians within the framework of a settlement in accordance with resolution 242 (1967).

37. The agreement should include provision for a just settlement of the refugee problem. The parties should agree to co-operate in working out such a settlement under the auspices of Ambassador Jarring, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 194 (III) and Security Council resolution 237 (1967). The settlement should reaffirm that the 1948 refugees wishing to return to their homes and to live at peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so and should include mutually acceptable arrangements and annual programmes for repatriation and for the resettlement with compensation of those refugees who choose not to return.

38. The parties should undertake to co-operate in the establishment and operation of machinery for consulting interested persons and Governments and for giving effect to the provisions of a just settlement of the refugee problem. The parties should accept that implementation of all other provisions of the agreement need not await the full implementation of the settlement of the refugee problem.

39. As I have tried to indicate, the essence of any settlement is that we must create true peace and security which will insure the area against a recurrence of conflict. Equally important is that the parties, as they move towards that settlement, must feel secure at each and every stage. Thus, questions of timing and of the entry into force of specific mutual engagements will have cardinal importance and will have to be fully provided for.

40. We understand the reasons which prompted Arab delegations to bring this problem to the Assembly this year. We have serious doubts about whether it is proper for the Assembly to attempt in any way to alter a resolution of the Security Council. We should, therefore, not be able to support any resolution of the Assembly which sought to amplify, or modify, or alter the balance of resolution 242 (1967), or which sought to do more than simply reaffirm resolution 242 (1967) and appeal for early progress towards its implementation.

41. But more important than our doubts about the legal position is the firm conviction that it is unwise for the Assembly to attempt to alter resolution 242 (1967). As the authors of that resolution, we are naturally proud of it. But even allowing for our pride of authorship, we believe that it does contain all the essential elements of a just and lasting peace in the area. But perhaps its greatest virtue is the fact that it was adopted unanimously and that it still commands the support of a very great majority of the Members of the United Nations.

42. We believe that we should therefore hang on to this resolution and attempt to build on it.

43. Thus, my delegation would prefer that if any resolution is to emerge from this debate it should be

quite short and simple, not much more than the Secretary-General's statement of 23 October.

44. As for the two draft resolutions before us, contained in documents A/L.602 and Add.1 and A/L.603, my comments have already covered that in document A/L.602 and Add.1, the draft sponsored by certain Afro-Asian countries. We would not dissent from the draft resolution in document A/L.603, which follows the lines of the Secretary-General's statement. It has the heart of the matter, but its formulation may not be quite what is required if it is to secure unanimity.

45. It is nearly three years since resolution 242 (1967) was adopted. We have reason to be disappointed at the lack of progress. Let us hope that out of the current debate there will come a move forward. If there is none and we have to take up the problem once more, we believe this should be done by the Security Council. We accept that if no progress can be made in a reasonable period of time, it would be right for the Security Council to address itself to the problem once more.

46. Mr. OULD TAYA (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): One of the major themes of this session is the maintenance and strengthening of peace and security. The search for that peace should be the primary responsibility and purpose of all the peoples of the world.

47. My delegation believes that it is possible to maintain and strengthen international peace and security through scrupulous and universal respect for the principles of the Charter. The deterioration of the international situation, the growing use of force, and the ever-more-frequent violations of international morality can only prompt us to redouble our efforts. But our efforts will be in vain until Member States finally abandon their policy of blocs and hegemony, as well as the various manifestations of the spirit of domination and conquest.

48. The word "peace" has never been uttered so frequently as during this session. But what kind of peace is at issue? It seems that everyone has his own view of peace. For some, peace—in particular in the Middle East—means the renunciation by sovereign States of part of their territory; thus peace in that region may also mean the capitulation of Arab States to aggression. For others, peace in the Middle East means maintaining the present status of the Palestinian people as refugees supported by this Organization.

49. While we endeavour to agree on a definition of aggression, it may also be good to agree on a definition of peace. However that may be, our Organization today must deal with a situation that is a serious threat to peace: the situation prevailing at the present time in the Middle East, where part of the territories of three sovereign countries Members of the Organization—the United Arab Republic, the Kingdom of Jordan, and the Syrian Arab Republic—has been occupied for more than three years as a result of an act of aggression.

50. The Security Council, which under the Charter has primary responsibility for the maintenance of inter-

national peace and security, in its resolution of 22 November 1967 [242 (1967)] unanimously decided on the bases for a peaceful settlement of the conflict. That resolution, three years later, has not even begun to be put into effect. Why is that so? Because of the obstinate refusal of Israel to abide by it. It has thereby clearly shown its expansionist designs.

51. Within the four-Power framework—or rather, the two-Power framework—the Rogers Plan, although disregarding a fundamental aspect of the question, was a further attempt to put resolution 242 (1967) into effect. Here again the Tel Aviv authorities, by their procrastination and contradictory statements, have paralysed the efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. In passing, I should like to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General and his Special Representative for their indefatigable efforts in the constant search for a just settlement of this serious crisis.

52. The General Assembly is dealing with the situation in the Middle East and at the same time Israel is once again obstructing efforts towards a peaceful settlement of the problem as envisaged by the Security Council resolution. It has officially withdrawn from talks with Ambassador Jarring. It has once again demonstrated its determination to jeopardize any settlement which may deprive it of the fruits of aggression. Did not the Foreign Minister of Israel state only a few days ago, in anticipation of this debate, that Israel would not consider itself bound by any further resolution adopted by the General Assembly?

53. Like South Africa and Portugal, Israel thus continues to defy our Organization by trampling under foot its resolutions. But Israel could not have adopted such a position if it did not enjoy the political, financial and military support of the United States. The United States would have us believe in its good intentions and in its desire to find a peaceful settlement of the problem, but it continues to give military and financial assistance to Israel, to reward it, as it were, for its further refusal to go along with negotiations.

54. The resolution of the Security Council and the Rogers Plan are attempts to settle the problem of the Middle East, but the fundamental aspect of the question, the Palestinian problem apparently continues to be a secondary or subsidiary issue for these advocates of peace. But my delegation believes that this question is of primary importance. Any agreement, any negotiations, any peace plan, failing to take account of this reality—the reality of the Palestinian people—is doomed to failure. The world today, more than ever before, has become aware of the existence of the Palestinian people and of its determination to wage its struggle to the bitter end to regain its lost land or to die in dignity. The heroic Palestinian combatants, who are the only genuine representatives of that courageous people, are the best evidence of this determination to live in dignity.

55. It would be inadmissible and dangerous for our Organization, in turn, not to realize this fact. We must stop considering these people as refugees living on sub-

sidies from the Organization. We must take the necessary steps to restore their dignity.

56. We believe that a draft resolution like the one submitted by nineteen Afro-Asian countries and Yugoslavia [A/L.602 and Add.1] might lay the foundation of an overall settlement of the question. But the question of the Middle East has been under debate for many, many years now. A number of resolutions have been adopted by various United Nations bodies. We are still waiting for those resolutions to be implemented. For that reason we would like to issue a warning to the Organization. Any delay in the settlement of this problem will diminish the chances for peace in that area of the world. It is greatly to be feared that this question may, like so many others, become just one more perennial item on which many resolutions are adopted but, because of the determination of a few small States supported by the major Powers, remain a dead letter.

57. Mr. ALATTAR (Yemen) (*interpretation from French*): So soon after the commemorative session of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations and after the unanimous vote on the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [resolution 2625 (XXV)] stipulating 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" and, further on, that "No territorial acquisition resulting from the threat or use of force shall be recognized as legal", political realities oblige us to deal with the question of the Middle East, that is to say, the question of a people driven out of the land of its birth and the consequences of that act, which led to the occupation of the territory of three Member States of the United Nations—an occupation which has lasted for more than three years now.

58. The United Nations has thus demonstrated its total powerlessness in the face of the challenge of Zionism and its protector, world imperialism. The authority of the United Nations has surely been flouted in the very principle of the Charter, namely that of the inviolability of the territory of a State. Whether it be in this field or in the field of self-determination—which we shall deal with in a moment—our Organization remains as ineffective and as incapable of reacting as the defunct League of Nations, the results of which were most regrettable. We are thinking particularly of the occupation of Ethiopia by a country with a fascist régime. In that way fascism was enabled to benefit from the victory which encouraged it to engage in adventures of one kind or another right up to the launching of the Second World War.

59. If we really want our Organization to be able to survive by applying its fundamental principles, it is urgent to break the hold, direct or indirect, of those who are trying to impose their views without taking account of the Charter and decisions taken according to the principles laid down in that Charter, or of the rules of international law.

60. Indeed imperialism, which has not been able to learn the lesson of history, is trying to apply—both by its traditional means, that is to say the direct use of force, as well as by the creation of client States, like Israel, which is also doing this dirty work on its own account—a policy whose essential purposes in its eyes consists in preserving its economic, political and strategic interests.

61. That explains the creation of the Zionist State of Israel. It feels protected and supported whatever it does. It thus benefits from military assistance—the latest deliveries of arms amount to \$500 million worth of aircraft, tanks, rockets, missiles and anti-missile missiles, deliveries which the United States is making so generously—and also enormous economic assistance, provided by all the European countries, but particularly the United States, and, together with this substantial assistance, unconditional political support. That is the source of the scorn demonstrated by the Zionist leaders towards the Charter and the resolutions of the United Nations and their indescribable arrogance. The Zionist State is the watchdog of imperialist interests in the so-called Middle East region. It is quite natural, therefore, that the objective of that State should be the expansion of its territory in order to accommodate several million Zionist immigrant settlers.

62. I do not want to demonstrate here the purposes of the Zionist State from the economic and political points of view. I tried to do that in my statement in the Security Council on 3 July 1969 [1485th meeting]. However, it would not be superfluous to stress in a few words the importance of this aspect of the question. There can be no colonial State—in the dictionary sense which defines "colony" as the installation of settlers on land which does not belong to them or which has been occupied by force—without there being economic penetration and the prospect of long-term economic objectives. That is where the true imperialist danger of the Zionist State lies for the Palestinian people, for the Arab people and also for the people of the Middle East. It is this that Mr. Eban calls "the open frontier" and plans for such penetration and economic domination are already under study and preparation, particularly by the Zionist association called "The Association for Peace", created in Jerusalem in 1968 for the purposes of this planning.

63. That is why for us the so-called question of the Middle East, which we are dealing with today, is not of concern only to the occupied territories but is, and remains, essentially the problem of a people fighting for self-determination and national liberation. These Palestinians, who were driven from their land, Palestine, for there is a Palestine and the Palestinian people has always existed whether Mrs. Golda Meir likes it or not—Mrs. Golda Meir who, in a famous statement made to *The Sunday Times* of London of 15 June 1969, simply denied the existence of these people—are valiantly continuing their fight.

64. This crime of usurpation committed against a whole people, under the aegis of colonialism, as we all know here in the United Nations, could not have

been committed with impunity without the support of world imperialism.

65. Thus, Zionism born in Europe has succeeded, thanks to international intrigues, in becoming part of the plans for colonizing the Middle East. As far back as 1898, the Commission for the colonization of Palestine was set up; then we had the Company for agrarian development in Palestine and the Palestine Bureau. It was those institutions which were the instruments of Zionist penetration, coming a little before the paramilitary and terrorist organizations, such as the famous Haganah and Stern organizations. All means were used, even measures which were used by nazism against the Jewish population in Europe. The idea was to eliminate the Palestinians by expulsion or pillage, in a word by all forms of oppression which would be useful for acquiring new lands for immigrants. We should add that the pillaging and expelling of the Palestinian people is continuing because the process of the occupation of land, according to Zionist leaders, has not yet been completed.

66. It is true that the United Nations played a part 23 years ago in the consolidation of this colonial fact and committed an act of injustice by adopting a resolution which disregarded the will of the Palestinian people and was detrimental to the right of peoples to self-determination as laid down in the Charter.

67. That act detrimental to the rights of the Palestinians cannot be indefinitely tolerated by the international conscience, still less by the Palestinian people.

68. It has often been forgotten that that people fought against British imperialism and that as early as the 1930s, liberation movements were formed and the struggle for independence began. The great popular insurrection which broke out in Palestine in 1936 heralded the struggle for national independence. If those uprisings were not successful, the reason lay above all with the international situation at the time, that is to say, the power of imperialism. It was a fight a little ahead of its time and it is worth recalling in this hall in which the majority of Members which are here were freedom fighters for their own countries.

69. The rights of people to self-determination which is such an essential part of the United Nations Charter was disregarded at the time when the Zionist State was admitted to membership of this Organization. Since the creation of Israel by force and the imperialist plotting and intriguing, no less than 23 resolutions have been adopted by the United Nations in favour of the Palestinian people who were transformed into "refugees". Finally, last year the General Assembly adopted resolution 2535 B (XXIV) reaffirming *inter alia*, and unambiguously, "the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine".

70. Some people may say, what is the use of continuing to vote resolutions in the United Nations, during human rights conferences or at conferences of non-aligned countries and of the Organization of African Unity. To those who believe that Israel will continue

to defy the United Nations and its Members which are still attached to the principles of the Charter, since the Zionist State enjoys the unconditional support of certain great Powers including the United States, which continues to provide it with the means of maintaining a military machine, to all those, we say that the superiority of that military machine cannot crush the right of peoples to self-determination, particularly when that people is determined to fight for that right.

71. Just because South Africa, following the example of nazism and Zionism, is pursuing a policy based on outmoded racist ideas and thus possesses a powerful military machine thanks to the support of imperialism, it does not mean that we should cease to fight against the policy of *apartheid* or against the racist régime in Rhodesia.

72. Furthermore, who can now afford to continue to disregard the right of the Palestinian people to recover its national territory in order to set up there a Palestine free of all racist ideology and discrimination a democratic, progressive and modern Palestine, where all Palestinians, be they Arab or Jew, Moslem, Christian, Jewish or free-thinkers, can live together and form a Palestinian nation in a single State, without discrimination, without the elimination of the culture of each of the peoples who have lived in that land of great civilization?

73. The right of the Palestinian people is sacred for us who are convinced of the final victory of those who are fighting for their independence. We unreservedly support the people of Palestine, as indeed we support other peoples fighting for their independence and their human dignity and personality. Neither the power of Zionist imperialism nor that of its ally, world imperialism, can check the momentum of history; they cannot prevent the Palestinians from recovering their inalienable rights and from constructing that democratic and progressive Palestinian State. Certainly, the fight is and will be difficult, but the Palestinian people measures up to its historic mission. Every day it demonstrates that neither the power nor oppression of the Zionists, neither the massacres organized by those very people whose interests coincide with those of imperialism and who are imperilled by the liberation movements, can prevent it from continuing its fight for freedom.

74. The world is becoming more and more aware of this irrefutable fact, particularly the youth of several countries including the youth of Israel, too. Let us remember what happened here in July last at the World Youth Assembly in the United Nations. Among the important resolutions adopted by that youth which came from the whole world, a youth noble, unselfish and much freer than we are to express its progressive convictions, was the resolution which supported unreservedly the struggle for the liberation of the Palestinian people. And it is that youth of today which will form the generation that will be the leader of tomorrow. It will judge us harshly for having bargained away the rights of those peoples who are fighting for their independence and national identity, particularly

because that youth has been the victim of wars and is paying a heavy price for the sordid interests of some of its elders.

75. If a crime goes unpunished it encourages the criminal to repeat the crime. Thus an unpunished act of aggression followed by another act of aggression is the way in which Zionism has been able to create a State and then expand it according to plans providing for the establishment of an empire covering the whole area from the Nile to the Euphrates including non-Arab countries such as East African countries, Turkey and Iran.

76. Repeated acts of aggression of the Zionist State against the Palestinian people and subsequently against neighbouring countries have made it possible for it to occupy new territory. Israeli newspapers themselves publish semi-officially the fact that the Zionist Government has prepared a five-year plan costing about \$50 million for the settlement of the occupied territory of the Golan Heights in Syria. The same is true of the territories in occupied Palestine. Let us not be told that Israel is ready to evacuate territories where it is investing millions of dollars. It is quite clear that the wish is for these Israeli colonies to become permanent.

77. The guilt of certain great Powers—and particularly the United States—that have supported and continue to support the Zionist State is clear to everyone. This guilt is at the very source of the scorn displayed by the imperialist State for the resolutions of the United Nations. How, after such defiance, arrogance and disregard of the rights of the Palestinian people and other Arab peoples whose territories are occupied, can we consider resolving this question of the Middle East, the solutions to which are becoming more and more urgent since they are based upon the right of self-determination in accordance with the Charter?

78. However, the United States, through the statement of Mr. Yost, and the submission of this draft resolution [A/L.603], shows us what kind of solution it has in mind. It is based primarily upon resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council of November 1967 and we are not told what the interpretation is. Secondly, out of respect for the cease-fire, according to the Zionist interpretation of it, the United Arab Republic should do nothing to defend itself and should allow Israeli aircraft the freedom of its skies so that those aircraft can bomb Egyptian towns and villages, kill and burn soldiers and civilians, destroy industry and works of art. Thirdly, it is to bring about a climate of confidence—this is what Mr. Yost says—that is, to defer to the Zionist will by agreeing to carry out the rectifications called for, and finally, the continuation of the dialogue with Ambassador Jarring, which is only a dialogue of the deaf to which Israel has never attached any importance.

79. But where in this draft resolution is there any mention of the right of Palestinian people to self-determination? There is nothing of it at all. It has even been forgotten that Security Council resolution 242

(1967) does not mention the Palestinian people except to consider them exclusively as refugees. However, Mr. Yost spoke for the first time of what he called the question of the Arabs of Palestine. He told us that the United States agrees that account should be taken of the wishes and legitimate aspirations of the Palestinians. I urge the Assembly to take note of the precise words. It is a question of concerns and legitimate aspirations, but there is nothing at all about the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. However, Mr. Yost raised some questions at the time. He said: "However, we have no preconceived ideas about what form Palestinian participation in a settlement would take" [1890th meeting, para.68]. Then he asked who spoke in the name of the Palestinians, what their relations were with established Arab Governments, what were their peace objectives and so on.

80. Before dealing with these questions, let us make it clear that it is above all of the representatives of the fighting Palestinian people that we should ask these questions. We should recognize their presence and not treat them as if they were inanimate objects, because it is they who are the essential element.

81. It is true that this way of posing the problem—of being willing to have a discussion only with an accredited opposite number—has been a device of several régimes. The people of Algeria became accepted as being so accredited only when it was able to make itself so and impose itself by its sacrifices and organization. Then the more realistic statesmen of France had the courage to admit this irrefutable fact. The National Liberation Front of Viet-Nam was not regarded as qualified to take part in talks for a very long time, but today its representatives are sitting at the negotiating table in Paris.

82. The leaders of the Palestinian fighters also are imposing and will impose their presence. The sacrifices of the Palestinian people are great, but they have already managed to take charge of their destiny and refuse to be the protégés of anyone else. No one any longer has any right to speak in their name. They are now responsible for their own fate whether we like it or not.

83. That is why, before concluding my statement, I should like from this rostrum to bow to the martyrs of this people, to salute its fighters and to state how much I regret that its representatives are not seated among us in this hall when we are discussing the Palestine problem.

84. André Malraux wrote in *La Condition humaine*, about man: "You do not need nine months, you need sixty years to make a man—sixty years of sacrifice, of will and so many things." Let us add, particularly when we are talking about a man who is sworn to sacrifice his life for the national struggle for self-determination and his human dignity.

85. The PRESIDENT: (*interpretation from French*): Before the next speaker takes the floor, may I remind representatives that we are trying to have speeches limited to 15 minutes? I make this appeal once again.

86. Mr. DIACONESCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): The situation which persists in the Middle East constitutes a dangerous source of tension in international relations and has serious implications for the people of the area and for world peace in general because a conflict anywhere in the world may grow into a large-scale conflagration with unpredictable consequences for mankind.

87. The delay in a peaceful settlement and the possibility of a further outbreak of hostilities are sources of great concern not only for the people of the area but also for the international community as a whole.

88. The fact that time has passed without any concrete measures having been taken to bring about a political settlement in the area means that the conflict has not been eliminated, nor has peace been restored. The passing of time has served only to aggravate the crisis, to lead to new sources of tension, suspicion and distrust, to an escalation in the arms build-up and to further incidents and military clashes which may only rekindle the flames of war.

89. International experience has given unassailable proof of the fact that war is no way to settle problems and disputes among States. The continuance of the conflict in the Middle East has caused the people of the area great harm and suffering, and serves only the interests of imperialists and reactionary circles in the area and outside the area.

90. At the present time a settlement of the conflict has become a matter of great urgency, and it is equally urgent that a peaceful settlement be found and that efforts be intensified to put an end to the present situation.

91. Romania is convinced that the problems confronting the States in the Middle East, although they are particularly complex and of long standing, are not insoluble. The norms of international law and the peaceful procedures provided in the Charter offer a wide range of ways and means to settle the situation in the Middle East, to proceed from the present stage of hostilities, which seriously affect the life of the people in the area, to a just and lasting peace.

92. Whatever the United Nations does, therefore, must be directed to creating an international atmosphere capable of promoting greater political and diplomatic efforts with a view to a rapid and peaceful settlement of the conflict in the Middle East.

93. The elimination of the use of force to settle disputes among States is a principle which, after long experience, has become one of the fundamental tenets of international relations.

94. The Government of Romania has always stated and states once again that a settlement of the conflict in the Middle East should not be a result of military confrontations, but exclusively a political and peaceful settlement acceptable to all parties concerned, one which respects the legitimate interests of all the people

living in that part of the world. Developments have fully borne out that point of view.

95. The position of our country on the problems of the Middle East is based on the realities of the post-war world. We have taken into account the existence of independent Arab States and the State of Israel.

96. We have endeavoured to act consistently in developing friendly relations with Arab States. We have devoted ourselves constantly to co-operating with those States on a number of levels. Romania has expressed its support for the just struggle of the Arab States against imperialism and neo-colonialism and for the defence of their independence and national sovereignty, for their economic and social development, without any dependence and without any foreign interference. At the same time our country has said that it is in favour of recognizing the right of all the States of the area to a free and independent existence through the establishment of peaceful relations among all the people of the area.

97. As regards a settlement of the fundamental problem of the Middle East, Romania, like a number of other States, has always felt and still feels that resolution 242 (1967), unanimously adopted by the Security Council on 22 November 1967 as a result of the collective efforts of the Members of the United Nations, constitutes a reasonable basis for a settlement of the conflict.

98. The constant position of Romania on how best to resolve the conflict was best expressed by the President of the Council of State of Romania, Nicolae Ceaușescu, on 19 October last in the debate during the commemorative session of the General Assembly, when he said:

“As to the Middle East, we believe that the resolution of the Security Council of November 1967 [242 (1967)] represents a sensible basis for the political settlement of the conflict in that region. This presupposes the withdrawal of Israeli troops from occupied Arab territories, the settlement of other problems in accordance with the interests of all the States in the area, and the guarantee of their independence and territorial integrity. At the same time, we believe that in order to establish a lasting peace in the Middle East a solution must, of necessity, be found with regard to the situation of the Palestine population so as to take into account the wishes and the national aspirations of that people.” [1872nd meeting, para. 85.]

99. The principle that force does not and cannot create law has become a tenet of contemporary international law. It has not provided, nor will it be able to provide, a solution to disputes or conflicts and can in no way justify territorial claims or the annexation of territory. Romania would reaffirm its view that the withdrawal of Israeli troops from occupied territories is necessary, as is the guarantee of the independence and territorial integrity of every State in the area.

100. In our opinion, it must also be understood that the occupation of territory belonging to other countries can hardly strengthen the security of a State. On the contrary, as it runs counter to the norms of international law, the occupation of foreign territory constitutes a permanent threat to the peace and independence of the State involved, and is a permanent source of tension and conflict.

101. At the same time, in accordance with the principles of the Charter which we have all subscribed to, and consistent with the provisions of the Security Council resolution, there must be recognition of the inalienable right of every State in the area to its own existence, political independence and territorial integrity, and to peaceful development without any hindrance. As has been stated by a number of countries, also in the course of this session, this is a further requirement of a durable political settlement and peace in the Middle East.

102. In order to bring about stability and a lasting settlement of the conflict in the area, the problem of the Palestinian people must be solved in accordance with their national interests. This presupposes, in the final analysis, that there be respect for the right of those people to self-determination and, therefore, the creation of an independent national State.

103. We believe that so as to achieve those results we must promptly take full advantage of the opportunity provided by the cease-fire agreed to on 7 August 1970. Talks must be resumed through Mr. Gunnar Jarring, Special Representative of the Secretary-General, whose efforts and activities to implement the Security Council resolution have been widely admired.

104. International experience has shown that the basic requirement of peace and security, of respect for the right of all peoples to a free and independent existence, is the elimination of force, and force in its most brutal form—war—as a means for settling disputes among States.

105. Experience has also shown that any attempts to resolve conflicts by means of force cannot lead to viable solutions. Political means, respect for the norms of law and the peaceful methods prescribed by the United Nations Charter, taking into account the legitimate interests of States, can alone lead to a lasting settlement.

106. Developments in the Middle East have clearly shown that armed confrontations, acts of violence and repression, the occupation of foreign territories, any action based on force, far from contributing to a solution of the many controversial issues of the area have served only to obstruct peace and to increase instability and insecurity in that area.

107. The norms of international law condemn the use of force and the threat of the use of force and make it quite clear that peaceful procedures are binding, and it is therefore necessary in the present circumstances that States demonstrate that they have the political

will to abide by this principle, which had great importance for the fostering of the legitimate interests of every nation and for general peace and security. This implies that political and diplomatic means must be used very widely; that there be talks, conversations and negotiations, in a spirit of understanding and trust; that problems be tackled with patience; and that solutions be found which respect the rights of one and all.

108. In order to bring about a climate of trust and a relaxation of tension which will facilitate efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement, all acts that might serve to accentuate tension or aggravate the situation and thereby render more difficult a solution of the problem of the Middle East must be eschewed.

109. Furthermore, no outside efforts can replace the genuine process of the settlement of the conflict by the countries directly concerned in the area. We believe that the countries of the Middle East have an old civilization and culture and rich traditions in the use of political and diplomatic channels, and we feel that they are fully able to promote a peaceful settlement of their problems, to coexist peacefully, to reconcile their interests and to respect each other's identity.

110. Romania believes that the primary responsibility for settling the problems of the Middle East rests with the States of that area, those which are directly interested in a climate of trust and peace that will make it possible for them to devote their full efforts to economic and social progress. At the same time, we believe that other States Members of the international community, the United Nations, can and must by their actions contribute to a peaceful settlement of the situation in the Middle East and to creating the conditions necessary for implementing Security Council resolution 242 (1967) without any further delay. The present session of the General Assembly must also make a constructive contribution in this respect.

111. Romania, for its part, will continue with other States to work for a peaceful settlement of the situation in the Middle East, one which will be in keeping with the legitimate interests of all the peoples in the area, and consistent with the interests of peace and the security of all the nations of the world.

112. Mr. MUNTASER (Libya): Since the commencement of this debate and even during the commemorative session of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations all speakers have emphasized the dangerous situation in the Middle East which threatens world peace and security. The possibility of a global war—originating in that area and widening rapidly to involve the great Powers and all nations on every continent—is something which none of us can afford to ignore.

113. The crux of the problem in the Middle East is the Palestine question and the creation of a Zionist State based on injustice. The Palestinians have been driven by the Israelis from their homes; their property has been seized and given to new Jewish immigrants,

and their homeland—Palestine—has been turned into a new State in which new immigrants have been granted the status of legal citizens while the indigenous peoples have been made stateless. As a result, Palestinians are today living either in exile, under Israeli occupation, or as second-class citizens in Israel with restricted rights, privileges and opportunities. There could be no greater tragedy than that of Palestine and no injustice more profound than that perpetrated at the expense of the Palestinians.

114. In order that this debate be concrete and positive we should recall some basic facts which are at the heart of the problem of the Middle East in general and of that of Palestine in particular.

115. Firstly, at the time when the Balfour Declaration was announced and when Britain created the problem of Palestine, throwing the issue of the persecution of the Jews in Europe in the lap of the Middle East, 90 per cent of the Palestine population consisted of Arabs. The Jewish population numbered about 56,000 only, and they lived in harmony and friendliness with all Arabs, Christians and Moslems alike, as other Jews did in various parts of the Arab countries. The Arab homeland was, with all its territories, the safest refuge place for all the Jews who fled persecution and anti-Semitism in Europe.

116. Secondly, the Arab population of Palestine at that time owned 97.5 per cent of the land, while the Jews owned only 2.5 per cent.

117. Thirdly, when the question of Palestine was submitted for the first time to the United Nations, the Zionists possessed only 6 per cent of Palestinian land.

118. Fourthly, the General Assembly partition plan resolution [181 (II)] unjustly and unduly gave Israel 55 per cent of the total land of Palestine, with the result that an alien Zionist race was imposed on the people of the area, who were displaced and forced to live in tents while the usurpers and Zionist invaders inhabited their cities and took over their farms and their property. Following the partition plan, Israel took over by force 77 per cent of the total of Palestinian land.

119. It is ironic that Mr. Eban asks for what he calls a guarantee and legitimate security for Israel. Who really needs a guarantee in the Middle East? It is certainly the Arabs, who need a guarantee against continuous Israeli aggression, and not the Israelis, who ever since, and indeed even before, their alien State became a *fait accompli* have systematically and brutally extended their frontiers. Does Israel think that the world has forgotten what happened during its three wars of aggression against the Arabs over the past 20 years? The first one resulted in the occupation and annexation of 77 per cent of Palestine, including west Jerusalem. The world has not forgotten that Israeli forces, in defiance of United Nations resolutions, penetrated into the southern area of the Negev and reached the Gulf of Aqaba. Does Mr. Eban think that the world has forgotten how the Jewish population has

risen from a mere 56,000 to 2.5 million? In a short span of 20 years we have seen the creation of Israel and its expansion to include, in the form of either annexation or military occupation, the whole of Palestine, including the west bank, Gaza, the Sinai and the Golan Heights.

120. When Israel claims that it seeks peace this means that it is preparing for another war. The world has not forgotten that in 1956 Mrs. Meir, then Foreign Minister, stated: "Our first aim is peace." However, six months later came Israel's second-lap onslaught in the form of the tripartite aggression against Egypt. Ben Gurion declared then that Israeli forces had "liberated" the Sinai.

121. All the events that have taken place, including the 1967 war, have been in complete harmony with the territorial aims of the Zionist leaders. Yet, even Israeli conquests in 1967 still fall short of the minimum territorial goals planned by the founders of Zionism. Zionist leaders spoke of extending the nation west to east from the Nile to the Euphrates. It is indeed naïve, after such unprecedented expansion, to state now that Israel seeks peace. Peace to Israel means to prepare for another war for conquest and occupation. This garrison State, imposed by force in the midst of the Arab world, has proved to be one of the most militaristic and expansionist States in modern history. A great statesman has described it as "a warlike State determined to expand".

122. The Zionist leaders from Herzl to Goldman, from Ben Gurion to Dayan have all declared openly that they are seeking to expand. However, Israeli leaders today are more cautious in their attempts to mislead world public opinion. They are trying now to make threats and actions sound like security necessities.

123. Israel wants to retain the occupied territories and insists at the same time on negotiating at gunpoint and now wants to prevent one of the victims of its aggression, that is, the United Arab Republic, from taking defensive measures in those parts of its territories that have remained unoccupied. It is clear that Israel wants to impose its terms and achieve its expansionist aims in the area. At a time when Israel still occupies other States' territories, defies United Nations resolutions and undermines all efforts made to solve the problem, we find a super-Power, a founder of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council, namely the United States, rewarding Israel by providing it with the most sophisticated offensive weapons. Such action, after Pentagon experts have asserted that Israel enjoys great military superiority, has only one interpretation, that is, as encouragement to Israel to dictate its terms and impose its will. The United States has also encouraged Israel to withdraw from the Jarring talks. Even in this debate the United States representative has warned this Assembly not to take any action which would not satisfy the United States puppet régime in Tel Aviv. Therefore, my delegation considers that the United States draft resolution seeks only to water down this debate

and to serve as an umbrella for Israel to impose another *fait accompli* in the Middle East.

124. There will never be any solution to the explosive situation in the Middle East unless the injustice perpetrated at the expense of the Palestinians is remedied. There will never be peace in the Middle East as long as the Palestinians are denied their inalienable right to freedom and self-determination. In September 1948 the United Nations mediator in Palestine, the Swedish Count Folke Bernadotte, reached the same conclusion: that no settlement could be reached in the Middle East unless the Palestinians were allowed to return to their homes. In his report to the Secretary-General of the United Nations he stated:

“It would be an offence against the principles of elemental justice if these innocent victims of the conflict were denied the right to return to their homes while Jewish immigrants flow into Palestine, and, indeed, at least offer the threat of permanent replacement of the Arab refugees who have been rooted in the land for centuries.”¹

125. The reaction of Israel to the United Nations mediation was that only a day after completing his report, Count Bernadotte was shot and killed in Jerusalem by Israeli terrorists.

126. So long as Israel persists in occupying Arab territory, so long as 2 million Palestinians see their homeland occupied, their legitimate rights denied, and so long as three Member States of the United Nations see their territories occupied and exploited and continue to live under the threat of yet another Israeli invasion, there will be no peace. Until the occupying forces are withdrawn there will be no peace and there will be no settlement until justice is restored to the indigenous people of Palestine.

127. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): It seems appropriate that the item at present under discussion, “The situation in the Middle East”, should come immediately after the commemorative session. During that session emphasis was laid on the growing dangers from technological advances, particularly in nuclear weapons of global destruction. The debate in this Assembly on the present item may bring awareness of the reality that the Middle East situation is *par excellence* the one international problem today which, if it continues unresolved, might well trigger a generalized war.

128. Indeed, the Middle East problem contains all the elements that go to make a situation dangerously explosive. It is a convergence of mutual fears, nationalistic pride, wounded pride, deep-rooted animosities and super-charged emotions.

129. The long-nurtured feelings of injustice over the human sufferings of the Palestinian refugees left festering over two decades have developed into a generating

force of increasing belligerency and instability in the area.

130. Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly have remained without effect and no alternative to them has ever been offered over the years in an ever-deteriorating climate of mounting tensions. The supervening war of 1967 brought in its wake new problems and unforeseen dangers materially aggravating the whole situation. Indeed, what was mainly a local problem became an area of accentuated antagonisms between major Powers over spheres of influence and the balance of power. Thus, the dreaded possibilities of a nuclear conflagration came dangerously close to and became almost interconnected with a problem of highly explosive emotions, to the detriment of all parties in the area and world peace.

131. Contemporary experience has repeatedly demonstrated that violence and war can solve no problem and can bring no benefit to those who use them, but that only accumulated calamities result for all concerned and for the world at large.

132. The United Nations, beyond its general responsibility of not remaining passive on international problems, has a special responsibility with respect to the Middle East situation, which has taken its course from an original United Nations resolution. The Organization, having an immediate interest in the cause of world peace and security, must exert all its efforts, exercise all its powers and exhaust all measures under the Charter in an endeavour to bring a peaceful solution to this long-festering and constantly escalating problem.

133. Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 is a balanced decision unanimously adopted by the Council and aiming at a just and workable settlement in accordance with the principles of the Charter. It takes due account of the vital rights and interests of both sides and of the fundamental requirements of peace in the area, including, of course, the just settlement under the Charter of the problem of Palestinian refugees.

134. Regrettably, however, that resolution also has remained unimplemented. The value of resolutions lies in their implementation and not in their mere pronouncement. But hope was generated by the recent efforts of the major Powers, culminating in the Rogers plan. Accepted by both sides, this plan was to set in motion the machinery of talks through the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Jarring, mandated to ensure the implementation of the Security Council resolution.

135. The talks, however, were stalled from the very start over differences regarding compliance with the cease-fire and have since remained inoperative. But the United Nations has unremittingly to continue its efforts to bring about a spirit of understanding and goodwill towards a settlement on the basis of the 1967 Security Council resolution, in an endeavour to avoid the incalculable hazards involved in the Middle East

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Supplement No. 11*, part I, chap. V, para. 6.

situation. The General Assembly can well bring its own contribution in facilitating the implementation of the Security Council resolution of 1967 by bringing its weight to bear for the effective resumption of the talks.

136. Therefore, the debate on this item in the Assembly is appropriate and can prove constructive if applied to that purpose. At the present juncture no useful purpose could be served by entering into the origins or the substance of this problem. The scope of the present debate on this item in the General Assembly is therefore limited in its purpose and concrete in its objective. It is not to discuss the merits or demerits of the Middle East problem nor to add to, subtract from or interpret the Security Council resolution. Its objective is to break the impasse in the implementation of the Security Council resolution in the interest of all concerned and that of international peace and security. Towards that objective the General Assembly would have to call upon the parties urgently to resume their talks with and through the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Jarring, without permitting delays or distractions to impede the progress of this important work on any grounds whatsoever.

137. It may be recalled in this connexion that under Article 2, paragraph 3, of the Charter it is the obligation of all Members to "settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered". And for such peaceful settlement there must be communication, as provided in the Security Council resolution. Therefore, this calling for talks is most essential and urgent.

138. The General Assembly would also have to call for the extension of the cease-fire for a further period, for it is not possible to carry on talks and at the same time to destroy the climate of those talks by actual fighting and war. Furthermore, the General Assembly must uphold two cardinal principles of the Charter contained in the resolution of the Security Council which have been either directly or by implication challenged or bypassed. The first principle is that of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war, as emphasized in the preamble to that resolution and affirmed in its operative part by the call for the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from the territories occupied in the recent conflict. The second principle that has to be upheld by the General Assembly and must equally be applied and emphasized is the right of every State to respect for and acknowledgement of its sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence, as well as its right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force.

139. Those two cardinal principles, contained in the Security Council resolution, have to be fully respected so that the implementation of that resolution in its totality may be facilitated. It is fundamental to the Charter that the acquisition of territory by conquest and war cannot be admitted by the international community or legitimized by the United Nations. This is the pre-

sent reality in our transformed world of the United Nations era and the space age, whatever may have been the history of nations in the past. Also basic to the Charter is respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence and security of all States in the area and in the world. Needless to add, a just solution of the problem of the Palestinian refugees, as provided in the Security Council resolution, is of pre-eminent importance to a peaceful settlement of the Middle East situation.

140. It is our conviction that affirmation by the General Assembly of these four basic points could acquire a sufficient consensus and, through proper wording, achieve unanimity. The deadlock in the talks could thus be broken and the way to the needed implementation opened. If this objective is attained, the General Assembly will have rendered a significant contribution in practical terms to this problem and to the commemorative session, by the first item it has dealt with since that session.

141. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The conflict in the Middle East is, in the opinion of the Spanish delegation, the most critical of all the conflicts afflicting mankind at the present time. It is the most critical not only because of its duration, complexity and the considerable interest at issue, but because there has been such a build-up of modern arms and means of destruction in that area that unless an end is put to this arms race, and unless it is reversed, the present potential war will inevitably lead to another confrontation, with the obvious risk that it could become a world conflagration.

142. Three years ago, the Security Council, aware of this serious danger, formulated a few basic principles and guidelines for action to bring about a political settlement of the conflict.

143. After a few months of efforts and negotiations, the Security Council adopted resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, which, because of its balanced provisions, commanded unanimous support.

144. Under that resolution, Ambassador Jarring was asked, in paragraph 3, to establish and maintain contacts with the States concerned, to promote an agreement and a peaceful settlement of the conflict in accordance with the provisions and principles of the resolution. It seemed that we were about to agree on a solution, but this did not occur.

145. Ever since 1967, the Security Council has dealt with a number of complaints as a result of armed attacks, military incursions, and attempts at changing the legislative and administrative structures of Jerusalem, contrary to the provisions of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

146. We do not believe that it is necessary to consider the resolutions adopted by the Council demanding respect for earlier decisions and the principles of the Charter, and ordering an immediate withdrawal of Israel's forces as a result of further military interven-

tion. But my delegation believes that it is appropriate to say that the Security Council, ever since 22 November 1967, has adopted no less than ten resolutions condemning Israel for acts perpetrated in violation of the Charter

147. Although those decisions of the Council contain additional elements that should be borne in mind, the basic requirement of a settlement of the conflict in the Middle East continues to be set forth in resolution 242 (1967) which, because of its balance and because it contains all the elements necessary for all States in the area to live in security, must be maintained without modification or amendment. But what has occurred since that resolution was adopted? The efforts of Ambassador Jarring have not met with the expected success. The appeals of the Security Council and the General Assembly have fallen on deaf ears. The talks between the four Powers or between the United States and the Soviet Union have not met with any positive results, and the confrontation between the adversaries have continued with increasing violations of the cease-fire and military interventions which have been condemned time and time again by the Security Council. We, as non-permanent members of the Security Council, have said that we are very concerned about the fact that a prompt solution of the conflict has not been found, and we said this to permanent members of the Council when we saw that talks had not progressed and that the monthly report that was submitted to us was nothing more than a reflection of frustration and efforts which have met with failure. In the face of this discouraging situation, an appeal has been heard time and again that the cease-fire must be respected.

148. My delegation believes that it is appropriate to say here, that in spite of the fact that the Security Council adopted resolution 233 (1967) on 6 June 1967, urging the Governments concerned, as a first step, to adopt without delay all appropriate measures for a cease-fire, a few hours later the area of military action was increased encompassing a significant portion of Syrian territory. Subsequently, further resolutions were adopted urging that a cease-fire be maintained, condemning violations and calling upon invading troops to return to their original bases, but those resolutions were not abided by. These facts have been ignored or overlooked by those who insist that the violations of the cease-fire of which others may have been guilty are the main cause of the standstill which has occurred in present negotiations.

149. However, a cease-fire is nothing but a temporary measure, albeit an important and urgent one. It is nothing but the first step towards negotiation and peace. The cease-fire must be respected, but it must be respected as the first step towards peace, not as the goal which will perhaps become a guarantee of advantages which were once secured and which one may wish to consolidate. If this were not true, the cease-fire would only serve to perpetuate the present situation—meaning Israel's occupation of part of the territory of three sovereign States Members of this Organization, in violation of the norms of international law and the principles of the Charter. It is by abiding

by resolution 242 (1967) and not by observing the cease-fire that we will agree on a solution of the problem, for if the terms of resolution 242 (1967) had been abided by, it would not now be necessary to say that the cease-fire needed to be observed.

150. We welcomed the United States initiative to freeze hostilities, for ninety days, which had taken place in the Canal zone, and this was to bring about the talks that it was hoped would lead to a solution of the conflict.

151. But over the past three months no decisive step has been taken in the direction of peace. The cease-fire has been respected but this measure has been taken advantage of to introduce a considerable quantity of military weapons of an offensive nature which may lead anywhere but certainly not to negotiations or a relaxation of tension.

152. We have heard justification of these offensive weapons. We have heard talk of restoring balance when what in fact exists is profound imbalance. Reference has been made to violations of agreements, but the most tragic thing is that apparently no thought has been given to resuming negotiations leading to peace. Reference has been made to the need to restore confidence when it is obvious that confidence can be created only in the course of negotiations since, first and foremost, what is needed is a determination to negotiate which, in turn, will lead to mutual confidence. This determination to negotiate, which might have made it possible to put into effect the Rogers Plan, has been missing.

153. But, before the United States initiative there already existed resolution 242 (1967) which had not been abided by. The main thing which has obstructed negotiations on peace has been, and continues to be, the occupation of territory by force. Until Israel is prepared to put an end to this occupation by withdrawing its troops from all occupied territories, there can be no serious talk of a genuine will to negotiate because, without this fundamental requisite it is impossible to abide by resolution 242 (1967). For that reason when we demand a withdrawal and at the same time urge the early implementation of resolution 242 (1967) in all its parts, we are only, in a balanced way, reaffirming the content of that resolution and calling for the means necessary to implement it.

154. My delegation is concerned over the fact that someone might think that the withdrawal should not be complete. That would be very serious for the Organization, for it would create a precedent which would open doors to future intervention in this and other areas of the world. No country would feel safe any more or feel secure that its Territory would not first be militarily occupied and then mutilated by an invader. The fundamental principles of the Charter and our Organization would be made a mockery of if the advantages acquired by an invader were recognized. My delegation has constantly maintained that the military occupation of the territory of another State is an unlawful international act, and that annexation by milit-

ary conquest is not allowable within the legal order established by the United Nations Charter.

155. Assuming that a complete withdrawal is necessary, in keeping with the principles of resolution 242 (1967), this General Assembly must recommend, in the opinion of my delegation, that the parties concerned should get into contact directly and resume negotiations with Ambassador Jarring. If, for any reason, it is felt that Ambassador Jarring needs additional instructions, then either the Security Council or the General Assembly should provide those instructions immediately so that the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations will see the implementation of the resolution I have just mentioned and will see the restoration of peace and tranquillity in the Middle East.

156. Consequently, my delegation believes that if it becomes necessary to continue the cease-fire for an additional period of time to be mutually agreed upon, this General Assembly should order such a continuation. Accordingly, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.602 and Add.1 which, while reaffirming the inadmissibility of the occupation of territories by force, recognizing the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and calling for the implementation in all its parts of resolution 242 (1967), contains the necessary elements for a solution to the conflict.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.