



CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 124: The situation in the Middle East (<i>continued</i>)	1117
---	------

**President: Mr. Gaston THORN
(Luxembourg).**

AGENDA ITEM 124

The situation in the Middle East (*continued*)

1. Mr. BENNETT (United States of America): The debate in the plenary General Assembly continues to focus our attention on one of the most sensitive and difficult problems we face as a global community: the situation in the Middle East. We have already discussed aspects of this issue on various occasions during the current session, and the Security Council and Committees of the Assembly are at this moment working on Middle East issues. I therefore feel no need to dwell on the seriousness of the Middle East situation or on its importance to us all. The issue hangs heavy upon us.

2. Nor do I really need to tell representatives what United States policy is in the Middle East. Since the signing of the new Egyptian-Israeli Agreement of 4 September 1975, United States policy in the Middle East has been elaborated several times by Secretary of State Kissinger, most notably in his address to the Assembly on 22 September [2355th meeting]. He has explained our view of that agreement and what the United States is prepared to do next. It may be useful, nevertheless, to reiterate here some of the main points of that position in order to demonstrate once again the determination of the United States to go forward in the pursuit of a peaceful settlement.

3. Our conclusion after the October war of 1973 was that to have approached all the issues pertaining to all the countries involved would have been nearly futile until a minimum of confidence had been established. The United States believed that we should proceed step by step with the parties that were ready to negotiate and on issues that allowed some room for manoeuvre.

4. We believed that once into the process the parties would have a stake in its success and that momentum would be created which could produce benefits and agreements that would be kept. We considered that in the end this step-by-step approach would bring about conditions which could then lead to a final, overall settlement. That has been our goal from the beginning. It remains our goal today.

5. Since October 1973, there has been more progress towards peace than at any time since the beginning

of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The United Nations has played an important role in making that progress possible and in assuring that gains achieved have not been lost. Security Council resolution 338 (1973) launched a negotiating process and the first Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East. Agreements to separate forces, to create buffer zones in support of the cease-fire, were negotiated between Egypt and Israel in January 1974 and between Syria and Israel in May 1974. A further agreement, not as the direct outcome of war but as a step towards peace, was signed in September 1975 between Egypt and Israel.

6. We have said and we shall say again that these are only steps in a continuing process. We have made notable progress but the task is in no way finished. We are determined to persevere.

7. The question before us all is where do we go from here and how? The United States is convinced that answers to these questions can be found. President Ford has made it clear that the United States will assist the parties in any way that we can, as the parties desire, to achieve a negotiated settlement within the framework established by Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). We are fully aware that all the basic issues must be met and that there will be no permanent peace unless we deal with the concern of the parties for their territorial integrity, their political independence and their right to exist in peace, and unless we take into account the legitimate interests of all concerned, including the Palestinians.

8. We remain ready to help in further negotiations between Syria and Israel. We are ready to consult and to discuss the possibilities of a reconvened Peace Conference. We are ready and willing to explore any practical method of advancing the cause of peace, including a preparatory conference of the original participants in the Geneva Conference to discuss agenda procedures, participation and other matters relevant to a resumption of the Geneva Conference. This is the policy of the United States. We shall execute it vigorously.

9. The draft resolution before us for our consideration does not, in the view of the United States, help us in the process towards the peace that we support and desire to achieve. We shall vote against the draft resolution. Its one-sided condemnation of one of the parties to the Arab-Israeli dispute and its departure from the accepted negotiating framework established by Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) make further settlement between those parties even more difficult. It calls upon the Security Council to implement certain resolutions that deal with problems that can only be solved by negotiation. That is the task before all of us, to get down to the serious work of negotiation among the parties in which real progress can be made. Draft resolutions such as the one before us today can, in our view, only exacerbate

the situation. Further, it adds to the series of one-sided resolutions which do a disservice to ourselves, to the parties and to this institution. It would take us one step further in destroying throughout the world the credibility of the idea that the General Assembly is truly going about its business. These irresponsible draft resolutions do not take into account the legitimate concerns of one of the parties, and lead us into a domain removed from the reality where a settlement can be achieved.

10. Let us turn away from empty rhetoric and resolutions. Let us commit ourselves to a practical process of negotiations, the process which continues to hold out the best hope for reaching that objective so essential to all the peoples of the Middle East and, indeed, to the peoples of the entire world.

11. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The situation in the Middle East continues to threaten international peace and security. For that reason, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic welcomes the fact that the thirtieth session of the General Assembly has on its agenda an item entitled "The situation in the Middle East", which is being discussed in the plenary Assembly. The reason for the constant threat of the outbreak of open armed conflicts, tension and situations fraught with conflict in this region lies, as the Assembly knows, in the continuing aggression of Israel and its stubborn refusal to withdraw from the Arab territories which it occupied in 1967 and to recognize the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including its right to create its own State.

12. The General Assembly and the Security Council have frequently had occasion to deal with the dangerous situation which has been brought about by the policy pursued by ruling circles in Israel, which is based on the Zionist concept of expansion. Numerous resolutions have been adopted aimed at bringing about a relaxation of tension in the Middle East and at providing an opportunity for a political settlement of this conflict. Unfortunately, those resolutions, Security Council resolution 338 (1973), for example, have gone completely unheeded by Israel, a fact which can only be regarded as a manifestation of Israel's continuing reluctance to make a contribution to a genuine and long-term political settlement of the conflict.

13. Resolutions of the General Assembly have also been ignored by Israel, as for example resolution 3236 (XXIX) and resolution 3375 (XXX), which both represent constructive contributions to a settlement of the conflict. It is quite obvious that ruling circles in Israel continue to aspire to carry out a complete programme which is aimed at perpetuating their expansion and occupation of foreign territories. This is indicated in recent communiqués about Israeli intentions to install their settlements in the Golan Heights. It is also borne out by the criminal air attack by Israel on a Palestine refugee camp and populated areas in Lebanon on 2 December. Israeli planes indiscriminately strafed and bombed schools, dwellings and peaceful villages, and women and children were killed. From this rostrum I should like to condemn outright this new act of overt aggression on the part of Israel against a neighbouring sovereign State, and the con-

tinuing shocking annihilation of peaceable people by Israel.

14. The Ambassador of the German Democratic Republic to Lebanon has met the leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO], Yasser Arafat, and expressed the feelings of profound solidarity of the Government and people of the German Democratic Republic, particularly in the face of the barbarous attacks on both Palestinians and the Lebanese civilian population. He emphasized that these bloody acts of terrorism are in stark contradiction to recent decisions of the United Nations, particularly decisions taken by the Security Council aimed at bringing about a settlement of the Middle East problem by political means, while at the same time observing and respecting the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people. Yasser Arafat thanked us for this fresh proof of the solidarity of the German Democratic Republic with the Palestinian people in their just cause.

15. Justice demands that we ask ourselves whether a State which has stubbornly violated the basic principles of international law, ignored human rights and failed to fulfil United Nations decisions has any intention of ever being numbered among the family of nations. The irresponsible position taken by ruling circles in Israel is abetted by the political, military and economic support given by a number of States. Anyone who helps to increase the military potential of the Israeli aggressor thereby assumes a serious responsibility. It would be better for the cause of a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict if those Members of the United Nations whose close ties with the aggressor are demonstrated by their talks with Israeli leaders, which often lead to agreements on economic and military support, were to influence Israel finally to come to its senses and end its expansionist policy, thus gaining peace and security. Those States on whose help and support the Israeli aggressor relies should revise their position so that a realistic evaluation of developments gets through to Tel Aviv.

16. After everything that has happened, particularly in Indo-China, ruling circles in Israel should also be given to understand once and for all that other peoples cannot be oppressed, enslaved and exploited endlessly and with impunity. My delegation shares the frequently stated opinion that there will be no peace in the Middle East, nor can there be any security for Israel, while that State continues to pursue its policy of aggression and expansion, and as long as the thinking and the actions of its Government are motivated by predatory designs.

17. Like other socialist States, the German Democratic Republic is in favour of a comprehensive political settlement of the Middle East conflict, through which it will be possible to institute a just and lasting peace. The time has now come for the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East to resume work in order to achieve a political settlement of the entire range of problems touching the Middle East. At the same time, for all those who not only talk about such a settlement but genuinely desire it, it should go without saying that at the very outset we should invite to participate in that Conference on an equal footing the sole legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine, namely, the PLO. In my statement at this rostrum on 4 November 1975 on the Palestine question

I had occasion to emphasize that: "The delegation of the German Democratic Republic considers that the PLO should be able to participate with equal rights in any action whatsoever relating to Palestine and the Middle East as a whole." [2392nd meeting, para. 104.]

18. My delegation welcomes the official statement by the President of the Security Council on 30 November¹ reflecting the position of the majority of the members of the Security Council and stating that when the Security Council reconvenes on 12 January 1976 to consider the Middle East problem, including the Palestine question, the representatives of the PLO will be invited to participate in the debate.

19. In fact, at this thirtieth session the General Assembly has once again reaffirmed the significance of the part played by the PLO and the need for it to participate on an equal footing in all actions undertaken in order to settle the Middle East conflict.

20. The people of the German Democratic Republic have long now been bound by sincere solidarity with the Arab people of Palestine and its representative, the PLO. Recently, a PLO delegation once again visited the German Democratic Republic capital, Berlin. In a communiqué on the talks, it was stated unambiguously:

"that a lasting and just settlement of the Middle East problem and of the Palestine question is only possible if, from the very outset, the PLO participates as an equal partner as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestine people in all those actions which are intended to bring about a political settlement of this problem."

21. This necessity is now obviously realized by a number of States which have hitherto been reluctant or unable to recognize the role of the PLO. The slanders uttered against the PLO by representatives of Israel and also by a number of incorrigible and foolish persons who do not wish to understand the situation of the Palestinians, and who fail to distinguish between cause and effect, who distort the facts and who overtly indulge in provocation, are simply hopeless attempts to distract our attention from the continuing aggression of Israel against the neighbouring Arab States. That sort of slander simply makes it obvious that those circles are resisting any genuine long-term settlement of the conflict.

22. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic would like to reaffirm its repeatedly stated opinion that the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East is only possible on the basis first of full withdrawal by Israel from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967 and, secondly, of the exercise of the legitimate and inalienable national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to form their own State. Only if these issues are settled will it be possible to secure a genuinely lasting peace in the Middle East and to create conditions which will make for the safe existence and development of all States in that region, including Israel.

23. Such a peaceful settlement of the dangerous conflict in the Middle East is something which is aspired to by peoples throughout the world, on the basis of the belief that, in the final analysis, justice, reason and realism will prevail over criminal instigation to

war, coupled with aggression and expansionism. Ruling circles in Israel in the final analysis cannot fail to reckon with this truth. The growing foreign policy isolation of Israel and the hopelessness of Israel's present political conceptions are prompting an ever-growing number of people in that country to demand that their leaders adopt a realistic approach in the interests of a lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict. Neither generous supplies of weapons and long-term agreements on such supplies nor the activities undertaken by certain agencies of imperialistic circles aimed at instigating and widening disagreements among Arab States can serve as a sheet anchor for Israel's aggressive politicians. All attempts by means of so-called partial measures to consolidate any status quo, that is, to consolidate the present abnormal situation, are doomed to failure.

24. My delegation is convinced that the discussion on the situation in the Middle East can help to give fresh impetus to those efforts directed at bringing about a political settlement of the Middle East conflict within the framework of the already existing international machinery—I am referring to the Peace Conference on the Middle East—and in this way can make an effective contribution to bringing about détente and further consolidating international security and co-operation to the benefit of all peoples and States.

25. Mr. DAMDINDORZH (Mongolia): The Middle East problem has been on the agenda of the General Assembly and other organs of the United Nations for over a quarter of a century, but the situation in that area still remains explosive.

26. The favourable trends now prevailing in the process of international détente could serve for the overall political settlement of the Middle East problem through peaceful means, using the good offices of the United Nations.

27. The principal obstacle to the political settlement of the problem lies in the aggressive and expansionist policy of Israel with regard to its neighbouring Arab States, neglecting the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian Arabs dispersed from their homeland.

28. The Israeli authorities, under the patronage of the forces of imperialism and zionism, against the will and demands of progressive world public opinion, are blocking all moves towards a Middle East settlement, manoeuvring to employ all possible methods, provocations and threats to split and disrupt Arab solidarity and unity which, in the mind of my delegation, are important factors conducive to the cardinal solution of the conflict in question.

29. The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that a just and lasting peace in the Middle East could be established provided that Israel withdraws all its troops from the territories occupied in 1967, recognizes the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arab people and acknowledges the inalienable national rights of that people including its right to self-determination—that is to say, to the creation of its own statehood. Only thus will the sovereign existence, development and co-operation of all the States and peoples in the Middle East be guaranteed.

30. However, there has not been much change for the better in the situation in the area. Israel continues to hold on to its occupied territories, bluntly refusing to recognize the PLO as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arab people; hundreds of thousands of Palestinian refugees are not allowed to return to their homes and properties; the Israeli aggressors are changing the geographic features and demographic composition of the occupied lands.

31. The PLO, as one of the detachments of the national liberation movement, is gaining ever-growing recognition all over the world. Now the PLO is a fully-fledged member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the League of Arab States, as well as of a number of governmental and non-governmental international organizations.

32. At its last session, by its resolution 3237 (XXIX), the General Assembly granted permanent observer status to the PLO, recognizing it as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arab people. That has been reaffirmed during the current session.

33. In such circumstances it would have seemed that Israel would have to recognize the PLO. But the most recent developments in the Middle East darken the horizons in that area. Suffice it to mention the decision of the Israeli Cabinet to block United Nations efforts in search of ways and means to settle the Middle East problem. The recent barbaric air raids by Israel on Lebanon are a serious challenge to the cause of peace in the Middle East.

34. In the view of my delegation, certain isolated steps taken and partial disengagement accords reached recently in the Middle East are far from being likely to facilitate the expected comprehensive settlement. Such partial measures cannot provide a sound basis for the over-all solution to the crisis unless they are inseparable from the comprehensive settlement of the conflict and acceptable to all directly-interested parties.

35. My delegation voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 3375 (XXX) on the invitation to the PLO to participate in all international efforts designed to settle the Middle East crisis under the auspices of the United Nations.

36. It is my delegation's view that all the aspects of the Middle East settlement, as well as balanced and mutually acceptable decisions, should be considered and adopted within the framework of the established international machinery, the Peace Conference on the Middle East—as originally submitted by one of the co-Chairmen of the Conference, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The PLO should participate in the Conference on an equal footing with other parties directly concerned.

37. Under the Charter of the United Nations, the primary tasks of the United Nations, specifically of its main political body, the Security Council, are the preservation and strengthening of world peace and international security. For the last decade the United Nations has made a valuable contribution towards reducing tension and halting armed conflicts in the Middle East. We all remember well the goodwill mission of Mr. Gunnar Jarring and Security Council resolutions such as resolution 338 (1973) and the one on the United Nations Emergency Force, and others.

We should pay due tribute to the Secretary-General, whose good offices are called upon to facilitate the Middle East settlement. In our opinion, the United Nations role in promoting the over-all settlement should be further strengthened.

38. By its resolution 381 (1975), the Security Council adopted a decision on 30 November last to extend the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force [UNDOF] in the Syrian-Israeli sector in the Golan Heights for a further period of six months and to convene the Security Council early next year on the Middle East problem including the question of Palestine. My delegation welcomes that resolution on the assumption that both the extension of the mandate of UNDOF and the Security Council meetings scheduled to begin on 12 January 1976 are not ends in themselves, but should be regarded as indispensable components of the over-all political settlement of the Middle East conflict.

39. My delegation fully shares the opinion of the majority of the Security Council members that in the deliberations to be held early next year the representatives of the Palestinian Arab people—that is to say, the PLC—should participate as an equal partner with other directly interested parties to the conflict.

40. The Government and people of the Mongolian People's Republic resolutely condemn the Israeli aggression and will do what they are in a position to do to support the just struggle of the Palestinian Arab people as well as the Arab countries in their fight against the Israeli aggressors.

41. I should now like to say a few words about draft resolution A/L.783 and Add.1, submitted this morning by the non-aligned countries.

42. In the view of my delegation the draft resolution before us deals with the key problem of an over-all settlement in the Middle East. It requests the Security Council to take all necessary measures, including measures to ensure the complete withdrawal by Israel from all the occupied Arab territories and full recognition of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. The draft resolution also calls upon the Member States to implement all the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

43. In the opinion of my delegation, this will provide a sound basis for the safe existence and development and the co-operation of all States and peoples in the area. Therefore, my delegation is prepared to vote in favour of this draft resolution.

44. Finally, my delegation reiterates its hope that the consideration of the problems related to the prevailing situation in the Middle East will serve the desired cause of establishing a just and lasting peace, in the interests of all the States and peoples in that area.

45. Mr. HARRIMAN (Nigeria): My delegation is participating in the debate on this item fully convinced that the United Nations has a crucial role to play in this seemingly intractable situation in an area of the world with which Nigeria enjoys strong and deep ties.

46. We have all heard the statements by the representatives of Syria, Egypt, Israel and others. It goes without saying that the situation in the Middle East is still very serious. It is for that reason that I intend to

address this Assembly, briefly but frankly, on this complex situation.

47. As the Assembly is well aware, at the outbreak of war in the Middle East in 1967, and ever since, the Government of Nigeria has sought through contacts with all the parties, including the super-Powers, to lend its support to all meaningful efforts to achieve the re-establishment of a just and durable peace in the Middle East. The Nigerian Government has repeatedly stated that it could not and would not subscribe to any policy that would legitimize the acquisition of territory by force of arms. My delegation, therefore, proceeds from the principle that no people and no nation can for ever endure in silence and accept the occupation of its territory by foreign troops. In pursuance of this principle, the Nigerian Government supported Security Council resolution 242 (1967), the operative paragraphs of which directed Israel to return the Arab lands occupied by Israel after the June 1967 conflict and to acknowledge the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

48. Consistent with Nigeria's policy and in conformity with resolution 242 (1967), my delegation has repeatedly called upon the Government of Israel to respect international opinion and morality and to withdraw from the territory of Egypt, a member of the Organization of African Unity [OAU], and other Arab lands which Israeli forces have occupied since their pre-emptive strike against Egypt in 1967.

49. A few weeks ago at this very rostrum the Commissioner for External Affairs of Nigeria, Colonel J. N. Garba [2378th meeting], drew the attention of the international community to the threat to international peace and security which the situation in the Middle East still presents. He said that the current relative calm in the Middle East since the signing of the Sinai Agreement between Egypt and Israel had shown beyond any kind of doubt that the Middle East conflict could and should be resolved only by negotiation and not by force of arms.

50. There is a valuable lesson which my delegation would like to draw before I proceed, and that is the urgent need for the adversaries in the Middle East to be more actively encouraged by their powerful supporters to sink their differences in the pursuit of what my delegation and like-minded delegations consider the overriding common interests of the vast majority, if not all, of the members of the international community and of the peoples of the Middle East, namely, a just and durable peace.

51. It is for this reason that my delegation would like to be associated with those who have spoken before me and expressed their gratitude to all the very important personalities and other groups of persons who contributed to the achievement of the Sinai Agreement. Nevertheless, my delegation sees the Sinai Agreement not as peace *per se* but as a right step in the positive direction towards peace in the area. We in Nigeria believe that there is no reasonable alternative to peace in the Middle East or in any other part of the world, for that matter. It is therefore the firm belief of my delegation that another war in the Middle East, which is still possible, will not solve the problem. In the circumstances, whatever anyone can do for the cause of peace in the area should be done without further delay. For this purpose my delegation

is committed to and will support all meaningful efforts designed to re-establish a just and durable peace in the Middle East.

52. As a member of the goodwill mission of the OAU on the Middle East conflict, we sincerely desire peace in the area—peace based on equity, peace that does not insist on the acquisition of the territory of other people as a precondition, peace that recognizes and acknowledges the right of all nations, big or small, in the area to coexist in peace and security.

53. It is in line with our declared policy of working for a just and durable peace in the Middle East that my delegation desires to take this opportunity to express its gratitude to all the members of the Security Council and to our indefatigable Secretary-General for their relentless efforts and perseverance against all odds to achieve a peaceful settlement of the conflict, particularly by Security Council resolution 381 (1975), by which it was decided to extend the mandate of UNDOF on the Golan Heights for six months, and to reconvene on 12 January 1976 to continue the debate on the Middle East situation, in which the PLO should be invited to participate.

54. Nigeria naturally is dismayed by the out-of-hand rejection by Israel of the Security Council decision to invite the PLO to participate in its debate. It is indeed another glaring and contemptuous example of Israel's defiance of international efforts to re-establish a just and durable peace in the Middle East. Israel should therefore be encouraged to reconsider its stand and accept the participation of the PLO in the forthcoming debate as a positive step that could contribute immensely to the search for peace in the area.

55. Nigeria has consistently maintained that in order to ensure a just and durable peace in the Middle East it is essential that Israel show positive signs of its willingness to respect all United Nations resolutions and other meaningful peace efforts. This, in our firm conviction, will be in the long-term interests of the State of Israel.

56. As representatives will recall, the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly was suspended, not adjourned, in December 1973. Although the item on the situation in the Middle East was not discussed during the last two sessions, my delegation believes that the two resolutions adopted by the twenty-ninth session on the question of Palestine were important decisions which, if seen in their proper light, would help rather than hinder the search for a peaceful solution of the problem. We therefore regret that attitude of Israel to those decisions.

57. My delegation has repeatedly sounded a note of warning that the doubtful value of an "all or nothing" approach to such a volatile, or rather, explosive situation which the Middle East presents is as inimical to peace in the area as is the arrogance that constantly finds expression in the defiance of United Nations resolutions and other meaningful peace efforts.

58. I think the former Secretary-General, the late U Thant, reduced all the efforts of the international community in the Middle East to a few words when, in his exhortation to Mr. Gunnar Jarring, he made the following prophetic statement: "The road ahead is long, arduous and uncertain, but if only there is a will for peace, all obstacles can be surmounted and peace

will be achieved." That statement was made in the context of the Middle East.

59. Encouraged by these words, my delegation has always remained confident that, given the willingness to co-operate among the adversaries in the Middle East, especially Israel, the United Nations and its Member States can make the road to a just and durable peace more certain, less arduous and shorter. By so doing this Assembly, by whose decision Israel was established, would contribute positively to the efforts of the Secretary-General and the members of the Security Council to re-establish lasting peace in place of the pain and suffering the Middle East has endured for so long.

60. In conclusion, I can only emphasize on behalf of my delegation that lasting peace cannot be achieved on the basis of an expanded Israel. All attempts being made at present to colonize captured territory must cease forthwith. Lasting peace is impossible if a large number of Palestinian refugees continue to live in refugee camps and as exiles, continually ignored by Israel and its supporters. Israel, which was created by a decision of the United Nations, must be accepted by its neighbours. But, finally, super-Power politics that have confounded the search for peace in the area must give way to the genuine needs of the peoples and States of the area.

61. Mr. MARTYNENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The situation in the Middle East continues to be the focus of attention of world public opinion and the United Nations. This is essentially because the explosive situation there has not yet been resolved. At the same time, the main reason for the tense situation in the Middle East continues to be the aggressive policy of Israel and the fact that Israel continues to occupy territories that have long belonged to the Arabs.

62. However, the facts convincingly show that any forcible changes in the Arab-Israeli boundaries in favour of Israel are fraught with a potential and, in fact, quite real danger of new bloody military clashes in the Middle East. In a situation that is marked by worldwide international détente, the fact that the Arab-Israeli conflict has not been settled continues to be particularly sorely felt since it is fraught with dangers for universal peace. The expansionist policy which Tel Aviv continues to pursue is not only dangerous for the Arab countries; it also represents a danger for the future of Israel itself as a State which, for historic reasons, is obliged to seek and to find mutually and generally acceptable forms of coexistence with its Arab neighbours.

63. However, by its obstructionist approach to any proposals which take even the slightest account of the interests of the Arab countries as well as those of Israel, Tel Aviv is thwarting any attempts to make any positive changes that would bring about a settlement in the Middle East. The Government of Israel is trying to consolidate its position in the occupied Arab territories and by means of stepped-up military pressure is trying to impose its terms on the Arabs. Instead of directing its efforts to bringing about a settlement of the Middle East problem, Israel is busy increasing its military potential at the expense of its rich friends. The danger inherent in such a policy on the part of Israel is first and foremost to be seen in the fact that

an explosive situation still prevails in the Middle East, while the leaders of Israel are getting virtual support for their annexationist designs on the Arab territories it has seized, and that a just political settlement of the Middle East problem is being made more remote. One may thus legitimately wonder why the ruling circles and ruling forces in Israel are threatening peace and security in the Middle East and are blocking the road to peaceful coexistence and co-operation between the Israeli people and the Arab peoples.

64. The reply to that question is crystal clear. The Israeli leaders, directed and supported by imperialist circles, are stubbornly and heedlessly pursuing their purpose of overthrowing the anti-imperialist régimes in the neighbouring Arab countries and putting an end to progressive developments taking place in the Arab world. They aim at inflicting defeat on the Arab national liberation movement and weakening the ties between Arab States and countries belonging to the socialist community, in order to weaken the national liberation movements in Asia and Africa.

65. In pursuing these goals, the Government of Israel is shirking the quest for a political decision to the conflict on the basis of decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly and denies the existence of the Arab people of Palestine and its rights. However, this is a reckless policy, and it shortsightedly overlooks the developments that are taking place in the world. Israel is reluctant to acknowledge that there has been a change in the balance of forces in the international arena, and it ignores the fact that the international community has given broad recognition to the Palestinian liberation movement.

66. Israel continues to refuse to return to the boundaries existing before 5 June 1967, denies the right of the Arab people of Palestine to create its own State, fails to recognize the PLO and does not wish to hold any talks with it. But there can be no doubt that the situation would be quite different if Israel were to evince readiness to hold negotiations with the PLO at Geneva and to recognize the right of the Arab people of Palestine to create its own State.

67. Israel continues to pursue a policy of *fait accompli*, carrying out annexations of Arab territories and trying by all means in its power to thwart the implementation of Security Council resolutions. Such a policy is fundamentally at variance with the interests of the Israeli people. At the same time it accords with the purposes of imperialism and its monopolies. Therefore it is natural that that policy cannot but lead to, and in fact has led to, the isolation of Israel in the international arena.

68. The corner-stone of the policy pursued by the Government of Israel and the Zionist movement has always been and remains the denial of the very existence of the Arab people of Palestine and its national rights. However, the facts have shown that peace in the Middle East can be brought about only by recognition of the right to self-determination of the Arab people of Palestine.

69. The present official policy pursued by Israel on the Palestine question has done and continues to do serious damage to the cause of peace in the Middle East. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR has already declared from this rostrum that the Palestine problem

is essentially a political one and that its solution is an important and integral part of a general Middle East settlement. Today it is abundantly clear that the majority of States throughout the world refuse to accept the position of the Government of Israel on the Palestine question and consider that a settlement of the Middle East crisis is possible only if the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine are restored.

70. Last year the General Assembly, by an overwhelming majority of votes, reaffirmed the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arabs [*resolution 3236 (XXIX)*] and adopted a decision to grant the PLO, the legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arabs, the status of observer to the United Nations with the right to participate in the work of the General Assembly and in all conferences convened by international organizations [*resolution 3237 (XXIX)*]. The representative of Israel was the only one who objected to even having the item included in the agenda. That was further proof of the fact that Israel is completely isolated in its attitude on a question of tremendous significance if peace is to be restored to the Middle East.

71. The wide recognition of the rights of the Arab people of Palestine shows the legitimacy of the demands of this people that their national rights be honoured. This recognition stems from the fact that the struggle of the Palestinian people is an organic part of the national liberation movement of all the Arab peoples and also part and parcel of the common action undertaken by peace-loving forces to bring about a settlement of the Middle East conflict on a just basis. Therefore it is impossible to assume that this conflict will be settled unless a solution is found to the Palestine problem which takes due account of the interests of the Palestinians themselves.

72. The removal of the danger of war and tension in the Middle East is a task of prime importance and urgency, and the only way to change the situation is by achieving, on the basis of the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, a just and lasting settlement which would take account of the legitimate interests of all the peoples of the Middle East, including the Palestinian people, and the right to existence of all States in that area. A just and lasting settlement in the Middle East is possible if the flouted rights of the Palestinian Arabs are restored and at the same time Israel ceases its policy of occupying and annexing Arab lands. The settlement of the Middle East question on this basis would offer broad prospects in the field of political and economic co-operation in the Middle East and would really guarantee peace and security in that area.

73. Of great significance in the attempts to find a settlement of the crisis in the Middle East is the initiative taken by the Soviet Union aimed at promptly reconvening the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East. The resumption of the work of the full-scale Geneva Conference would be in consonance with the purpose of bringing about genuine progress in settling the Middle East conflict. The aim of that Conference when it resumes should be to achieve a comprehensive political settlement of the Middle East conflict on the basis of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, and first and foremost, Security Council resolution 338 (1973) and General Assembly

resolution 3236 (XXIX). A settlement in the Middle East will depend on whether these key issues are resolved—that is, the complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the territories occupied in 1967 and the restoration of the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to create their own State. Only if these questions are settled will it be possible to establish a genuine and lasting peace in the Middle East and to provide sound conditions for the secure existence and development of all States in that area. We are very much in favour of the participation in the Geneva Conference from the outset of its resumed session and on an equal footing of all parties directly concerned, including the representatives of the Arab people of Palestine, the PLO. The adoption of the Soviet proposal in its entirety—that is, as regards the membership and agenda of the Conference—would be in full accord with the interests of the Arab peoples and in the interest of establishing a genuinely just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

74. Eight years have elapsed since the Israeli aggression in 1967, and also there has been a quarter of a century of ceaseless military tension in the Middle East. This has convinced us all that active steps must be taken and constructive efforts made to achieve genuine peace in that area. Of course, no one can deny that the search for mutually acceptable solutions in all matters relating to a Middle East settlement is by no means easy, but it must be continued by all interested parties and without any further delay. The United Nations should not, in conditions in which there is progressive détente in international affairs, allow the Middle East web of contradictions to remain a constant source of tension which is fraught with the gravest possible consequences for universal peace and which is having a negative effect on present and future relations not only among States in that area but also among other countries.

75. Mr. AL-SHAIKHLY (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): For more than eight years the question of the Middle East situation has been on the agenda of the General Assembly. We have become used to hearing and reading the words “the situation in the Middle East” both within and outside the United Nations, but we have rarely heard the truth of the situation and the direct reasons and results and their effect on international security and peace, especially in certain countries, such as the United States, which has a particular and direct responsibility for the tension that has prevailed in the Middle East for more than a quarter of a century. This unfortunate expression came into use as a result of international political reality following the Israeli aggression of 1967 in order to disguise the truth of the manoeuvres intended not merely to put the aggressor and the victim on an equal footing but in fact to give a superior position to the aggressor *vis-à-vis* the victim of its aggression.

76. All these attempts to deceive world public opinion and mislead it with regard to Israeli aggression against the Palestinian people and the Arab States, claiming that it does not constitute a threat to peace in the region, nor to international peace and security, have failed. In spite of the attempts in the past to mislead, the realities of the Middle East question and the core of the situation have been understood as aggression

against the Palestinian people and three Arab States Members of the United Nations. The international community has come to understand better than ever the dimensions of this aggression and its adverse effects on international peace and security.

77. We do not want to list again all the historic facts which led to the explosive situation in the Middle East or the reasons for it, particularly since these are now known to all observers of international affairs and the facts of the situation take up a large part of the records of the United Nations and many international conferences which have been concerned with this question. Undoubtedly what is called the situation in the Middle East, which resulted from the Zionist aggression of 1967, is only another link in the long chain of attempts by Zionism since its first attack against the peaceful people of Palestine to create new facts and truths, through which it wants to absorb all Palestine and expand its aggressive racist entity into the Arab territories, in the belief that this can guarantee the final solution of the problem of the Palestinian people and their cause.

78. This truth has become well known to all those who do not wish to be the victims of the lies which the Zionist representative is in the habit of telling in this forum on the pretext that in 1967 Israel was threatened with extermination by the Arabs. The statements of Zionist leaders themselves refute those allegations. Yitzhak Rabin said the following, according to *Le Monde*, on 28 February 1968:

“I do not believe that Nasser wanted war. The two divisions he sent into Sinai on 14 May would not have been enough to unleash an offensive against Israel. He knew it and we knew it.”*

The following is quoted from *Hu'aretz* of 19 March 1972:

“Dr. M. Peled said that the thesis that in June 1967 Israel faced a danger of annihilation and that the State of Israel was fighting for its physical survival is a tale which was born and elaborated only after the war. Dr. Peled, who was in the Army General Staff during the 1967 war, is now a Professor of History at the Shilo'ah Institute.”*

Mr. Mordechai Bentov, Minister in the coalition Cabinet at the time of the June war, stated in *Al Hamishmar* of 14 April 1972:

“All this story on the danger of extermination has been invented in its entirety and blown up *a posteriori* in order to justify the annexation of new Arab territories.”*

79. It is clear and obvious that Zionism's denial of the inalienable legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people has been and continues to be the core of the explosive situation in the Middle East and the direct reason for it. Zionism's insistence on its policy of expansion and aggression, annexation by force of Arab territories, extermination of the population, eviction of the Arab people from their villages and changing the demographic character and nature of those areas constitutes a flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law, which prohibit such annexation and occupation of the territory of others by force, and

regard occupation, in all its forms, as an act of aggression that must be condemned. The continued policy of expansion and aggression has affected the peace and security of the entire area and of the whole world.

80. We have heard a great deal about attempts to reach a peaceful settlement of the Middle East question and to end Israel's occupation of Arab territories. In this context, we would like to affirm that we are not interested so much in the form as in the content and in the principles on which those efforts are based and which would be the basis for any acceptable, final and just solution. We have made clear on many occasions what we believe to be a suitable settlement of what is called the situation in the Middle East and have affirmed that there are two essential elements in such a just and final solution to this abnormal and inhuman situation in the Middle East: first, the implementation of all resolutions concerning the inalienable and universally recognized rights of the Palestinian people, in particular General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX), and recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to return to their homeland and to exercise self-determination; and, secondly, the unconditional eradication of the consequences of Israeli aggression against the Arab States. It is our belief that denial of the rights of the Palestinian people will not help the search for a final and just settlement of the situation in the Middle East.

81. On that basis—in our opinion—the ways and means of settling the situation in the Middle East and their effectiveness in achieving a just and lasting peace in the area are clearly specified. We have said on many occasions that efforts based on Security Council resolution 242 (1967) can only be at the expense of the Palestinian people, since that resolution denies the greater part of the truth, in order to recognize a small part of it. This is not strange, since the resolution was adopted after the 1967 aggression, which was supported by American imperialism. We wish to state our belief that Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) cannot be the basis for a just solution since they refer only to Palestinian refugees and not to why they became refugees or where they came from.

82. What arouses our anxiety is the price that Israel has demanded for withdrawing just a few kilometres from the Arab territories, a price that runs into thousands of millions of dollars in the form of destructive and sophisticated American weapons. That confirms our belief that the peace which Israel wants is based only on military superiority, modern weapons and preparations for further aggression and attacks in the area.

83. At a time when we confirm our belief in peace based on justice and the importance of a lasting and just peace in the Middle East based on the principles of the Charter, we feel it is the responsibility of the United Nations to condemn Israeli aggression and restrain and punish the aggressor, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. To remain silent in the face of this aggression, in addition to the danger it would entail, would cause people to lose faith in the credibility of the United Nations and would weaken its ability to carry out its task.

84. We believe that the logical basis for any serious settlement of the dangerous situation in the Middle East

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

is to consider it as a question of a flagrant aggression against the Arab nation. Although Zionism has been able to achieve temporarily what it thinks is a final victory, thanks to American political and military support, this cannot last, because it is against the nature of things and is contrary to the current of history, which proves that the era of neo-nazism, racism and aggression is on the decline and the will of peoples to eliminate all forms of racial discrimination and to achieve self-determination is one of the outstanding characteristics of our time.

85. Mr. AMIRMOKRI (Iran): As a Member State from the region of the Middle East, Iran is deeply concerned with the question of the development and establishment of peace, security and justice in that trouble-stricken area. As such, we attach special importance to the continuing efforts of the United Nations in seeking a just solution to the perennial crisis which has plagued the life of the people of the area for the last 28 years.

86. The position of the Government of Iran in this respect is well known and has been fully expressed in various international forums and has always been informed by the following premises. First, after the 1967 war, the Shahanshah of Iran was the first world leader to speak out publicly against the acquisition through the use of force of territories belonging to other States. Secondly, we continue to believe that the basic principles of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) remain to this day the most vital and realistic framework for bringing about peace in the Middle East. Thirdly, recognition of the inherent right of the Palestinian people to self-determination is to be viewed as an essential element in the settlement of the Middle East problem.

87. It logically follows that on the basis of these premises, a just and lasting peace in the Middle East calls for the fulfilment of the following requirements: the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from the territories occupied in June 1967; respect for the rights of the Palestinian people and its effective participation in peace negotiations for the settlement of the Middle East dispute; the termination of the state of belligerency, and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all States in the area and of their right to live in peace, free from threats or acts of force.

88. However, we have not come here merely to reiterate our previously stated position or to play the same role in the merry-go-round drama of the Middle East question. The reason prompting us to participate in this debate is the appearance of certain signs in the political setting of the Middle East that may justify a cautious optimism: namely, that a process of negotiation in the Middle East conducive to a peaceful solution has been initiated.

89. The recent Sinai Agreement between the Government of Egypt and the Government of Israel, within the framework of the Geneva Peace Conference, which resulted in the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from a portion of Egypt's occupied territories is, in our opinion, a modest step forward towards the solution of the problem. However, it is imperative that this opportunity be seized and its potential for the achievement of a lasting peace be fully exploited. Herein, however, the opportunity lies not in the phasir.g

out of the salami-tactic approach to the solution of the long-standing problem, but in the good intentions and dedication to the cause of peace *par excellence* which have been demonstrated by the leader of the Arab Republic of Egypt.

90. In this Assembly we have often heard the representative of Israel trying, in alarming tones, to attract the attention of the world to the so-called intransigent views of the Arab leaders *vis-à-vis* Israel, often epitomizing this rhetorically in the phrase "no recognition, no negotiation, no peace with Israel". Now that Israeli commercial ships can use the Suez Canal, the question that arises in one's mind is whether it is not now the time for the other side also to ease its adamant posture and make a substantial move forward to meet the Egyptian and Syrian positions and to understand the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people as well. It is the resourceful intention to pursue peace which is to be tapped and the genuine demand for co-existence which is to be seized upon.

91. The time has come when all concerned should try to look to the future and take advantage of international instrumentalities at their disposal and of the general and fervent desire of the States concerned to open a new and more harmonious chapter in the history of the Middle East. Indeed, the procedures envisaged for the Geneva Conference have opened a new gambit and have offered valuable possibilities of limiting the conflict, if not of solving it. This opportunity should be fully utilized by all concerned, including the representatives of the PLO.

92. We have frequently maintained that any treaty arrangement or peace agreement on the Middle East without adequate accommodation of the legitimate rights and aspirations of the Palestinian people is a flimsily built structure destined to collapse.

93. The question of Palestine and the perennial turmoil in the Middle East are two aspects of a single fact and are part and parcel of the political infrastructure of the Middle East question. Let us now admit that there is no hope for any durable peace in the Middle East unless the legitimate rights and aspirations of the people of Palestine are recognized and accommodated. Therefore, we firmly believe that in any negotiations concerning the question of the Middle East, including the Geneva Peace Conference, the representatives of the Palestinians should occupy their rightful place and have effective participation.

94. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): The Middle East problem in its very substance and essence is rooted in the problem of the Palestinian refugees. All other ensuing and subsequent events are but the inevitable repercussions of that basic problem which has been periodically interspersed with outbreaks of abortive wars. Unless that basic problem is solved according to the ethics of justice, of the principles of the Charter and the provisions of innumerable General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, no aspect of the Middle East problem can effectively be solved.

95. Piecemeal efforts of nearly three decades to overcome the dire repercussions of that basic problem, while leaving the very core of it untouched—namely, the ever-festering and deteriorating situation of the refugees, who are denied their inalienable right to return to their homes and lands—have amply demon-

strated their futility, while the situation has been steadily and continuously worsening. Diplomatic manoeuvres over the years, in endeavours to prevent further outbreaks of war and to find accommodations, have resulted in little else but transient palliative measures which have hardly brought any progress towards a solution and peace.

96. The main problem of the continuing injustice committed against the Palestinian refugees, who for almost a generation now have been living in growing frustration of their yearning to return to their homeland, has created a feeling of despair that has brought an escalation of their ever-increasing dedication to the cause of return to their homeland, so frustrated over the years. There has been an accumulation of feeling from year to year.

97. Now, the love of home, from the most ancient times, has been one of the fundamental instincts of the human race and, as such, is a generator of will-power and of immeasurable potentialities involving fortitude of spirit and unmitigated human determination in its pursuit. A whole generation of Palestinian Arabs was born, grown and nurtured in such aspirations and longings. Since the dawn of civilization, man's love of his home has been a predominant and deep-rooted feeling. Homer in *The Odyssey* referred to *nostimon imar*. *Nostimon* means return to the homeland and *imar* means day—the day of return to the homeland, described by Homer as a day of exquisite happiness. Since then the word *nostimon*, which was return to the homeland, in the Greek vocabulary has come to mean anything of exceeding and unparalleled pleasure and deep satisfaction, and is so used today. Similarly, "nostalgia", which is used in English and comes from the same word *nostus*, return, and *algia*, pain, means the pain and anguish of frustrated longing to return to the homeland, which in English is also called homesickness. The longing to return to one's homeland becomes a sickness. This derives from the instinctive and fundamental link of man with his physical environment. It is part of his nature, and is more profoundly felt by peoples of ancient ancestry like the Greeks, the Arabs and the Jews, and should be more readily understood by them. Is that not a part of the Zionist idea, an idea which survived through millenia of separation in the Diaspora? The satisfaction of that longing and the remedy of the wrong inherent in the Diaspora could surely be achieved without creating a parallel and even graver wrong to fall upon the Arab inhabitants of the area who had lived there over many generations through the ages.

98. The General Assembly resolution of 1947 establishing the State of Israel surely did not envisage such a situation, and this appears obvious from the subsequent resolutions of the United Nations calling for the return of the Arab refugees to their homes and lands. What was meant by the resolution was that the Arabs and Jews of the territory involved could well live in peace and amity together by mutual accommodation and could look to a brighter future in the positive spirit of their common interest, rather than in a negative spirit of division and strife resulting from separateness and exclusion.

99. The advent in the region of the Middle East of a people as gifted in science and art and in all expressions of the human mind as are the Jews should have

been a welcome occurrence for all the peoples of the region. But from the moment that the Arab inhabitants of the territory involved were thrown out of their homes in a spirit of exclusivity, made refugees in neighbouring lands and prevented from returning, a problem of immense and threatening dimensions was in the offing. Instead of there being a search for its remedy from the very start, in accordance with repeated United Nations resolutions, on the basis of the inalienable right of the refugees, as of all peoples, to return to their homes and lands, a contrary course was regrettably followed, and its consequences are obvious. The unreasonable and persistent refusal, on unsubstantiated grounds of security, of those responsible over the years to allow such a return of the refugees has been the basic error and cause of the whole complication and deterioration of the Middle East problem, for indeed, the pursuit of security through enforced inequity is but an illusion, bringing more strife and insecurity, and pushing further and further away the prospects of peace, as developments since have abundantly shown.

100. A positive sense of security for all should be sought through basic justice, in this case for the Arabs, and parallel security for Israel. It might on all occasions be profitably borne in mind that no durable settlement of the Middle East or other conflict can be separated from the fundamental principles of justice, in this case for the Palestinian refugees.

101. Similarly, the expulsion of the indigenous Greek Cypriot majority population from their homes and lands in the occupied areas of Cyprus, with their houses and properties usurped by foreign colonizing populations, all rapidly done within a year, constitutes an injustice of wider repercussions affecting the whole region and the world in its symbolism of naked force unabashedly prevailing. This is particularly incompatible with our present-day world of interdependence.

102. The sudden breakthrough in science and technology has brought man to the age of fundamentals. What are the fundamentals? The fundamental structure of the universe has a meaning and a message for man. That meaning and message are that the ethical order of the universe, in the positiveness of its functions through balance and harmony, must be followed by man, particularly in an age where man has advanced to such high levels of scientific and technological achievement as not to be excused on the pretext of ignorance. He knows well enough that in his present stage of advancement there should be a parallel advancement in ethical principles and in moral conduct. Without that, the future of humanity and its survival are at stake.

103. These are the fundamentals that should be recognized by the international community in the United Nations, particularly at the present time, when we live in an ever more closely interdependent world. Whether we turn to the problem of disarmament and peace or to the threatened environment—both of which contain grave threats to the survival of humanity—or to any other global problem, it is upon the positive approach to the fundamentals in them that effective solutions can be sought and found. By acting on the periphery and pretending to be solving the problems, we are doing nothing but perpetuating them and leaving them at the end unsolved. But we want to be optimistic

and so we hope and trust that there is still time for the leaders of nations in the international community to transform their solemn, high-sounding declarations and pledges in the United Nations into practical policies and actions. We hear so many declarations, and we see so much contradictory action, in some cases blatant, in other cases covert, but always contradictory to the very principles and ideas of the Charter and to the solemn declarations made at the very same time and almost in the same breath. This creates a problem of split personality in nations and peoples, because one thing is said and another thing is done.

104. It may be said that it was always so in the past. What about the age of Metternich and other ages? That was a different time, not a time of advanced technology and science. It was a time when force was supposed to be the dominant feature in the world, accepted by all, and therefore there was no need for hypocrisy. But today, when force can no longer be reverted to in a nuclear age, we pretend that we are abandoning force and we make solemn commitments on the non-use of force, while at the same time using force or allowing the open use of force. This is really a great problem which creates a gap in the very heart of mankind and cannot be a good sign for the course of its further evolution.

105. The problem now before us is one of many that have to be solved in accordance with ethical principles and in this particular case, with the clear statements and resolutions of the United Nations on the following aspects. First, the effective and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli armed forces from the territories occupied by force during the 1967 war, a withdrawal firmly based upon the universally recognized principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by force. Secondly, the return of all the Palestinian refugees to their homes, in accordance with the United Nations resolutions and, I would add, through enlightened means and procedures to that end, which can surely be devised, in order that the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council may be intelligently carried out in a practical manner.

106. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*). On behalf of my country and various other countries, it is my privilege to introduce the draft resolution in document A/L.783 relating to the question of which the Assembly is seized at present.

107. This draft, the first to be considered by the General Assembly on the situation in the Middle East since the twenty-seventh session, is drafted in clear, direct and unambiguous terms, and drawn up within a balanced and stringent framework in order that each and every one of us, in the exercise of our responsibilities, may take an unequivocal decision leaving no room for restrictive interpretations.

108. That is why we have included, in the preamble, three fundamental principles, concerning which there can be no conflicting or divergent positions, namely: the inadmissibility of the acquisition or occupation of territory by force; the recognition of the national rights of a people, of which the right to self-determination is the primary expression; and the indivisibility of peace and security. The designations, subsidiary definitions and particulars we have given in the enunciation of these principles are derived strictly and

solely from the decisions, resolutions and statements of the Security Council or of the General Assembly.

109. Similarly, we have voluntarily kept our objectives within the limits of the Charter and the pertinent resolutions and decisions of the principal organs of the United Nations, in order to arrive at a common line of action, the validity of which and the need for which cannot be called into question. Indeed, no one can oppose the idea that the aggression constituted by the occupation or annexation of a territory should be brought to an end. No one can deny that we are duty bound to ensure that a people has the full exercise of its national rights. Neither can anyone refuse to associate himself with any United Nations effort to safeguard peace and security.

110. These have at all times been our objectives, ever since the United Nations was seized of the Middle East question. They have been repeatedly defined and reaffirmed, and if we harp on them in our draft resolution it is because none has as yet been achieved. In fact, Israel continues with impunity to occupy the Arab territories; the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people have been neither universally nor fully recognized; the absence of a global solution, by reason of its significance as well as its scope and meaning, threatens peace and security in the region; and the non-observance of United Nations resolutions and decisions has virtually reduced to nil or at best to a state of alarming precariousness the initiatives taken by the United Nations.

111. In order to complete this schematic analysis of the situation which constitutes a threat to international peace and security, we felt we had to indicate in the preamble the direction to be given to United Nations action and the character it should assume from now on. Those indications, which may be regarded as part and parcel of the prerequisites of any action, however urgent, relate on the one hand to the framework within which the settlement of the conflict is to be worked out, and on the other, to the elements that should be taken into account. In fact, we recognize that we all aspire to a global, definitive, just and lasting settlement of the Middle East question, and experience has shown that neither the Palestinians nor their national rights can be ignored, and still less the United Nations.

112. These are the basic premises of our draft resolution, which the Assembly will find reflected anew in the operative part, which calls for three series of actions and decisions. First, at the United Nations level in general it is desirable for the Assembly to pronounce itself on the continued occupation by Israel of the Arab territories. The condemnation advocated stems from the systematic and flagrant violation of the provisions of the Charter by Israel, and the non-observance by that country of the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. Secondly, individual States are requested to desist from supplying Israel with any military or economic aid. This is no gratuitous or arbitrary measure, but we must bow to the evidence that Israel's economic and military might, supported and maintained by foreign interests, enables it to pursue a policy based primarily on the refusal to recognize the existence of the Palestinian problem, without which recognition nothing just or lasting can be conceived for the Middle East. Thirdly, to prevent any further deterioration of the

situation, and in the interests of international peace and security, we advocate recourse to the Security Council. The rapid implementation of all resolutions and decisions on the Middle East and the working out of an over-all settlement represent two closely interdependent stages on the way to the normalization of the situation and the achievement of the objectives, which we have already highlighted in the preamble, namely, the complete withdrawal of Israel from all the occupied Arab territories, and the recognition of the national rights of the Palestinian people.

113. Recourse to the Security Council should be construed, too, as an expression of our desire to enable the United Nations once again effectively to take the initiative, both in regard to measures to be taken to maintain what has already been achieved and in regard to the definition of the bases for a new *démarche* taking account of the Palestinian national identity, as we confirmed it last year, and of the right of the Palestinians, represented by the PLO, to participate in all the peace efforts.

114. The role of the Secretary-General will be all the more decisive with regard to the Peace Conference on the Middle East and the parties concerned. That is only fair in view of the outstanding services he has rendered the Organization in this particular sphere and of the more than convincing results of his recent initiatives in the region.

115. The draft resolution I have just introduced is built around principles that we all uphold. Our final aim—which we share with the other Members of the United Nations—is the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. The series of facts that we have briefly set forth cannot possibly be denied, and objectivity demands that at least note be taken of them. We have made it a point to remain faithful to the decisions and recommendations of the Organization itself, within the limits imposed by the Charter. Obviously, we cannot prevent delegations from giving their own interpretations to what they believe to be our motives. But if there must be such an interpretation, honesty demands that it be sought in the draft resolution itself, whose preamble and operative part constitute a whole, as I have endeavoured to demonstrate during this statement.

116. It is in the light of those considerations that the sponsors submit this draft resolution to the General Assembly for its consideration, in the hope that it will be adopted overwhelmingly, in a spirit reflecting the attachment of members of the Assembly to the principles set forth therein and their responsible acceptance of the obligations flowing therefrom.

117. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): Draft resolution A/L.783 is but an additional example of the manner in which this Assembly is allowing itself to be controlled by a group whose sole purpose is to block the road towards peace and destroy any progress which has been made in that direction. Extremists have converted this body into a mechanism to be used by those who oppose accommodation in the Middle East, a mechanism whereby they can effectively sabotage any act which shows promise of a move towards peace in our war-torn area.

118. Let me repeat what I said a few days ago in the debate on this item:

“When the Organization has disappeared in infamy into the limbo of history, historians will recall that the process . . . began as soon as it allowed itself to depart from the original lofty purposes for which it was created and to become the instrument for those who would block the road to peace in the Middle East. Representatives can move from Committee to Committee today and they will discover that this obsession with Israel which has been imposed upon them has become a mania which has by now perverted the Organization into the sorry picture which it presents to the world and has turned it into a body which is rapidly losing any vestige of credibility in the eyes of decent people.” [2423rd meeting, para. 74.]

119. This draft resolution is a most sinister document, designed as it is to use the General Assembly to disrupt the Geneva peace talks and to negate Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which set out the framework for a negotiated peace settlement in the area. This is a one-sided, biased and discriminatory draft resolution which accords with the tradition of anti-Semitism and discrimination which has become the prevalent idiom in this world Assembly. An analysis of the list of the sponsors and all that most of them imply in terms of human misery, suffering, lack of freedom, oppression, hunger and internal division and dissension—sponsors sanctimoniously pronouncing on the situation in the Middle East—is sufficient to emphasize the brutally cynical nature of the Organization and to illustrate the reasons for its utter lack of credibility in the eyes of the world. Take the list of sponsors of this draft resolution and the draft resolution itself and one has here in capsule form the tragedy of the Organization.

120. We reject out of hand this draft resolution, which is a document that does not deserve consideration by any self-respecting body. My delegation calls on all other delegations whose purpose it is to encourage the process of peace-making in the Middle East to reject the draft resolution out of hand, in the interests of peace in this world. Furthermore, we reject this draft resolution as being in violation of the Charter of the United Nations. It is unbelievable, but a draft resolution on an issue which can be resolved only by negotiation consciously avoids mentioning negotiation or the process of negotiation and consciously ignores Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which call for the 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; and which affirm the necessity for guaranteeing freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area, and for guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every State in the area, and which decide that negotiations shall start between the parties concerned under appropriate auspices aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East.

121. Not one word on negotiation appears in this draft resolution. Not one word of those points is mentioned in this one-sided, biased piece of paper called a draft resolution—drafted by nations that would be better advised to put their own houses in order

before they begin to expound on the Middle East situation. Or perhaps that is why they are involving themselves in our problem: so that they can avoid dealing with their own.

122. Article 33 of the Charter of the United Nations requires that the parties to any dispute shall seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation and so forth. This draft resolution ignores also the principles of Article 2 of the Charter, and above all paragraph 1, which provides that the Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members.

123. This draft resolution is an open and flagrant violation of the Charter, and it is symptomatic of a very dangerous trend whereby this Assembly, since it has allowed itself to become an instrument of a small group of extremists, has become a body that is acting daily in violation of the Charter and is arrogating to itself functions and authority which do not belong to it under the Charter.

124. Many delegations have issued warnings against this insidious process which is going on in the course of this session of the Assembly. They can find no better example of this process than the draft resolution which is before the Assembly today.

125. I reiterate that in the course of the protracted struggle in the Middle East nothing has been achieved without negotiation. On the other hand, no negotiation has taken place without something positive being achieved.

126. At the opening of this debate I reiterated the Government of Israel's declared policy favouring a process of negotiation with our neighbouring States and the maintenance of negotiations, without any preconditions and in a manner which befits a self-respecting sovereign nation. On the other hand, I also emphasized that the Government of Israel would not agree to any attempt to impose a solution or to dictate to one or other of the parties in this dispute. By eliminating any mention of negotiation, this draft resolution by its very wording sets itself squarely against the current process of peace-making in the Middle East and aligns all those who vote for it with the forces that have decided to sabotage the current move towards peace in the Middle East.

127. For this and for many other reasons, my delegation rejects this one-sided, biased example of discrimination termed a draft resolution. Should it be adopted by automatic majority, my Government, bent on achieving peace through negotiation in the area, will not be bound by the terms of this one-sided discriminatory attempt by those who would sabotage the move towards peace in the Middle East.

128. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Two delegations, the delegation of Turkey and the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic, have requested to speak in exercise of their right of reply. I now give them the floor.

Mr. Driss (Tunisia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

129. Mr. AKIMAN (Turkey): The General Assembly is at present discussing the very important question of the situation in the Middle East. We, and I am sure all delegations present, attach great importance to that problem. Yet Mr. Rossides, as is

typical of the Greek Cypriot delegation, has chosen once again to bypass the item under discussion and divert attention to another problem on which extensive discussion took place only a week or so ago. I feel sure that you, Mr. President, and the members of the General Assembly will properly evaluate that usurpation of your functions by Mr. Rossides.

130. I would not have wished to follow in his footsteps had he not embarked upon yet another distortion of facts. Mr. Rossides spoke about Greek Cypriots being thrown out of their homes. I wish only to remind the General Assembly that thousands of Turkish Cypriots lived in Cyprus as refugees for 11 years following the Greek Cypriot administration's onslaught on them in 1963, yet no one has ever heard Mr. Rossides speak about that. I submit, therefore, that the picture is not as it has just been drawn by him. Further, there is no parallel between the refugee problem in Palestine and that in Cyprus.

131. I just want to add that if there is a split personality or hypocrisy, to which Mr. Rossides also alluded, it is only on the Greek Cypriot side.

132. Mr. ALLAF (Syrian Arab Republic): The representative of the Zionist régime, as was expected and as is traditional for this representative of a racist, aggressive entity, has once again come before this body and repeated lies, fabrications and insults not only to the members of this Assembly, but also to the United Nations itself. That racist representative predicts that the United Nations will be destroyed and will shortly disappear, and that when that takes place it will be because the Organization has criticized and condemned the policies of aggression and the acts of the Israeli racist régime.

133. What I would like to tell the Israeli Zionist representative is that long before this United Nations disappears, the aggressive entity of Israel, if it continues its aggression and its policy of expansion and racism in our area, will disappear. I am sure that it is not the United Nations that will disappear, but that entity, if it continues along the path of aggression and crimes against humanity.

134. In repeating his lies the Israeli Zionist representative said that this draft resolution, which is sponsored by more than 20 Member States of this Organization, was a draft resolution against the Charter of the United Nations. Among those sponsors there is not the name of any Arab country, not because the Arabs do not support it, but, on the contrary, because we foresaw that the Israeli representative would come here and say that this was a draft resolution presented by their enemies, the Arabs. This draft is presented by countries representing all continents and all groups of nations, countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America, and socialist countries. We are sure it will be supported by an overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations. But the Israeli Zionist representative has said that it is a draft resolution against the Charter. It is very strange and ironic to hear the representative of that régime, which every day violates the principles of the Charter, judge a draft resolution like the one now before the Assembly to be a draft resolution that is against the Charter.

135. The Zionist representative says that the resolution does not mention the word "negotiation", and

he has quoted only what he wants to quote from resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and has forgotten the other, even more important paragraphs and provisions of those resolutions.

136. First of all, I would inform the representative of the Zionist régime that this draft resolution does not ignore any resolution either of the General Assembly or of the Security Council; in both its preambular part and its more important operative paragraph 4, what the authors of the draft are asking is for the Security Council and the United Nations to implement all relevant resolutions of the United Nations, including the resolutions referred to by the Zionist representative.

137. But he referred only to part of resolution 242 (1967), which says that every State in the region has the right to live in peace within secure and recognized borders. He forgot everything about the first part of paragraph 1, which calls for the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from all the territories occupied by Israel. From resolution 338 (1973), he remembered only that we should go and negotiate with the aggressor under the force and weight of occupation. He forgot that paragraph 1 of that resolution calls for a cease-fire; that paragraph 2 calls for immediate implementation of resolution 242 (1967), which in turn calls for complete withdrawal and says that Israel should not benefit from its aggression. The preambular paragraphs of resolution 242 (1967) are very clear. They condemn the acquisition of territory by force. And that is what the present draft resolution of the non-aligned countries starts with: that the principle of non-acquisition of territory by force is a principle which should guide the action of the General Assembly.

138. If the Israeli representative would really like to enter into negotiations, why has his régime reacted in this criminal and murderous manner to a very recent resolution of the Security Council which merely asked for a debate and discussion on the Middle East and the Palestinian situation in the presence of all the concerned parties? This representative comes here and says, "I want peace; I want negotiation"; but what is the answer of that representative and his régime to a very simple resolution adopted three days ago by the Security Council, which merely says the Council will

undertake a debate on the Middle East and the Palestinian question and that all interested parties should participate, including, of course, the Palestinian people? He says he wants negotiations, but his régime's answer to that resolution was, as our colleagues know, a murderous succession of waves of Phantom aircraft against refugee camps in Lebanon, as a result of which more than 100 women, children and elderly persons were massacred; more than 200 unarmed civilians were wounded; and villages, refugee camps and many areas in Lebanon were completely destroyed. That was the answer to the call of the Security Council for a simple debate on the Middle East.

139. Another answer was Israel's decision to create even more settlements on the Golan Heights. Simply because Syria asked for a debate on the Middle East, they have decided to establish more aggressive settlements on the territory acquired by Israeli aggression. So that is how the Zionists understand the concept of negotiation, and that is the peace these Zionists want to impose on us.

140. I conclude by saying that I was going to oppose the Israeli representative's being allowed to speak yesterday, because we understood from the President that there were eight speakers, the last of whom was to be the representative of Madagascar, who was to present the draft resolution. But we did not want to raise that objection, because I was sure the Israeli representative would say what he said and because I was sure that what he said would render support for the draft resolution much wider. So, even though the Israeli representative does not deserve our thanks, we thank him at least for what he said, because in insulting the United Nations, in insulting the Members, in repeating his fabrications, he perhaps convinced some of those who were not convinced of how Israel understands this matter.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

NOTE

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirtieth Year*, 1856th meeting, para. 23.