



President: Mr. Imre HOLLAI (Hungary).

AGENDA ITEM 33

Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa
(continued):

- (a) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*;
- (b) Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports;
- (c) Reports of the Secretary-General

1. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to introduce draft resolution A/37/L.46/Rev.1, which contains a further appeal for clemency in favour of South African freedom fighters.

2. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I wish to introduce very briefly draft resolution A/37/L.46/Rev.1, which my delegation has the honour to present to the General Assembly on behalf of the group of African States, of which the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is Chairman for the month of December. The draft resolution deals with a humanitarian matter of some urgency, because the sentence on the six freedom fighters referred to in the draft resolution has been confirmed and there is nothing to prevent the racist régime in Pretoria from executing them at any moment. That is why we insisted that this matter be considered now and why the draft resolution is being submitted to the Assembly.

3. We are all aware of the wretchedness and evil of *apartheid* as practised in southern Africa. A few days ago, the debate on the item concerning the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa was concluded. All delegations, including my own, have had an opportunity to express their views and attempt to highlight the tragedies resulting from that policy. That is why I do not wish to go into any detail on that now.

4. I should like to say, however, that the death sentences referred to in the draft resolution should be seen in the context of a campaign of persecution and oppression against the nationalist citizens of South Africa who are opposed to *apartheid* and particularly against the African National Congress [ANC]. These actions prove to what extent the racist régime disregards the resolutions and the repeated appeals of the international community.

5. The draft resolution deals with a purely humanitarian matter. Its purpose is to save the lives of certain innocent militants whose only crime is to oppose the policy of racial discrimination practised by the minority

régime of South Africa. These militants are demanding freedom, justice and equality and thus expressing the clear will of the international community and its rejection of the policy of racial discrimination which has been frequently condemned by the General Assembly and is considered to be a crime against humanity.

6. The preambular part of the draft resolution refers to the fact that the appellate division has rejected the appeal against the death sentences imposed on three members of the ANC and that the South African Government has not heeded the General Assembly's appeal for clemency contained in its resolution 37/1, of 1 October 1982, in favour of three other South African freedom fighters, and considers that the continued repression of the opponents of *apartheid* is bound to have grave repercussions.

7. In the operative part of the draft resolution, the General Assembly calls upon the South African authorities not to proceed with the execution of the six freedom fighters referred to in the text and asks them to commute the death sentences as soon as possible. It also requests the Security Council to direct an appeal for clemency to the South African authorities not to proceed with the execution of the six members of the ANC and requests the Secretary-General to transmit this resolution to the South African authorities immediately and to report on the matter to the General Assembly not later than 15 December 1982.

8. In view of the purely humanitarian nature of this draft resolution, I urge the General Assembly to adopt it without a vote. I also call upon the Member States represented in the General Assembly to spare no effort to see that the death sentences on these innocent people are commuted.

9. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting.

10. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): The delegation of the United States supports the humanitarian purpose of the draft resolution before us. We could have joined and would have wished to join in a consensus in favour of a straightforward humanitarian appeal by the General Assembly for clemency for these condemned men. Unfortunately, the authors of the draft resolution have chosen to state the appeal in contentious, politically motivated language. The inclusion of such rhetoric in a draft resolution on which the General Assembly should have been able to speak with one voice is not only unnecessary but also tends to undermine the seriousness of the issue before us and, indeed, to cast doubt on the humanitarian intent of the draft resolution itself. Consequently, although fully in agreement with

the humanitarian concern that should constitute the sole thrust of the draft resolution, the United States will be forced to abstain.

11. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In common with many other Latin American States in the past 20 years, Ecuador has always supported our brother peoples in Africa through resolutions on the subject reflecting not only a painful tragedy for the people of South Africa but a serious and constant threat to international peace and security. This situation deserves our attention and should be the subject of sanctions pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

12. As regards draft resolution A/37/L.46/Rev.1, which contains a further appeal for clemency and is of a humanitarian nature in favour of South African freedom fighters, I must point out that the Constitution of Ecuador which is the result of a free referendum states in its article 4 that:

“The Ecuadorian State condemns all forms of colonialism, neo-colonialism and racial discrimination or segregation. It recognizes the right of peoples to liberate themselves from these oppressive systems.”

13. Since ours is a country proud of its human resources, the result of a merging of different races and cultural contributions, all racial discrimination is illegal and *apartheid* is considered to be a crime against humanity, for it is one of the most shameful forms of discrimination inasmuch as it is institutionalized and originates in a country that claims to be civilized and whose present leaders are descended from those who settled African lands and claimed that their objective was to bring civilization and justice.

14. Article 19 of the Constitution of Ecuador includes among the guarantees it gives to all the people

“... the inviolability of life, personal integrity and the right to full material and moral development. Torture and all inhuman or degrading procedures are prohibited. There is no death penalty.”

Ecuador will therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.46/Rev.1.

15. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/37/L.46/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives,

Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 127 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 37/68).¹

16. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote.

17. Mr. WYATT (United Kingdom): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.46/Rev.1. Our motive was entirely humanitarian, but, as my delegation explained after voting in favour of a similar draft resolution [A/37/L.2/Rev.1] on 1 October [14th meeting], we have serious doubts about whether the language of the draft resolution just adopted is best calculated to achieve its objective.

18. The purpose of the resolution is to encourage the South African President to exercise his prerogative of clemency. Are the sponsors really convinced that the language they have chosen is ideally designed for this purpose? Is it likely to be particularly persuasive with the South African authorities? This is something that the General Assembly might ponder in the case of any further draft resolutions of this kind.

19. Finally, as before, my delegation is instructed to put it on record that our vote in favour of the draft resolution does not imply any comment on the merits of the court proceedings as a result of which the persons named in the resolution were convicted. Nor does it prejudge our position in any Security Council proceedings such as are referred to in operative paragraph 2.

20. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Uruguayan delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution, taking into account three basic premises: first, the lofty humanitarian nature of the draft resolution; secondly, my country's firm opposition to the death penalty; and, lastly, the constant condemnation by Uruguay of the policy of *apartheid*.

21. None the less, my delegation wishes to endorse the reservations it expressed upon the adoption of resolution 37/1 during this same session [*ibid.*]

AGENDA ITEM 34

The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General (*continued*)

22. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The question that we are studying today, that is, the situation in the Middle East, is the result of the scourge of zionism, with its

racist, expansionist nature and its past and present crimes against international peace and security. As everybody knows, Israel today constitutes the greatest danger for our planet and its very foundations, threatening the security and the very lives of peoples and bearing the risk of global destruction. Israeli militarism has demonstrated to the world during the past year again, by its ambitious and aggressive behaviour and the use of its full potential and the means that it imports, that it is able to bring destruction and death to all parts of the Middle East.

23. Its irresponsible and unreasonable behaviour during the summer of 1982 provides further proof of the Zionist mentality, which finds in destruction and shedding the blood of the Arab people the principal outlet for its aggressive instincts. It is regrettable that the United States, even after all the bloodshed and destruction that have taken place, continues to support Zionism militarily, politically, financially and through publicity, knowing all the time that its support threatens Arab existence. The United States claims that it is unable to restrain its protégé, but we all know that Israel could not have carried out its military adventures from 1967 until today had it not had all kinds of means provided by the United States. Yes, Zionism does exert pressure on the United States so that the resources of that country can be transferred to the benefit of Israel, but successive United States Governments, for their own strategic and economic reasons, have hastened to encourage Israeli hegemonism, because through that hegemonism Israel continues to be the main military base in imperialist strategic plans to suppress and eliminate the national rights and interests of the Arab nation.

24. The United States would have us believe that it had no choice when it had to take a position on draft resolutions concerning the problem of the Middle East. We almost believe that and sympathize with that super-Power which is in the hands of a minority which is not even the biggest of the minorities. The fact is that a more thorough analysis indicates that this allegation is an unrealistic attempt to persuade the Arabs and other peoples not to hold the United States responsible for what is happening now in the Middle East. By way of example, the United States knew in advance that the Israeli aggression of 1967 against three Arab States was going to take place. What did the United States do to halt that aggression? We are fully aware of that country's policy, which was to strengthen, protect and ensure the success of that invasion in order to benefit from its consequences.

25. We also know that Washington knew what Israel's objectives in Lebanon were. What did it do to stop that invasion, which began on 6 June and which is still going on? Suffice it to refer to a statement by President Carter in this respect, in which he confirmed that the United States Government knew in advance what was going to happen. What was done by that Government following the invasion in order to put an end to it? Was not the United States duty-bound to fulfil its responsibilities, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), by telling Israel to end its aggression? On the contrary, the United States has turned to its advantage the tragedy of the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples by

seeing that Israel attained its objectives. Was not the eviction of the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO] from Beirut one of Sharon's requests that was agreed to by Washington? Did not the entry of Israeli forces into Beirut represent Begin's dream of occupying an Arab capital without the United States doing anything about it? Thus it was that the blood of innocent people flowed during the massacres in the Sabra and Shatila camps, which will go down in history as one of the crimes against humanity. Israel remains in Lebanon as an occupation force to fuel the civil war and prevent national understanding.

26. Are not the forces of pressure—that is, the Jewish lobby in the United States—the obstacle preventing the restoration of stability and security in Lebanon? Do those who draw up United States plans in Washington want Israel to crown its victory by a political victory, to the detriment of the Arab nation? American Jews themselves no longer believe in the usefulness of the Jewish lobby. Rabbi Alexander Schindler, a man well known for his Zionist convictions, made an appeal at Denver, which was reported in *The New York Times* of 5 December:

“... many American Jews had been ‘plugged into Israel as if it were a kidney machine, a scientific marvel that keeps them Jewishly alive’.

“... ”

“ ‘... For many American Jews [Israel] has become the synagogue and its prime minister their rabbi. Their opinions on domestic and international issues are too often determined by the standard—is it good or bad for Israel?’ ”*

He completed his statement by saying that all Jewish American citizens should respond to the appeal of the poor and the weak in their own country instead of making Israel their primary cause. He said: “ ‘The weak, the helpless cry for relief. Will we heed them or block our ears so long as we see President Reagan's benign smile when he speaks of Israel?’ ”*

27. The voice of Rabbi Schindler confirmed what we have stated, namely, that the Jewish lobby, in spite of its strength, is not the only giant beast imposing its will on the United States Government. What is the truth? Is it the interests of monopolies or American strategic military interests that are destroying the Middle East through the intermediary of Israel on the pretext that they are helpless faced with that terrifying lobby, or is the United States Government exaggerating the importance of that giant beast in order to justify itself to various sectors of world public opinion, which continue to believe that without that Jewish lobby the United States would have been the friend of the Arab people and that the latter would show nobility of character if it showed understanding of Washington's impotence and excused it. But the truth is that the different lobbies become stronger or weaker, rise or fall, according to the will of the United States Government and according to its interests as represented by the alliance of the military and industrial sectors in that country.

28. It is claimed that the United States alone holds the key to peace in the Middle East, but the reality is that the United States is attempting to impose an

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

American peace, based on recompensing the Israeli aggressor to the detriment of Arab rights and interests and imposing American hegemony in the Middle East in order to exploit that area and achieve American global strategic interests. That logic is completely refuted by our nation, because the Arabs know that the only enemy is Israel. The only danger threatening them is that represented by Israel.

29. The United States strategic plans which are still being prepared include its collaboration with Israel against the Arab national interests that do not correspond to the interests of the United States. We have already said that we are not defenders of American interests that are completely counter to those of the Arab nation.

30. The United States must know that peace cannot be established unless the Arabs can create a strategic balance through their own potential and their own means. That is contrary to what is sought by Washington as long as its basis for action is direct or indirect hegemonism. The Camp David agreements were not a step towards peace, as was claimed, but, rather, an invitation to war and aggression and an attempt to isolate Egypt's potential in a strategic equation.

31. This disequilibrium has encouraged Israel to defy the whole world by declaring Jerusalem its eternal capital, annexing the Golan Heights, waging war against Lebanon and committing the most terrible crimes. The United States profits from that today by learning from the weapons used by Israel against the Arab forces and to kill more than 30,000 Arab civilians. We have learned that last week a Pentagon military mission visited Israel for an exchange of information on weapons of destruction. This shows that United States weapons, exported contrary to United States law, were tested in Lebanon. Does the United States expect thus to convince the Arab nation that it is its friend?

32. The Camp David plot, which Washington is trying to expand, helped Israel to intensify its policy of creating settlements on the West Bank, in Gaza and in the Golan Heights as *faits accomplis*, giving Israel a pretext for not withdrawing from all the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem. Israel has taken 54 per cent of the land on the West Bank and created 139 settlements there and in Gaza and 33 in the Golan Heights. As for Jerusalem, where colonization is taking another form, approximately 90,000 Jews were transported into the previously annexed part of the city and 30,000 others were sent to what are called Nahals, or paramilitary agricultural colonies, in order to stifle and totally encircle the Arab presence there.

33. Begin has repeatedly said that "any future negotiations on the peace Treaty between Israel and its Arab neighbours cannot lead to the dismantling of Jewish settlements", and the criminal Shamir has confirmed that "Israel did not sign the Camp David agreements with the intention of giving up Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip, and no force on earth can persuade it to do so".

34. Since its occupation of southern Lebanon, Israel has attempted to establish branches of El Al and banks and to prevent Lebanese farmers from selling their products, in order to ensure the sale of Israeli products at high prices on the Lebanese market.

Israel is putting the waters of the Litani to its own use, to implement expansionist plans in southern Lebanon prepared in the 1950s.

35. It would take volumes to go into the details of what Israel has done and continues to do in order to Judaize certain regions of the Middle East, to outline Israel's practices that run counter to the elementary principles of international law, and to list all Israel's efforts to eliminate all prospects for peace. Israel is trying to gain time at the expense of the Arab victims by appropriating their property, helped by American equivocation, even though Washington claims to be trying to find a just and durable solution to the Middle East crisis. I repeat that the Arab nation believes in peace and justice, as well as the law. However, faith in those principles does not mean that it can give up its inalienable rights.

36. The Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez, drew up a peace plan [A/37/696] based on the total withdrawal of Israeli forces from all occupied Arab territories; on recognition of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to return to its homeland, to self-determination and to the creation of an independent State, under the leadership of the PLO, its sole legitimate representative; and on the Security Council establishing and ensuring the application of guarantees for peace based on the relevant United Nations resolutions, on the faith of the Arabs in peace and on the need of the entire international community for peace.

37. In stating those principles, recognized by the United Nations and the majority of the countries of the world, the Arabs know full well that Israel is not seeking peace based on justice and law. Rather, it is seeking peace based on submission imposed by force, aggression and oppression. We are convinced today more than ever before that the Arabs will triumph over the aggressor and that they will fight with every means possible to recover their rights and to make aggression fail. By so doing, they are defending not only their rights, their interests and their dignity, but the rights, interests and dignity of all countries of the world.

38. Our struggle against aggression will not stop because of the aggressor's strength. On the contrary, the struggle will intensify. We are convinced that in spite of its present suffering our nation will close its ranks and pool its efforts and resources to struggle against aggression, injustice, indignity and subjugation.

39. The United Nations must take a clear and precise stand today in order to preserve international peace and security and protect its Charter. That requires the adoption of a resolution asking Member States to break off relations with Israel, calling on the United States to end all its military, economic and political assistance to Israel, rescinding General Assembly resolution 273 (III), by which Israel was admitted to membership of the United Nations, and providing for all aid and assistance to be given to the Arab States so that they may be able to face up to aggression. Such a resolution does not aim to restrict aggression; its purpose is rather to strengthen the role of this international Organization and eliminate threats to peace and security in the Middle East and in the world at large.

40. As a result of the behaviour of Israel and Washington, both the near and the distant future could be filled with dangerous situations with dire consequences not only for our region but for the entire world. Our region, which is at the crossroads of three continents through which pass the most important world communications channels, has energy reserves which Israel is trying to appropriate.

41. Our region and the Arab nation can no longer be patient in the face of the danger which threatens it. The United Nations, and especially the Security Council, must therefore discharge their responsibilities by applying the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter, because already we are beginning to wonder about the usefulness of this Organization and the extent to which it is able to ensure respect for the ideals for which it was created.

42. Mr. RÁCZ (Hungary): Yet another year has passed and the Middle East crisis is still far from being settled. It is still a hotbed of tension, endangering not only the security of that region but world peace as well.

43. The grave and constantly deteriorating situation in the Middle East is a matter of universal concern. Its comprehensive, just and lasting settlement is one of the most demanding tasks challenging the international community today.

44. The Middle East problem has long been a heavy burden on world politics. All the steps to resolve it have failed. Among the attempts aimed at settling this long-outstanding crisis are the numerous resolutions adopted by the Security Council, the General Assembly and other United Nations organs. But those resolutions, condemning Israel for its aggressive policy of expansionism and demanding that it abandon its unlawful and dangerous policy, have remained unimplemented. Israel has ignored all the calls made by the community of nations and has refused to abide by the relevant norms of international law and the provisions of United Nations resolutions.

45. Having committed a series of acts of aggression in the four Arab-Israeli wars since 1948, having declared Jerusalem its eternal capital and having bombed the Iraqi nuclear installations, Israel undertook two more dramatic moves in the past year. In December of last year, it annexed the Syrian Golan Heights, and only half a year ago the Israeli war machine invaded Lebanon and militarily occupied a great part of that sovereign State, a Member of the United Nations. The two latest Israeli actions were yet another manifestation of the aggressive and expansionist policy that that country pursues.

46. In the light of these steps by successive Israeli Governments, it must be obvious to everyone that the root cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Middle East crisis and, at the same time, the main obstacle to their solution is the Israeli policy based upon the infamous Greater Israel ambitions and aimed at perpetuating the consequences of the aggression committed against neighbouring Arab States. That is a fact that no prevarication of Israeli propaganda can change.

47. While the world community long ago recognized the true nature of the Israeli endeavours and the danger they represent, a large part of the Israeli

population has already come to the conclusion that Israel's present political course runs counter to their fundamental interests too. That ever-growing awareness found its expression in the recent massive protest within Israel against the brutality of the latest act of Israeli aggression against Lebanon and the Palestinians in that country.

48. It is very well known to everyone present here that Israel could not pursue its aggressive policy of expansionism and could not repeatedly violate international law, challenge the authority of the United Nations by continuously defying its resolutions and stubbornly ignore world public opinion without the political, military and economic support of its major ally, without its strategic co-operation with the United States.

49. As was once again amply demonstrated by the American proposal of September 1982 on the ways and means of settling the Middle East problem, Washington, pursuing its own aspirations, long ago sided with Israel. A noteworthy manifestation of that close co-operation occurred in the not-too-distant past with the Camp David accords on separate deals. The so-called peace process which it launched never brought the possibility of attaining a just and comprehensive Middle East peace any closer. Instead, it resulted in a further increase of tension in the region, in stabilizing the Israeli presence in Arab lands and in the perpetuation of the Israeli oppression of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories, and it culminated in the Israeli aggression against Lebanon, in the siege of Beirut and in the massacre in the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps.

50. The aim of that latest Israeli aggression was to destabilize Lebanon, physically to exterminate the Palestinian people and thus finally to solve the Palestinian issue. Those actions and their brutality have been resolutely condemned by world public opinion.

51. The events of the past 35 years have repeatedly proved and confirmed that only collective efforts, a constructive approach and a sincere quest for a genuine peace can bring about a just solution to the long-standing crisis of the Middle East.

52. The joint statement, on the Middle East, issued on 1 October 1977 by the Soviet Union and the United States was a step in the right direction and clearly demonstrated that recognition of the realities, together with the political will, might enhance the cause of peace in that region too. Unfortunately, however, a sudden substantial change in American policy later crushed all the hopes that emerged as a result of that joint statement.

53. The Hungarian delegation still has the firm conviction that only an international conference, with the participation of all parties concerned, can provide the appropriate framework for negotiations aimed at a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of all the aspects of the Middle East issue. We hold that the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arab people, should also participate in the negotiations, on an equal footing with all the other parties.

54. A great number of United Nations resolutions have already envisaged the main guidelines and basic principles through which a genuine solution to the prob-

lems could be reached. The unified Arab position expressed in the Fez Declaration [*ibid.*] was conceived in the spirit of the documents and principles I have mentioned.

55. It is generally accepted that acquisition of territories by force is inadmissible, and, therefore, the illegal occupation and annexation of Arab lands by Israel is in violation of the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations and other norms of international law. Furthermore, the occupation is a direct source of a great many fundamental problems. Its consequences—the establishment of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories and other measures taken to change the legal status, geographical character and demographic composition of those territories—threaten the long-term prospect of a genuine settlement. Therefore, the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967 or since then, including Jerusalem, is an inevitable pre-condition of any just solution of the crisis in its entirety.

56. The major victim of the Israeli aggression and policy of annexation is the Palestinian Arab people. Its future fate is a central issue in any settlement; its problem constitutes the core of the whole Middle East crisis. No lasting peace can be achieved in that region unless the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to self-determination and to establish an independent, sovereign State of its own, are recognized and fully exercised. General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 1947 already envisaged that an “independent Arab” State “shall come into existence in Palestine”. This resolution is still valid; its call for the establishment of such an independent Palestinian State has been repeatedly reiterated in numerous General Assembly resolutions adopted in recent years.

57. An equally important element of a future comprehensive settlement of the Middle East issue must, in our view, be the assurance of the peace and security within internationally guaranteed boundaries of all States of the region. But it must be stated in no uncertain terms that the right of one State to peace and security can by no means be built upon the denial of the same rights to the other parties involved in the conflict.

58. Since the fundamental aspects of the Middle East crisis are interdependent and cannot be separated, a genuine settlement of this issue should also be comprehensive. We are of the view that the six-point Soviet proposal [A/37/457], set forth last September by the late Leonid Brezhnev, meets all these requirements and, coinciding with the principles approved at Fez, is suitable to serve as a firm basis for all future efforts aimed at solving this burning issue without undue delay.

59. Our position *vis-à-vis* the various aspects of the Middle East crisis is well known. It has been put on record on previous occasions. We resolutely condemn the aggressive, expansionist policy of Israel and we support the just cause of the Arab peoples. It is in this spirit that we consider the occupation of Arab lands illegal and the annexation of some of those territories null and void and without international legal effect. It is in this same spirit that we demand the immediate withdrawal of Israel from Lebanon and the

restoration of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country and we wholeheartedly support all efforts really aimed at forcing Israel to abandon its expansionist political course and promote a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Middle East issue.

60. Mr. KULAWIEC (Czechoslovakia): We too have followed with feelings of concern the deteriorating situation in the Middle East, which, as a result of the Israeli position, has become a permanent hotbed of international tension. The developments in the Middle East and the escalating Israeli aggression in that exceptionally sensitive region further increase the possibility of the widening of the conflict.

61. The signing of the memorandum on mutual understanding in the field of strategic co-operation between Israel and the United States in November 1981 further highlighted the expansionist nature of that military-political alliance. Long before that, of course, Israel was able to defy the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, as well as the recognized norms of international law, to continue to occupy Arab territories, to expand the policy of annexation, whether on the West Bank of the Jordan, in the Gaza Strip or in the Golan Heights, to annex Jerusalem, to bomb the Iraqi nuclear reactor, and to wage a war of extermination against the Palestinians. But, by joining *de jure* the interests of Zionism and United States imperialism within the framework of mutual strategic co-operation, a new stage was begun which, as was shown by the gory events in Lebanon, can be dangerous both for the peoples of the Middle East and for international peace.

62. The representatives of those interests put their stakes on the policy of force, annexation and State terrorism, and it is Israel and its expansionism that are suitable instruments in the hands of Washington for implementing the dangerous concept of declaring various parts of the world, including the Middle East, spheres of its vital interests. There is no doubt that the essence of this concept is the arrogation of the exclusive right to control the natural resources in the Middle East and the approaches to the area and, at the same time, to reinforce its military presence in that extremely sensitive region.

63. As an indispensable prerequisite for reaching these objectives, it is necessary to prevent the formation of a united Arab front, to create division in the ranks of Arab States and, on that basis, to convince more States to favour separate talks with Israel. This aim is pursued also by reviving the spirit of Camp David within the framework of the United States proposal of last September for a Middle East settlement. Like the Camp David agreements, which could not serve as an example of a comprehensive, durable and just settlement in the Middle East because they were concluded without the participation of the Arab Palestinian people and their sole legitimate representative, the PLO, the United States September plan too is of an anti-Palestinian nature. As we very recently pointed out from this rostrum [88th meeting], as did a number of other delegations, the reason why this is so is that this plan ignores the basic elements of the solution of the question of Palestine, that is, the establishment of an independent, sovereign Palestinian State and the participation on an equal footing

of the PLO in the process of the Middle East settlement.

64. It furthermore bypasses the demand for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. It ignores those elements of the settlement which are its very substance and which have been reaffirmed by a number of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, starting with the still valid resolution 181 (II) of 1947, which envisaged the establishment of two sovereign States, an Arab State and a Jewish one, on the former territory of Palestine.

65. Czechoslovakia's fundamental position concerning the whole complex of aspects of a Middle East settlement has been reaffirmed recently in a number of foreign policy documents of my country emphasizing the importance of the unity of all the Arab countries for a successful struggle against Zionist and imperialist aggression. We also stress in those documents the need to adopt effective measures against Israel in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

66. In the joint Czechoslovak-Syrian communiqué adopted at the conclusion of the official and friendly visit paid to Czechoslovakia from 27 to 30 September 1982 by the Prime Minister of the Syrian Arab Republic, Abdul Raouf Al-Kasm, both parties:

“... condemned the Israeli occupation of a large part of Lebanon, the destruction of many cities, villages and Palestinian camps and the brutal massacres in Beirut. Both Parties also condemned the United States of America, which prevented the adoption in the United Nations of effective sanctions against the aggressor and without whose military, economic and political support Israel could not invade Lebanon and accomplish its aggressive intentions. Both Parties condemned the Israeli annexation of the Golan Heights, which constitutes a violation of the Charter and the resolutions of the United Nations as well as of international law, and they consider the decision on the annexation invalid, with all the consequences resulting from it. Both Parties condemned, at the same time, the policy of repression, of establishing colonization settlements in the occupied Arab territories and of changing their Arab character. They stressed once again that lasting and just peace in the Middle East can be restored only on the basis of the total and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, the implementation of the inalienable national rights of the Arab Palestinian people, including the right to establish their own State and the right of the Palestinians to self-determination and to return to their homes. In that context, the two Parties expressed their conviction that it is necessary that the PLO, the sole, legitimate representative of the Arab Palestinian people, should participate in all negotiations aimed at resolving the situation in the Middle East. Both Parties pointed out the significance of the decision adopted by the Conference of Heads of Arab States and Governments at Fez concerning the Arab-Israeli conflict, and they expressed high appreciation for the new Soviet proposals supporting the just demands of the Arab countries.”

67. The Soviet proposals, which comprise six realistic and constructive points for a comprehensive, durable and just settlement of the situation in the Middle East, are based on principles which, in our view, are in conformity with the norms of international law and with United Nations decisions on the Middle East. They would guarantee a peaceful life and security to all the peoples of the Middle East, both Arab and Jewish. Their successful implementation depends on sincere collective endeavours through the convening of an international conference on the Middle East on the basis of the participation on a basis of equality of all the interested parties, including the PLO. We fully support those proposals, which are aimed, in particular, at halting the policy of expansion and restoring justice and peace in that exceptionally sensitive part of the world.

68. Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): It is with deep concern that all peace-loving States and peoples observe the increasing gravity of the situation in the Middle East.

69. The most recent act of brutal aggression against Lebanon and the Israeli extermination campaign against the Palestinian people have very clearly shown the connection existing between the policy of global confrontation and arms buildup of the most aggressive imperialist circles and the aggravation of regional conflicts. This fatal imperialist course has encouraged the Israeli rulers to escalate their policy of aggression and expansion.

70. There is no doubt that the criminal policy of Israel's ruling circles directed against the Palestinian people and the Arab States is one of the main causes of the severe situation in the Middle East. Backed and supported by the main imperialist Power, they are trying to solve the question of Palestine according to their concept—that is, by the genocide of the Arab people of Palestine. Step by step, they are proceeding to annex the West Bank and Gaza Strip territories, after having already annexed, in violation of international law, part of Jerusalem and the Syrian Golan Heights. Experience during the past few months is further proof of the fact that the Israeli rulers do not stop at any crime, however abhorrent, to realize their chauvinistic great-Power aspirations. This policy threatens all Arab States and peoples. It constitutes a serious threat to peace and security all over the world.

71. The recent events in the Middle East clearly show that the Israeli policy of aggression and war corresponds to the long-term plans of United States imperialism, which are aimed at turning that region into a strategic bridgehead against the socialist States and the forces of national liberation. This is proved by the various activities of the United States aimed at increasing its direct military presence in the Middle East region. The constant search for new military bases for the so-called rapid-deployment forces serves this end. The imperialist endeavours gradually to extend the scope of action of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] under the mask of so-called multinational forces is an expression of those aspirations.

72. The continued comprehensive political, economic and military support for the aggressor is to be seen

in that light. Only against that background can it be understood why Israel, despite the world-wide demand to stop the aggression, continues to keep large parts of Lebanon occupied and is obviously making arrangements for a long-lasting occupation of those territories.

73. The steadfastness and heroism of the PLO in its struggle for the implementation of the Palestinian people's inalienable rights enjoy great respect and sympathy all over the world. All imperialist plans to destroy the PLO have failed. It has been evident for a long time that the policy of separate deals and the exclusion of the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine, will have no chance of success. All attempts made to revive that policy with so-called fresh initiatives are aimed at countering serious efforts for a peaceful and just solution to the Middle East conflict.

74. In the light of the peace-endangering policy of Israel and its imperialist allies, it is high time, in the view of the German Democratic Republic, to embark upon the road of safeguarding a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

75. During his recent visit to the Syrian Arab Republic and the State of Kuwait and his meeting with the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO, Yasser Arafat, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker, reaffirmed the German Democratic Republic's principled policy with regard to the Middle East problem and the question of Palestine.

76. The German Democratic Republic believes that a comprehensive and just solution to the Middle East problem is possible only on the basis of a total and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, including the Arab part of Jerusalem. A solution to this problem requires the safeguarding of the inalienable national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including its right to return, to self-determination and to the establishment of its own independent State, in keeping with United Nations decisions on the Palestine issue.

77. It is on that basis that the six-point proposal of the USSR meets with the full support of the German Democratic Republic, which also advocates the implementation of the Soviet proposal to convene without delay an international conference on the Middle East with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the PLO.

78. In the interests of peace and security in the Middle East and everywhere in the world, the uniform positions and actions of the Arab States and all forces interested in a peaceful solution to the Middle East conflict are today of the utmost importance. Therefore, the German Democratic Republic supports the decisions taken at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez, to strengthen collective efforts for a just and durable settlement of the Middle East problem.

79. Mr. LÓPEZ del AMO (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The rapid deterioration of the situation in the Middle East is an increasing threat to the preservation of international peace and security, thus

constituting a matter of constant concern for the international community. In spite of the enormous efforts made by the United Nations and the entire international community to find a just, comprehensive and lasting solution to the Middle East conflict, that hotbed of tension continues to worsen and is reaching unprecedented levels.

80. The State of Israel defies with impunity the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and systematically violates the principles and purposes of the Charter, which as a Member of the Organization it has signed and is obligated to heed. The Middle East problem, in all its dimensions, is a challenge to the United Nations and its capacity to apply the principles on the basis of which it was founded. Israel's arrogant defiance is possible only because of the open political, diplomatic, economic and military support by a permanent member of the Security Council, the United States, on the basis of its strategic alliance which is directed against the Arab countries and other peoples of the region.

81. As we all know, the systematic exercise of the veto by the United States in the Security Council continues to prevent that United Nations organ from adopting appropriate measures to put an end to the Zionist Government's criminal actions. What other explanation than that unconditional support given by the United States could be given for the fact that actions such as the annexation of the City of Jerusalem, the attack against the Iraqi nuclear plant and the annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights can take place with impunity? What other explanation could there be for the declared intention to annex the occupied Palestinian territories through the systematic increase of settlements established by force? What explanation other than the support given by Washington can there be for events such as the recent ones in Lebanon?

82. In the course of recent months, the international community has witnessed acts of barbarism and extermination by Israel, comparable only to Nazi-Fascist actions during the Second World War.

83. The resistance of the Palestinian people to the brutal and inhuman invasion of Lebanon and its capital, Beirut, and the genocide of defenceless refugees in the Sabra and Shatila camps, write a new page in the records of heroism and demonstrate the grandeur of the Palestinian people and the legitimacy of their struggle and aspirations.

84. Three months after the withdrawal of Palestinian fighters from Beirut, Israeli military forces still remain on Lebanese territory, in flagrant violation of resolutions of the Security Council and in open defiance of international public opinion.

85. Recent events unequivocally demonstrate the urgent need for a solution to the question of Palestine, the core of the Middle East conflict. If we want to advance towards a just, comprehensive and lasting solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict, it is essential to demand Israel's immediate withdrawal from the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories: the territories of Lebanon, the West Bank, Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights.

86. The question of the Middle East cannot be resolved until the heroic people of Palestine is guaranteed the exercise of its inalienable rights, respect for its

self-determination, and the establishment of a sovereign and independent State in Palestine, under the leadership of the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

87. A constructive and important step in the search for a negotiated comprehensive solution on a just basis would be the convening of an international conference on the Middle East under the aegis of the United Nations, with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the PLO, on an equal footing.

88. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has traditionally focused attention on the question of the situation in the Middle East and the question of Palestine and has shown solidarity and given its active support to the cause of peace in that region, as well as to the struggle of the PLO for the restoration of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. This year, the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries held two extraordinary ministerial meetings, one in Kuwait, from 5 to 8 April, and the other at Nicosia, from 15 to 17 July. Both meetings were convened to deal with new elements of tension in the region concerning the question of Palestine and to develop effective measures to strengthen solidarity with the Arab peoples and the Palestinian people, under the leadership of the PLO, in their struggle for the liberation of their territories.

89. In its final communiqué, the Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana from 31 May to 5 June 1982, also gave high priority to Palestine and the Middle East [A/37/333, paras. 72 to 103] and reaffirmed its condemnation of and its deep concern at the unbridled expansionist policy of Israel, which is converting that region into one of the main hotbeds of tension in the world and which, as part of imperialist military escalation, is endangering international peace and security. The Ministers confirmed that such annexationist and oppressive policies attest to the fact that Israel is continuing to violate international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions of the Organization and thus is not a peace-loving State. Furthermore, they considered that the support received by Israel from the United States is the decisive factor in the persistent policy of aggression, occupation and colonization pursued by Israel in the occupied territories and in its obstinate refusal to recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

90. Cuba once again raises its voice in the General Assembly to reaffirm its most vigorous support for the Arab peoples victims of Israeli aggression and, above all, for the heroic Palestinian people and its sole legitimate representative, the PLO. Once again, we urge the international community to redouble its efforts to find the urgently needed solution to the Middle East problem on the basis of the unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories and the exercise of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. Only through the attainment of those objectives will it be possible to guarantee peace and security in the region.

91. Mr. NATORF (Poland): As the General Assembly continues its debate on the situation in the Middle East, no optimistic note can be found in the statements that have been delivered so far. Missing are

assessments which foresee the possibility of positive developments; absent are those which forecast the relaxation of tensions in the area and the opening of prospects of building the structures of peace.

92. On the contrary, both the general debate, in which many speakers pointed to the serious consequences of the existing problems in the Middle East, and the points of view presented during the consideration of the question of Palestine a few days ago and in the present discussion reflect very grave concern at the most dangerous development of the trends in the situation in the region which have become so obvious in recent months.

93. A year ago, when the General Assembly met to discuss this question at its thirty-sixth session, most of the Members of the United Nations were aware of the rapid deterioration of the situation, which threatened a widespread conflagration at any moment. The dark and heavy clouds of the Israeli policy of stepped-up aggression had already been casting a long and ominous shadow over Lebanon. Israel's escalated expansion into the occupied Arab territories by many means, direct and indirect, including a deliberate colonization effort, continued unabated. To the previous step of the illegal annexation of the eastern part of Jerusalem, the next was added. The decision of the Israeli Parliament to extend Israel's legislation, jurisdiction and administration to the Golan Heights was yet another proof of expansionist intentions. It offered additional evidence on the long list of illegal measures, *faits accomplis* and examples of disregard of the rights of the Arab people, flagrant violations of international law and the flouting of numerous United Nations resolutions. Furthermore, this step constituted, as a matter of fact, the prelude to the naked armed aggression against Lebanon in June 1982, which was cynically seen in some Israeli circles as the proper way of solving the Middle East problem.

94. There is no need to repeat the numerous descriptions of the notorious cruelty of the Israeli operations, which were carried out with brutal arrogance and complete disdain for all the generally binding norms of international law. Many times the world witnessed those operations on television screens or in the printed picture. The public at large, including that in Israel and that of the Jewish community in general, reacted with profound shock and revulsion.

95. The Israelis were not able to achieve their objective of the physical elimination of the Palestinians and, first and foremost, their leader, the PLO. Forged in the heaviest battles, the PLO, together with its people, has won another victory which has brought about even greater consolidation and more determination than ever. Also, it has enhanced further its political standing and moral prestige in international forums.

96. Today, as a result of the Israeli aggression against Lebanon, the situation in the Middle East has been further dramatically aggravated. The Israeli troops are occupying vast areas of Lebanon, although it was demanded that they be withdrawn forthwith and unconditionally. Thus, the brutal interference in the domestic affairs of Lebanon, the provocation against Syria and the threats against Iraq continue, notwithstanding protests from all over the world.

97. Tension in the Middle East has consequences on a far wider scale than the regional one. Like a powder-keg with a set detonator, the situation in the region poses a grave threat to international peace and security. The entire world awaits a peaceful settlement there. Yet it is known that for years the policy of the Israeli authorities has made it impossible to find a lasting and just solution to the crises. It is also known that, alone, Israel could not afford to play the role of the spearhead of aggression. In its actions, however, it can rely fully on those forces which see in the escalation of tension in the Middle East the dark possibility of attaining their sinister objectives. Israel knows that its war machine enjoys the unrestricted support and assistance of its strategic ally, the United States, which looks earnestly towards a military buildup in the region, tension and aggression that serve its objectives. Advertising the piecemeal and separatistic approaches of the so-called Camp David process and presenting a new plan which derives directly from its evaluation of the new situation following the Israeli aggression in Lebanon, the United States is actively and ruthlessly pursuing a policy of enhancing its strategic goals at the expense of the people of that area and to the detriment of genuine peace and security there.

98. For years, Poland has firmly and unequivocally presented its consistent position on the situation in the Middle East, a position which has always reflected our deep concern and our active efforts devoted to the relaxation of tensions and the extinguishing of hotbeds, the improvement of the atmosphere and the enhancement of the cause of peace so needed and much awaited by the peoples in the region, as well as by the peoples of the world.

99. A few days ago, speaking during the debate on the question of Palestine [88th meeting], which is the crux of the Middle East conflict, we emphasized all the basic conditions for a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region.

100. Poland, adhering firmly to the unvarying principles of its foreign policy, has always been among those who consider that no efforts should be spared in working towards the establishment of a lasting peace in the Middle East. In our view, the only way to achieve this is through searching for a comprehensive settlement based on a realistic basis.

101. Poland takes note with satisfaction of the basic principles for the solution of the question of Palestine and the comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem presented by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez.

102. We view as a realistic and solid basis the following six-point proposal made by the Soviet Union on 15 September 1982 regarding a peace settlement in the Middle East: strict observance of the principle of the inadmissibility of the seizure of the lands of others by aggression; ensuring in practice the inalienable right of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination; the return of the eastern part of Jerusalem to the Arabs to become part of the Palestinian State; the right of all States in the area to a secure and independent existence and to development on a reciprocal basis; an end to the state of war and the establishment of peace between the Arab States and Israel; and inter-

national guarantees of a settlement, with the possibility that the guarantors might be either permanent members of the Security Council or the Security Council as a whole. All those elements form the foundation for a comprehensive, truly just and lasting settlement.

103. It is not these words alone that have marked Poland's support of the cause of peace in the Middle East. In the past as well as now, we have been party to all genuine efforts aimed at restoring peace in the region. It has always been with this view in mind that we have made our contributions to this common cause through concrete action. For nine years now, since October 1973, Polish soldiers have served under the United Nations flag. Their soldierly toil gives yet further proof of Poland's strong commitment to the cause of strengthening peace and international security. It was with this objective in mind that the Government of the Polish People's Republic recently reacted positively to the Secretary-General's call on the troop-contributing countries for an extension of their participation in UNDOF for a further six months. Thus, we shall continue to take a direct part in United Nations peace-keeping operations, in the interest of peace and of the implementation of relevant resolutions of the United Nations, in the spirit of the Charter.

104. At the same time, we hope that conditions allowing for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East will be created—the sooner the better—and that the deployment of United Nations peace-keeping forces will no longer be necessary.

105. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): It would not be an exaggeration to say that this year the activities of the Organization and, if we take a broader look, the development of the international situation as a whole have to a large extent been affected by events in the Middle East. This year alone, the General Assembly has been obliged to meet four times in emergency special session in order to consider the situation in that part of the world. The Security Council has devoted 49 of its 82 meetings this year to these matters.

106. Such alarming statistics mean that we must once again take a closer look at the nature of the events occurring in the Middle East. The figures that I have cited reveal increasing Israeli aggression and expansionism against the Arab States and peoples. These have taken the form of the piratical war that it unleashed in Lebanon, the smoking ruins of Arab towns and villages, the brutal bloodbath in the Palestinian camps at Sabra and Shatila, which shook the entire world—the death, suffering and privation of hundreds of thousands of people. Behind all this is the sinister brain-child of the United States in the form of the gigantic military machine of Israel, which has brought the whole destructive force of modern weaponry down on the Palestinians and Lebanese and has occupied approximately one half of the territory belonging to a neighbouring sovereign State and Member of the United Nations.

107. Nevertheless, quite recently solemn commitments were made at Camp David that the agreements signed there were—they said—a major step on the path to peace in the Middle East. What kind of peace

this has been is quite obvious from the fact that, after Camp David, more blood was shed than during Israel's aggression in 1967. The recently published memoirs of the former President of the United States, Mr. Carter, show that during the Camp David talks the following became abundantly clear: first, that Israel rejected the key provision of resolution 242 (1967) on the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and held that it should not be applicable either to the Syrian Golan Heights or to the West Bank of the Jordan River and the Gaza Strip; secondly, that Israel did not wish to withdraw its troops from those territories, but was aiming at annexing them; and thirdly, that Israel intended to maintain and even to extend its settlements on the West Bank as an important means of strengthening its occupation. Nevertheless, despite this, the United States affixed its signature to the Camp David collusion—a collusion which was primarily at the expense of the Arab people of Palestine.

108. What happened thereafter is well known. It was just after Camp David that the aggressive, anti-Arab nature of Israel's policy became even more starkly evident. After that separate collusion, Tel Aviv proceeded to annex East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, perpetrated its piratical invasion of Lebanon and is now drawing the noose of occupation tighter around the Palestinian lands. The rulers of Israel have not sought to conceal the fact that the next regions to be annexed will be the West Bank of the Jordan River and the Gaza Strip. They are now treating the Palestinian people as a collective hostage. That people has fallen victim to chauvinist Zionist designs that constitute an attempt to create a Greater Israel. One may legitimately wonder how the aggressor can have become so brazen and so secure in its impunity. The answer is quite simple: this has occurred because it has always relied on its long-time partner and protector, the United States, and is still doing so. It is perfectly obvious that it would be physically impossible for Israel to pursue its aggressive and expansionist policies if American military arsenals were not thrown wide open to it, if there were not a constant and abundant flow of American assistance and if, after every aggressive sortie, it did not automatically have opened over its head the umbrella of American political and diplomatic cover.

109. The same American Administration which finds it too costly to concern itself with senior citizens and with the unemployed in its own country, finds it by no means a heavy burden to allocate every year to Israel, on a non-reimbursable or on a favourable basis, assistance which has been calculated to amount to thousands of dollars per Israeli. Since war and aggression is a costly business, the Washington protectors recently decided to reward their Israeli protégé for its bloody adventure in Lebanon. During the present financial year, they intend to bring the level of non-reimbursable credits up to one half of total American military assistance to Tel Aviv, which amounts to approximately \$2 billion.

110. The criminal war unleashed by Israel against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples was regarded by Washington as a rather helpful means of bringing about a radical refashioning of the political map of the Middle East, in accordance with its own global ambi-

tions, and whenever it is a question of the "vital interest of the United States", as interpreted by the Washington strategists, everything else—the blood, the devastation, the genocide against an entire people—is simply relegated to the background. Eloquent proof of this is provided by an article published in *The New York Times* on 19 November of this year by a quite well-known retired admiral, Mr. Zumwalt, Jr., who, with military bluntness, says something about which it is not always convenient for American politicians and diplomats to speak publicly: "Within the Administration ... there has been a recognition, right from the start of the operation [in Lebanon], that Israel's strategic objectives in the war closely paralleled American interests". This could not be put more clearly.

111. During the events in Lebanon, the essence of American policy in the Middle East was laid completely bare. The acts of Israel fitted very snugly into the framework of that policy, although at times some eyebrows were hypocritically raised in Washington at the sight of some of the most odious "excesses" of their protégé. Furthermore, the investigation into the use by Israel of cluster bombs manufactured by the United States against the civilian population in Lebanon, which was announced with such pomp and circumstance in June of this year, has now vanished without trace in the bowels of Washington's bureaucracy. However, the 75 F-16 planes promised to Tel Aviv by the United States and about which there was some talk of postponement by way of camouflage at the height of the Lebanese war, were, as the press has indicated, sent to Israel on schedule. All this, naturally, is no accident.

112. Washington's policies in the Middle East are motivated by an overt desire to establish its own undivided military and political control over the Arab countries and their natural and human resources. It is for that very purpose that, since the end of the last decade, there have been renewed wide-scale attempts to implant an American military presence in that part of the world, to encumber it with a network of military bases and to locate there, in various guises, forward contingents of the notorious rapid deployment forces. In this case, Israel, as before, plays the role of a henchman of American imperialism. The fact that Israel is a partner not unmindful of its own advantages does not conflict with the general correspondence between Israeli policies and the interests of the United States. The alliance between the United States and Israel and the agreements that have been formed on a strategic co-operation are aimed at reducing the Arab world to a state of subjection and turning it into a field for American expansion.

113. Anyone who would like to know more about the ultimate plans of American imperialism in the Middle East would be well advised to read a book by M. A. Conant entitled *The Oil Factor in the United States Foreign Policy, 1980-1990*. It was published this year under the aegis of the Council on Foreign Relations. That book quite clearly indicates that the policy is, with the help of American bases and an American military presence in the Middle East, to make Arab oil virtually the property of the United States.

114. It is not the Arabs but rather the United States, entrenched in the Middle East, which should, according to the American plan, determine how much petroleum should be extracted, where it should be exported and at what prices. That is purely and simply a plan to recolonize the Middle East and control its petroleum resources.

115. There is one further extremely curious detail in the book. The United States intends to entrench itself in the region in a way detrimental to the interests not only of the Arabs but of the Western European countries, which are regarded as competitors of the United States in this field. I should like to re-emphasize that the book does not have a single author. It is the result of profound discussion, analysis and planning in a private American foreign policy organization, the Council on Foreign Relations, which has long been considered a sort of shadow State Department. I need remind the General Assembly only that its members occupy almost half of the most senior foreign policy posts in the present Administration, including half of all the posts of Deputy Secretary of State. In other words, these calculations represent the virtual posture to be taken in the Middle East by the United States during the present decade. This should be recalled in particular at the present time, when the Washington Administration is trying to present itself as an advocate of a Middle East settlement and when it is playing with certain Arab countries in an attempt to involve them in a transaction which they themselves have acknowledged amounts to a continuation of the Camp David policy.

116. The vast majority of States regard it as an incontrovertible fact that there can be no lasting or just peace in the Middle East unless the question of an independent Palestinian State is resolved. The creation of an Arab State in Palestine is the direct responsibility of the United Nations, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 181 (II), of 29 November 1947. The American plan states quite unambiguously, however, that the United States is opposed to the creation of such a State.

117. It is widely acknowledged, and is indeed embodied in United Nations resolutions, that the problem of how to satisfy the national aspirations of the Palestinian people cannot be dealt with without the participation of the PLO. This has also been recognized by many Western European States. However, the American plan completely denies that the PLO should be a party to such a settlement. Washington virtually avoids the fundamental issue of the need to withdraw Israeli forces from all the Arab territories seized by Israel in 1967.

118. All the resolutions adopted by the United Nations are based on the assumption that there can be genuine security in the Middle East only if it is enjoyed in common by all the States and peoples in the area. The American proposals, however, refer constantly to the security of Israel alone. Who is threatening security? Is it not Israel, which has frequently attacked neighbouring countries, which has practised mass terror and genocide against the Palestinian people and which occupies the territory of others and has not tried to conceal its intention to perpetuate that occupation? If anything is to be said about security, it is first and foremost the Arabs,

particularly the Palestinian people, who are in need of security.

119. Again, the American plan contains the high-sounding and unjustified claim of the United States to play a leading part in Middle East matters, the role of an arbitrator—not authorized by anyone else—who is entitled to determine how the map of the Middle East shall look. Thus, the so-called American initiative simply confirms that in Washington, as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, said from this rostrum, "they are still thinking there in terms of diktat and enmity with regard to the Arabs, rather than in terms of peace" [13th meeting, para. 109]. The purpose is to divide the Arab countries, weaken their struggle against American and Israeli expansion and impose on them decisions which are advantageous to the United States and Israel alone.

120. However, as experience has shown, including the experience gained in recent years, United States plans once again to fetter the Arab people and deprive the Palestinians of their right to a future are simply an unrealizable imperialist dream. No one can turn back the clock of history.

121. The fire of war which broke out again this summer in Lebanon indicates the need to take immediate, responsible steps to attempt to solve the Middle East problem. The Soviet Union has consistently favoured a fundamental, comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict on the basis of the relevant decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. That is precisely the purpose of the Soviet proposals on the Middle East, dated 15 September of this year [see A/37/457], which can be summarized as follows.

122. First, the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of foreign territories by aggression must be strictly observed. That means, in effect, that all the territories occupied by Israel since 1967—the Golan Heights, the West Bank of the Jordan, the Gaza Strip and the Lebanese territories—must be returned to the Arabs. The borders between Israel and its Arab neighbours must be declared inviolable.

123. Secondly, the inalienable right of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination and to the establishment of their own independent State on Palestinian lands, which will be freed from Israeli occupation—the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip—must be guaranteed in practice. Palestinian refugees must be granted the opportunity, provided for in United Nations decisions, to return to their homes or receive compensation for property which they left behind.

124. Thirdly, the eastern part of Jerusalem, which was occupied by Israel in 1967, must be returned to the Arabs and become an integral part of the Palestinian State. Access should be guaranteed to all of Jerusalem for those belonging to the three religions for which that city is sacred.

125. Fourthly, the right of all States in the region to safe and independent existence and development must be ensured, naturally with the assurance of full reciprocity, for the security of some cannot be ensured by trampling on the security of others.

126. Fifthly, the state of war between the Arab States and Israel must be ended and peace between them must be established. That means that all parties to the conflict, including Israel and the Palestinian State, must assume a reciprocal commitment to respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of each other and to settle any disputes arising between them by peaceful means, through negotiations.

127. Sixthly, international guarantees of the settlement must be worked out and adopted. The role of guarantor could be assumed by the permanent members of the Security Council, for example, or by the Security Council as a whole.

128. Such a comprehensive, genuinely fair and lasting settlement can only be devised on the basis of honest, collective international efforts with the participation of all the parties involved, including, of course, the PLO, as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. The Soviet Union has frequently confirmed its readiness to undertake practical action along those lines and to co-operate with anyone wishing to make a contribution towards establishing a lasting peace in the Middle East. That is the purpose of the proposal of the Soviet Union that an international conference on the Middle East be convened.

129. As was stated at the meeting in Moscow on 3 December between the Soviet leaders and the delegation from the League of Arab States, headed by King Hussein, the approach of the Soviet Union to a solution to the Middle East problem is in keeping with the principles for such a settlement adopted at the Arab Summit Conference at Fez. That approach provides a genuine opportunity for broad, co-ordinated action leading to the achievement of genuine peace in that part of the world. A useful role in promoting such a settlement could be played by the United Nations as well.

130. An immediate and comprehensive settlement of the conflict in the Middle East would be in the vital interests of all the peoples of that area. On the other hand, any delay in such a settlement under any pretext whatsoever, which would quite clearly serve imperialist aims, could only result in new outbreaks and many more thousands of victims and would further inflame that centre of tension which is so dangerous for the entire world. If events should take such a tragic turn in the future, responsibility for this would lie squarely not only with the rulers in Tel Aviv, with their expansionist ambitions, but also with those that arm them, finance them and provide them with political cover.

131. Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): We have to note again that the already grave and exacerbated situation in the Middle East has this year deteriorated further and that it constitutes one of the major sources of tension in the world. It has now become more clear than ever before that the aggressive policy of Israel is the main obstacle on the road to peace and security for all peoples and States in the region.

132. That policy of aggression and expansion has turned the whole region into one of the most dangerous hotbeds of crisis. That policy violates international law, the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and all United Nations resolutions relating to the Middle East problem. By such behaviour, Israel shows

its disregard even of those resolutions which at certain phases it acknowledged to be acceptable.

133. Israel continues its occupation of Arab territories, contrary to the decisions and resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly. Furthermore, it is obvious that Israel is making plans for the annexation of new territories. That policy of expansion has brought new aggression and suffering to thousands of Palestinian and Lebanese civilians in Lebanon, where no signs of withdrawal are seen. In the occupied Palestinian territory and the Syrian Golan Heights, measures of oppression and the transformation of the national, demographic and administrative character have been intensified. The massive and flagrant violation of human rights and all norms of international behaviour and the total disregard of United Nations decisions and resolutions are ample proof of the most dangerous policy of Israel, which is trying to impose its will and domination in the region.

134. This development is even more dangerous since it occurs at the same time as the present aggravation of the overall international situation. It is an attempt to impose the rule of might, power and force in international relations. This is yet another manifestation of the policy of force and of the imposition of a foreign will with which the modern world is faced from all sides.

135. The arms race and the policy of the use of force, of increasing strength and expansion, and of spheres of influence continue to burden the world. As a result, existing crises are not solved but are renewed and exacerbated, and new ones emerge. In such conditions, the Middle East crisis is one exceptionally dangerous hotbed in a series of others.

136. Its particular characteristic lies in the fact that it is evolving in a strategically sensitive region, at the crossroads between Africa and Asia, the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean. Any deterioration in that region, therefore, has particularly widespread consequences. That is one of the reasons why the non-aligned countries consistently point to the urgency and imperative need to solve the Middle East crisis.

137. The developments in the Middle East, particularly after the recent aggression and massacres in Lebanon, again show that it is a conflict between two mutually incompatible policies. One policy is characterized by the effort of the international community, of the non-aligned countries and the Arab countries, to embark upon the road leading to a lasting and just peace, taking into account all regional and global realities. That policy has received the widest support and has morally and politically strengthened the struggle of the Palestinian people and the PLO. The other policy is the policy of ignoring efforts to find just and lasting solutions through a dialogue in which all, and particularly those directly concerned, would participate on an equal footing. Instead of making constructive efforts to achieve peace, the policy of force and new threats continues.

138. It is certainly unacceptable that anyone's right be exercised on the basis of the denial of that same right to other people. The right to one's own existence certainly cannot be secured by force which denies that same right to others. We hold that no one can

deny the right to national and cultural identity, to self-determination and the creation of an independent State of the Palestinian people under the leadership of the PLO, its sole legitimate and internationally recognized representative. Attempts to give a distorted image of the just struggle of a people and to place it in the context of bloc rivalry is a policy reminiscent of the cold-war period. It endangers the independence and sovereignty of all peoples and countries of the region, including the people of Israel itself.

139. We must undertake new efforts to reject the policy of *fait accompli* and to achieve the solution of the crisis on a comprehensive basis. The international community has an obligation to strive to that end, the basis for this being the ever-wider recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, the rejection of the illegal decisions of Israel regarding the Syrian Golan Heights, and the unanimous support for the sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence and non-aligned status of Lebanon.

140. Non-aligned countries are constantly and consistently participating in those endeavours. The ever more concrete contribution of other countries as well is an encouraging sign and is based on respect for the principle of the non-acquisition of foreign territories by aggression or by force, as well as the principle of the right of each and every people to free national and social development. These principles are integrated into all major decisions of the United Nations organs, their common denominator being the common right of peoples and of every human being to decide freely on their own destiny and of every country to exist in independence and security.

141. At the extraordinary ministerial meetings of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Palestine, held in Kuwait and Nicosia in April and July of this year, the non-aligned countries again pointed out that the crisis should be solved within the framework of the United Nations and its relevant resolutions and decisions. The achievement of a comprehensive, just and lasting solution, as they see it, must be on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations and of Security Council and General Assembly decisions and resolutions.

142. We consider that, despite adverse developments and difficulties, there does exist a consensus in the international community as to the content and methods of a solution of the crisis. Proposals made by various international bodies, particularly the significant decisions of the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference held at Fez, make us even more convinced that additional and combined efforts should be exerted in order to create conditions within the United Nations for a political and peaceful solution of the crisis, with the active

and equitable participation of all parties. This should be done quickly, since in the Middle East time does not wait. That would be the most consistent way for the world Organization to fulfil its responsibility and obligation to achieve, to implement, to realize, the just aspirations of the Palestinian people, while at the same time contributing to the implementation of the principles embedded in the foundations of international peace and security.

143. Yugoslavia has always supported the solution of the question of Palestine and of the Middle East crisis on the basis of respect for all the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the policy of non-alignment. This would lead to the elimination of the consequences of aggression and to enabling all peoples and countries in the region to live in peace and independence. Proceeding from such a position, as in all other cases of aggression and denial of the basic rights of peoples, Yugoslavia will continue to support all actions and efforts aimed at creating foundations for a lasting, just and comprehensive solution.

144. Such a solution will be possible only on the basis of the withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem; the exercise of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, national identity, sovereignty and the establishment of its own State; and the participation of the PLO on an equal footing in all efforts and negotiations aimed at achieving a lasting solution of the crisis. An integral part of this position is the recognition of the right of all countries and peoples of the region to a safe, independent and peaceful social development within recognized boundaries, free from the threat or use of force.

145. We expect that, on the basis of this debate, the General Assembly will adopt, in accordance with its responsibilities, relevant decisions aimed at achieving the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and at a lasting and peaceful solution of the crisis in the Middle East, which would contribute to international peace and security.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

NOTES

¹ The delegations of the Central African Republic, Kuwait, Lesotho, Mauritius and Panama subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

² Lexington Books, Lexington, Mass., 1982.