

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records



**74th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 27 November 1984,  
at 10.55 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

**President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA  
(Zambia).**

**AGENDA ITEM 36**

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

1. Mr. AL-SABBAGH (Bahrain) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Once again the General Assembly is considering the disquieting, extremely serious and explosive situation in the Middle East. For more than three decades now, we have witnessed constant upheaval in this important and tense region of the world. Nothing indicates now that a solution to the problem of the region is within reach, enabling the area to live in peace, security and understanding. This situation is due to the declared aggressive policy of Israel, aimed at imposing hegemony, domination and expansion through military force and systematic terrorism based on its vast military arsenal and backed by unrestricted external military support. Israel has used this military superiority against the Arab States and has refused to heed the will of the international community and international law. It is generally accepted that the question of Palestine is at the heart of the struggle in our region. That is why it is necessary to reaffirm the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, its right to return to its homeland and to establish its own independent State on its own national soil in Palestine.

2. Among the essential factors for stability in the Middle East are: the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and the right of all States of the region to live in peace, as well as the complete and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967.

3. We will not mention all the resolutions of the United Nations concerning the Arab-Israeli conflict but will confine ourselves to resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). In those resolutions, the Security Council, the supreme international body entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security, set the bases for peace in the Middle East. But Israel, by creating obstacles, has prevented the implementation of those resolutions. Israel has rejected the latest appeal made to it by King Hussein on the basis of resolution 242 (1967). Yitzhak Shamir rejected that resolution, which, according to him, is an outdated claim; that position was announced by Israeli radio and was published in *The Washington Post* on 25 November 1984.

4. On the pretext of maintaining its security, Israel repeatedly attacks its Arab neighbours, using its enormous military machinery, and has thus transformed the Middle East into a region of strife, international polarization and strategic rivalry between the big Powers.

5. Israel has changed the legal status of the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights, as well as the demographic and historic character of those territories. It is pursuing its settlement policy and the confiscation by force of the occupied Arab lands in the West Bank. But it is widely accepted that the policy of progressive annexation and *fait accompli* applied by Israel will not change reality.

6. The security to which Israel aspires cannot be ensured, because true security must rest on stability and on a just and lasting peace in the region. Such a peace, in turn, cannot be restored without a comprehensive, just settlement, with the participation of all the parties. The numerous relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, which I need not list here, must be respected.

7. Lebanon remains the focus of international attention because of the tragic situation there. We are in favour of the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from southern Lebanon, since the Lebanese are capable of resolving their own problems within the framework of national Lebanese reconciliation.

8. The international community must redouble its efforts to ensure the restoration of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

9. We believe that most of the other problems of the region result from the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. In order to end that terrible conflict, the Palestinians must return to their homes from which they have been driven. In addition, international political will must be mobilized in order to find a positive settlement of the problems of the Middle East in the face of Israeli intransigence and arrogance, which have gone beyond all bounds and which constitute flagrant defiance of the will of the international community and the resolutions of the United Nations. Israel cannot continue to deny the Palestinian people its rights. That people has a right to self-determination and to establish its own sovereign State, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 181 (II), adopted on 29 November 1947, which stipulates that a Jewish State and a Palestinian State shall be created in Palestine. The Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO] is the sole legitimate and authentic representative of the Palestinian people.

10. All countries the world over are aware that the Middle East region is of major strategic importance and that the region can only enjoy stability, peace and security if a just solution is found to the Palestinian problem. The future of international

peace and security and the settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict depend on this.

11. In this connection, we should like to mention the declaration issued at Venice on 13 June 1980 by the European Council,<sup>1</sup> the statement issued at Brussels on 29 June 1982 by the 10 States members of the European Community<sup>2</sup> and the statement issued at Brussels on 22 March 1983 by the European Council,<sup>3</sup> as well as the attempts of the European States to find a peaceful solution for the region. Those countries have not recognized Israel's policy concerning the Golan Heights and eastern Jerusalem, which they consider to be contrary to international law and null and void.

12. My country is in favour of the convening of an international conference, within the framework defined by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, in order to begin a true process of peace in the Middle East under the auspices of the Security Council. The United Nations is making preparations for that conference on the basis of its political, moral and historic responsibilities.

13. Everyone wants to break the circle of violence, hostility, fear and distrust in the region.

14. What is important is how to translate those principles into real political action. The major Powers must redouble their efforts to bring about a just, peaceful solution, given their special historical responsibilities in regard to the Palestinian problem.

15. President Reagan's peace initiative of 1 September 1982<sup>4</sup> is a constructive plan which could help progress towards peace in the Middle East. The United States should increase its efforts to find a peaceful solution.

16. Similarly, the Arab peace plan, embodied in the Final Declaration adopted on 9 September 1982 at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez,<sup>5</sup> contains constructive elements which could promote peaceful action and which reflect the desire of the Arab States and the PLO for a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement.

17. Everything possible must be done to achieve a just peace, given the explosive situation in the region, which could lead to widespread conflict that would reduce to nothing all the progress, prosperity and development achieved by the people of the region.

18. Mr. MACIEL (Brazil): Last year, at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly [94th meeting], my delegation renewed its expressions of deep concern about the deterioration of the situation in the Middle East. At that time, there was little ground for optimism with regard to the future in the light of the series of acts of violence in the area. Since then Brazil has continued to follow closely the evolution of the problems in the area. For years we have also witnessed a succession of proposals, suggestions and negotiations, and in particular the attempts to deal with the question in the United Nations.

19. It is thus with satisfaction that my delegation notes that the debate on the issue before us occurs this year almost simultaneously with the beginning of talks between Israel and Lebanon on the withdrawal of Israeli occupation forces from occupied Lebanese territories. Brazil shares the expectations created by those negotiations. It is our hope that even a limited outcome of this effort to solve one of the many problems in the region may serve as a positive example and lead to new attempts towards the

settlement of the other pending disputes in the area. My delegation hopes that the parties will persevere in their work with a view to the early completion of their task.

20. Owing mainly to the presence in my country of a considerable number of Lebanese and their descendants who have been actively participating in Brazil's life for over a century, we have close and fruitful ties with Lebanon. We would thus be specially gratified if in the near future Lebanon's independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty were entirely restored and respected, allowing that country then to devote itself to its reconstruction and to resume its traditional roles in regional and international affairs.

21. My delegation considers that measures could and should be taken to overcome the inequities caused by the continuing establishment of Israeli settlements in the West Bank, the illegal annexation of Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, and the frequent violation of the rights of the Arab population in the territories occupied by Israel.

22. Let me also again recall our conviction that a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement could be reached on the basis of the following principal elements: complete withdrawal of all forces of occupation from the Arab occupied territories, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973); respect for the right of the Palestinian people to return to Palestine, and recognition of their right of self-determination, independence and sovereignty; participation by the Palestinian people, through the PLO, their sole and legitimate representative, in any negotiations regarding their future; and recognition of the right of all States in the region, including Israel, to exist within internationally recognized boundaries.

*Mr. Bucci (Italy), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

23. It is our hope that five wars, countless conflagrations, numerous missed opportunities for settlement and, above all, great human losses may make it clear that the parties must show a true willingness to negotiate and must recognize the necessity for flexibility and reasonable alternatives. History and the possibility of the emergence of new critical elements in the regional crisis make such an attitude, in my delegation's opinion, the only valid alternative.

24. It must be stressed also that the international community as a whole has an obligation to contribute in every possible way to a positive outcome of the peace processes in the Middle East. To this effect, the United Nations may soon have to reassess its peace-keeping and assistance role in the Middle East and to review the mandate and operations of its forces in the region. My delegation considers that such an effort must also serve the purpose of re-establishing confidence in the Organization and its machinery.

25. As I conclude, may I also refer to the appreciation with which Brazil views the work of the Secretary-General on the Middle East problems. My delegation also expects the parties concerned to recognize his capacity to play an important role and constantly to support and facilitate his attempts to act accordingly.

26. Mr. HUCKE (German Democratic Republic): The Middle East continues to be one of the most dangerous sources of international conflict, posing a serious threat to peace and security in the world. To take the region out of its state of permanent tension

and establish a comprehensive, just and lasting peace is one of the most important tasks of our time.

27. The dangerous developments taking place in that region show, however, that the main obstacle to peace and security in the Middle East is Israel's continued United States-backed policy of expansion. The strategic alliance poses a constant threat to the peace and the existence of the Arab peoples. It reflects the endeavour to draw the Arab region more deeply into the imperialist course of global confrontation.

28. Leading politicians of the United States have repeatedly declared the Middle East to be one of their so-called zones of vital interest. The aim behind this is to dominate that strategically important, resource-rich area. The legitimate interests of the peoples living in the region are completely ignored. Although the policy of direct use of military force and the so-called peace action of the multinational forces in Lebanon have failed, imperialism, now as before, clings to its disastrous course of further enhancing its military presence in the Middle East and of extending the sphere of action of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to that part of the world. This is evident from plans to increase the so-called rapid deployment force, the constant drive to establish new military bases, the staging of provocative military manoeuvres and the attempts to create pretexts for deploying military units off the Lebanese coast, in the Gulf and in the Red Sea.

29. The German Democratic Republic resolutely rejects the imperialist policy of blackmail, use of force and interference in the internal affairs of the Arab States. It demands the accelerated and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli troops from Lebanon in accordance with Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) as the prerequisite for securing the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

30. In the debates during this session of the General Assembly, representatives of several States have quite rightly pointed to the direct link that exists between the tense international situation, arising from the aggressive course of imperialist circles, and the aggravation of the situation in the Middle East.

31. In this context, it is only natural that there should be growing concern about the deployment of United States medium-range missiles that has begun in Western Europe and that constitutes a threat also to the Near and Middle East.

32. Shielded and encouraged by the imperialist course of global confrontation and arms buildup, the ruling circles of Israel are escalating their policy of aggression and occupation and threatening the Arab peoples with new acts of aggression. The Arab people of Palestine is denied its legitimate right to self-determination and to the establishment of its own independent State. The Israeli rulers are stepping up the entrenchment of their occupation régime in the illegally occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories. They are intensifying their illegal settlement policies. Every day new crimes are perpetrated against the Palestinian population. Israel's ruling circles have now embarked on the step-by-step incorporation of the occupied territories in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip after annexing, in contravention of international law, East Jerusalem and the Syrian Golan Heights. After its criminal aggression against Lebanon in 1982, Israel still occupies one third of the territory of that Arab State. With their

actions in Lebanon, the Israeli occupiers seek to apply in southern Lebanon the colonization practices tried out in the occupied West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the Syrian Golan Heights.

33. The German Democratic Republic is in agreement with the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations in once again strongly condemning Israel's continued policy of aggression and occupation and in demanding its immediate and unconditional withdrawal from all territories occupied since 1967, including East Jerusalem. It supports the demand for the application of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, contained in the Final Communiqué [A/39/560, annex], adopted at the Meeting of Ministers and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984.

34. It has repeatedly been proved in this forum that the Israeli rulers could not arrogantly defy relevant United Nations decisions on the Middle East and the question of Palestine and violate international law without the support they receive from the imperialist super-Power to carry out their expansionist ambitions. Only a few weeks ago, the United States and Israel entered into new arrangements concerning the further expansion of their strategic alliance against the Arab peoples.

35. In the light of the deep crisis that Israel is undergoing as a result of the war policies pursued by its leadership, its ruling circles seek to obtain military, economic and financial aid from the United States at an unprecedented high level. According to official statements by representatives of the United States Administration, Israeli demands find a ready ear in the United States. It is therefore only too understandable that more and more countries oppose the collaboration between the United States and Israel. The Final Communiqué of the Meeting of Non-Aligned Countries mentioned above states the following on this point:

“The Ministers and Heads of Delegation condemned Israel for intensifying its aggressive practices and escalating its expansionist militarist policies. They denounced once again the continued support provided by the Government of the United States for these Israeli practices and acts as well as all forms of American assistance, particularly the agreements of mutual co-operation between them within the framework of their strategic alliance which threatens the security of the region and the world, and confirms the United States' total partiality towards Israel.” [*Ibid.*, para. 60.]

36. In view of the aggressive anti-peace policy pursued by Israel and its imperialist allies, it is imperative to intensify collective efforts in order resolutely to counteract the dangerous developments in the Middle East.

37. The German Democratic Republic, which, since its founding 35 years ago, has sided with all those who stand for the right of peoples to national sovereignty and self-determination, reiterates its full support for those States and patriotic forces in the Arab region offering heroic resistance to imperialist plots and Israeli acts of aggression, and unswervingly defends their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. It reaffirms its solidarity with the peoples of Syria, Lebanon and Palestine in their

struggle against Israel's policy of aggression and expansion.

38. The German Democratic Republic strongly opposes all imperialist attempts to revive the failed policy of separate deals.

39. Together with the majority of States Members of the United Nations, the German Democratic Republic favours the convening of an international conference on the Middle East with the participation of all parties concerned, including the PLO. It believes that central to a peaceful settlement in the Middle East is the implementation of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinians, in particular their right to self-determination and to the establishment of their own independent State. The German Democratic Republic will continue its efforts to support the just cause of the Palestinian people. It expresses its firm belief that a just and comprehensive solution to the Middle East problem, with the question of Palestine at its core, can be brought about only through the collective efforts of all the parties, including the PLO, as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

40. In line with its principled position on the Middle East problem and the question of Palestine, the German Democratic Republic fully supports the proposals on a Middle East settlement put forward by the Soviet Union on 29 July 1984 [see A/39/368]. It also welcomes the decisions taken on 9 September 1982 at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez,<sup>5</sup> concerning a settlement of the Middle East problem. They all point the way to a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the Middle East conflict.

41. Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The representative of the Zionist entity made a statement in the Assembly yesterday [72nd meeting] at the end of which he tried to reach a conclusion to what he had said . . .

42. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

43. Mr. GVIR (Israel): Mr. President, I should be grateful to you if you would request the speaker to comply with the rules and procedures of the Assembly and refer accordingly to Member States by their names and not engage in name-calling.

44. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Qatar may continue, bearing in mind what has just been said.

45. Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I shall heed the directive of the President, but I request the President to ask the representative of Israel to use the proper name when he speaks of the PLO. He should call the PLO by the name chosen by the people themselves, a name recognized by the entire world and by the United Nations.

46. Yesterday, the representative of the Zionist entity made a statement in the Assembly—I am sorry—the representative of Israel made a statement in the Assembly at the end of which he tried to reach a conclusion to what he had said by stating: "That problem consists of two elements: first, the propensity of Arab political culture to employ violence to resolve conflicts at all levels;"\* [*ibid.*, para. 105].

47. This is the conclusion the representative wished to reach, that Arab political culture and practice is based on the use of violence at all levels. Consequently, Arabs are different from other people and inferior.

We can well understand this logic on the part of that representative because the Zionist speaker and racist zionism can only understand things on this basis; as an Arab proverb puts it: They are judging others through themselves.

48. That representative analysed the situation in the Middle East on the basis of the racist nature of zionism, which is based on discrimination between men and nations. He is therefore being consistent with what he said last week [69th meeting] on the situation in South Africa.

49. It is paradoxical that the racist Nazis in Germany based their logic and their practices against the Jews on the same arguments and doctrines put forward by the representative of Israel when analysing the situation in the Middle East. The racist Nazis thought that the Jews had a culture and politics, an economy and a civilization which distinguished them from the rest of mankind and that they were inferior to the Aryan race. Today, the representative of those who were persecuted yesterday by Nazi racism uses the same language and logic with regard to the Arabs.

50. The problem of the Middle East remains one of the most urgent international problems and the focus of the concern of the United Nations, as it has been ever since the Organization was created. Although the elements of this problem existed before the United Nations was founded, the deterioration of the situation and its dangerous nature date from the founding of the Organization. It is disappointing that the United Nations, which had succeeded in solving many of the world's problems, in particular the problem of decolonization, a few years after its creation, is still unable to find any solution to the Middle East problem in spite of the fact that this question has been before the various organs of the Organization every year. However, there are no signs yet that there is any chance of a comprehensive solution based on justice that would maintain international peace and security, which today are threatened by the persistence of this problem, its deterioration and its explosive nature.

51. In spite of the fact that the United Nations has made praiseworthy efforts and adopted many resolutions on all aspects of Israeli aggression, the unlimited support and assistance provided to Israel by certain Members of the Organization, as well as the use of the veto against any draft resolution in the Security Council that would attempt to safeguard or restore the rights of those involved, has encouraged Israel to defy those resolutions, to be intransigent and to disregard the will of the international community.

52. The question of Palestine is at the very heart of the Middle East conflict and the essential reason for the deplorable situation in the region. My delegation will examine the question of Palestine in the course of the consideration of that agenda item. That is why we shall confine ourselves at this stage to making certain observations.

53. The Israeli invasion of Lebanon in June 1982 was energetically condemned by the United Nations in Security Council resolution 509 (1982), which called on Israel to withdraw its forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon. Unfortunately, that resolution remains a dead letter. The forces of aggression are still in occupation of southern Lebanon and Israel is trying to impose its terms and gain privileges, and not to have to withdraw its forces, in defiance of the

\*Quoted in English by the speaker.

will of the international community and in violation of the norms of international law and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, which prohibit the use of force in international relations.

54. The practices of the occupation forces of Israel in southern Lebanon have been condemned by the Security Council in resolutions 512 (1982) and 513 (1982), which call on Israel to respect the rights of the civilian population, in accordance with international conventions, in particular the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.<sup>6</sup> However, there is no juridical state of war now in southern Lebanon, but rather a persistent and aggressive occupation based solely on blind force and without any juridical foundation. Unfortunately, the most recent complaint, last September, to the Security Council by Lebanon against these practices did not yield positive results because of the use of the veto by one of the great Powers when the draft resolution submitted by Lebanon<sup>7</sup> was voted on. Thus the deplorable situation in Lebanon persists. Israeli arrangements and practices, which have made the life of the people of southern Lebanon hell, are justified by the occupying Power as being necessary to maintain its own security and that of its forces. This is a distortion of the truth and a denial of logic itself, because the Israeli troops have no right to be in southern Lebanon. Those forces have put themselves into a situation which exposes them to the normal reactions only to be expected from a population whose soil has been occupied and who find themselves obliged to repel the aggressor by all the means available to them. The heroic resistance of the Lebanese people deserves the admiration and appreciation of the whole world.

55. Israel still has a free hand in the occupied Arab territories and refuses to withdraw, as if international law did not embody the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by force and as if the General Assembly had not repeatedly called upon it to end its illegitimate practices: the application of its jurisdiction in the occupied territories; the establishment of settlements in those territories; the pursuit of its long-term plan aimed at modifying the juridical status and character of Jerusalem; the elimination of the elected mayors in the West Bank; and the killing of peaceful demonstrators. We could give a very long list of the illegal Israeli practices in the occupied Arab territories. Those practices have been condemned by the international community but they are still continuing and being intensified, in total disregard of the will of the international community and the principles of human rights. The most recent manifestation of these practices are the acts of Israeli terrorism against the Arab population, in which the Israeli authorities are involved and which, consequently, become State terrorism against unarmed, innocent civilians. We should not allow our attention to be diverted by these practices from the illegitimacy of Israel's occupation of the Arab territories, including Jerusalem and the Golan Heights. The basis of the problem is the need to put an end to the occupation and to Israeli practices, which have been condemned by the international community almost unanimously, but which are only secondary manifestations of the fundamental problem, namely, the persistence of the Israeli occupation.

56. The search for a peaceful solution to the problems of the Middle East continues to occupy the

attention of the United Nations. The General Assembly, in resolution 38/180 D, reaffirmed that a just and comprehensive settlement of the situation in the Middle East cannot be achieved without the participation on an equal footing of all the parties to the conflict, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. The Assembly reaffirmed the call for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all the parties concerned and the two super-Powers, under the auspices of the United Nations.

57. My delegation hopes that the General Assembly will reaffirm that resolution at the current session—with the approval of all—in conformity with the unanimous will of the international community that this conference be held as the best means of bringing about a comprehensive and just settlement. Israel, by its refusal to agree to participate in such a conference, is demonstrating to the international community once again its intransigence and its refusal to bring about peace based on justice. My delegation believes that the holding of an international peace conference on the Middle East, as defined by the General Assembly in resolution 38/180 D, is one way of bringing about a peaceful, just and global settlement on the well-known and universally accepted basis of the restoration of all the occupied territories and the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable right to self-determination and to the creation of its own State on its own soil.

58. We wish to refer here to the Holy City of Jerusalem, which is part of the occupied territories; conquest by force must not be admitted and the occupier must be forced to withdraw. We wish to highlight the particular importance of the Holy City, which is so dear to the entire Arab nation and the Islamic world. For this reason, the application of the principle of the non-acquisition of territories by force, as applicable to Jerusalem, is extremely important, much more so than in the case of the other occupied territories. Without the restoration of Jerusalem, there can be no solution that can be just and acceptable to the Arabs. At the present time, the international community must clearly reaffirm that Israel's arrangements and practices aimed at changing the physical character, demographic composition and legal status of Jerusalem are null and void, as has been affirmed in General Assembly resolutions at previous sessions.

59. The situation in the Middle East has been at the very heart of United Nations concerns for 37 years, and despite this its collective and individual efforts have not led to a peaceful, just and global settlement because those efforts have been concentrated on the symptoms and not the causes of the evil. The result of all military confrontation, after hostilities had ceased, has been the cessation of such efforts and the acceptance of the *fait accompli*. Efforts then turn towards new conflicts. An arbitrary approach to dealing with a world problem of extreme danger to international peace and security like the Middle East cannot bring about the required solution nor restore peace to the region. This is the lesson which I hope all States of the world have learned over the last 40 years; that is why the international community must adopt a different approach in dealing with this problem, which must not be left unresolved, because the consequences would be serious not only for the region but for international peace and security.

60. No State Member of the United Nations can have failed to note what the Secretary-General asserted in his reports to this and the previous session of the General Assembly on the ill effect on the prestige and credibility of the United Nations of the persistence of the Middle East problem and the incapacity of the United Nations to resolve it. Although the United Nations has been considering this problem, which it created, for almost 40 years, all efforts extended over this period have not led to the comprehensive settlement that was hoped for. That is why the international community, represented by the United Nations, must strive to find a settlement on the basis of a new approach, so that peace can be restored to this sensitive region and the United Nations can regain credibility and its unique role in the eyes of the world.

61. Mr. TURBANSKI (Poland): It is obvious to any objective observer that a problem that preoccupies both statesmen and public opinion and concerns one of the most dangerous hotbeds of tension in the world, the explosive situation in the Middle East, though it is fraught with the tangible danger of becoming the flash-point of a global confrontation, has become a somewhat routine perennial agenda item of the General Assembly.

62. So many statements have been delivered on this subject, so many resolutions adopted with the support of an overwhelming majority of Member States, yet the situation in the Middle East has continued to evolve as if nothing had happened in the United Nations at all.

63. With cynical, scornful disdain for the decisions of this world body and for international public opinion, Israel continues its expansionist policy towards Arab countries, expands its well-planned colonization of the occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip and, as developments of recent days bear witness, such as the fatal shooting of two Palestinian youths, one of them a student of Bir Zeit University, carries out further repressive measures against the population of the occupied Arab territories and, in particular, against the Palestinians.

64. The withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from southern Lebanon has still not taken place. Therefore, anyone who is even superficially acquainted with the present situation in the region and familiar with but one General Assembly resolution, namely, the latest one adopted on this question, resolution 38/180, could legitimately ask the obvious question: Why did it happen, why was it allowed to happen?

65. If agenda item 36 bears any resemblance to any other agenda item it is certainly to item 31, entitled "Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa". Even though those two items are a continent apart geographically, and might, at least to some, appear to have little in common as far as their substance is concerned, they have in fact one very important thing in common, namely, the reason why the Assembly still keeps them on its agenda in spite of so many years of debate and scores of resolutions. That reason is the fact that, in their respective aggressive policies, both Israel and South Africa enjoy the support and assistance of powerful friends, in particular the United States, which in the case of Israel officially calls itself a strategic ally of that country.

66. Addressing the current session of the General Assembly, on 28 September, the Minister for Foreign

Affairs of Poland, Mr. Stefan Olszowski, stated that behind most current regional conflicts and tensions

"we detect both the goals and the results of an imperialist policy based on a position of strength and designed to preserve the remnants of colonialism and reinforce neo-colonial practices and racism. Ample evidence of this is provided by the history of the prolonged and appallingly tragic conflict in the Middle East." [12th meeting, para. 232.]

67. The expansionism of Israel thrives on the full support of the United States, which, in the framework of its policy of global confrontation, sees in it a useful tool for achieving political hegemony in the region, including the strengthening of its military presence. The implementation of the Israeli-American agreement on strategic co-operation is an expression of their joint venture, consolidating Israel's gains from its string of acts of aggression and enhancing United States interests in the area. At the same time, the vital interests of the peoples of the region and the question of the establishment of a lasting, just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East are being relegated to second place at best.

68. While noting the failure of the United States policy of pressing for piecemeal solutions and enforcing the concept of unilateral settlements—and American activities in and around Lebanon in 1982 and 1983 are a glaring case in point—we notice at the same time the negative attitude of both Washington and Tel Aviv towards initiatives aimed at a comprehensive solution of the Middle East problem and, in particular, opposition to the idea of convening an international peace conference on the Middle East. This tendency is being manifested in the position taken by those two countries with regard to the initiative of the Secretary-General put forward pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 38/58 C of 13 December 1983. It might be worth while to recall at this juncture that resolution 38/58 C was adopted by 124 votes in favour to 4 against—including, of course, those of Israel and the United States—with 15 abstentions, all but two of them by Western countries.

69. The experiences of past decades have demonstrated beyond any doubt that an effective settlement of the Middle East conflict has to be based on the principles of comprehensive treatment of all its aspects, stability of solutions and appropriate taking into account of the interests of the peoples of the region. In the Middle East one simply cannot establish the lasting peace and the security of some at the expense of the basic rights and interests of others. Moreover, attempts to induce partial solutions or to impose unilateral formulas not only do not lead to a lasting settlement of the conflict, but, as recent years have amply shown, bring about new complications and lead to new tensions, prolonging the tragedy of the Middle East peoples.

70. Poland has steadfastly and consistently been advocating a peaceful solution of the Middle East conflict. We see a practical way towards achieving a comprehensive settlement through the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East with the participation of all parties concerned, including the PLO. We expressed this position, together with other socialist States, in the Political Declaration adopted at Prague on 5 January 1983 by the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty.<sup>8</sup> We have also

supported the initiative of the Secretary-General regarding the convening of such a conference. Consequently, in a statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of 10 August 1984, we came out strongly in support of the proposals of the Soviet Union on a Middle East settlement of 29 July 1984 [A/39/368]. As pointed out subsequently by the Polish Minister for Foreign Affairs in his statement to the current session of the Assembly, to which I referred earlier:

“Now that the sterility and fragility of any settlement predicated on forcing the Arab world to conclude separatist agreements with Israel have been so starkly revealed, solutions of a universal, equitable and lasting nature can be all the more irrefutably seen to be the only effective ones. They are guaranteed by the programme of action set out in the Soviet Union’s proposals on a Middle East settlement of 29 July 1984. Poland reiterates its complete readiness to make a positive contribution to the implementation of that programme.” [12th meeting, para. 232.]

71. The Soviet proposals are a logical expansion of and elaboration on the guidelines adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, and subsequently endorsed by the General Assembly in resolution 38/58 C, specifically paragraphs 3 and 4.

72. As to the link between the question of the Middle East and that of Palestine, a simple reiteration of the long-obvious fact that the problem of Palestine constitutes the core of the Middle East conflict would be enough. To translate that fact into United Nations terms, it should suffice to refer to General Assembly resolution 37/86 C of 10 December 1982, in which the Assembly, *inter alia*, reiterated the responsibility of the United Nations to strive for a lasting peace in the Middle East through a just solution of the problem of Palestine.

73. Poland, a country always vitally interested in the strengthening of international peace and security, a country presenting a firm, consistent and constructive position on the situation in the Middle East, has for the past 11 years been doing more than giving merely verbal support to the cause of peace in that region. Since October 1973, Polish soldiers have been serving in the Middle East under the United Nations flag, first in UNEF and later, until this day, in UNDOF. Their selfless and dedicated service constitutes my country’s direct and tangible contribution to the restoration of peace in the region. We thus back up our words with deeds.

74. At the same time, we hope that in the near future all the measures and actions necessary to enable a lasting, just and peaceful settlement to be achieved in the Middle East to which I referred earlier in my statement will finally be implemented, extinguishing once and for all the dangerous hotbed of tension that is the Middle East conflict and thus enhancing the overall security of the world at large.

75. Mr. SHIHABI (Saudi Arabia) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Middle East, Palestine, the West Bank and Gaza, the Golan, Lebanon, Israeli practices in the occupied territories, the Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor bring to mind an endless sequence of crimes and violations committed by Israel. Violations of the Charter of the United Nations, of international law, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and of the decisions of every

organ of the United Nations—all such violations, which sap the energy of the United Nations, have been committed by Israel, which occupies a seat here with other members and shamelessly challenges all these values.

76. The representatives of the Arab States are now sitting in this General Assembly Hall. The Arab States’ share in the problem of the Middle East has been in having to endure invasion, suffering, aggression and crimes for no reason or justification. It is even more offensive to have to observe those crimes and that aggression being justified by some of those sitting here, although we are sure that most of the Member States represented here are anxious to establish the truth and lay the foundations for a just peace. Also sitting in this General Assembly Hall are representatives of the Israeli authorities, the perpetrators of those crimes of aggression and expansion and of other crimes against humanity and the rights of other States and individuals.

77. The whole Middle East is an area of Israeli aggression. The entire world knows by now that Israel is planning to acquire the capacity to commit aggression beyond the Middle East.

78. What entity in the world today, other than the Zionist entity in Palestine, poses a threat to its neighbours, commits direct aggression against a whole region and is a potential threat to those outside the region?

79. In Lebanon, Syria, Iraq and Palestine it is the same story of daily, flagrant aggression. As for terrorism, international terrorism, talk about it continues and the subject-matter is well known to representatives.

80. The real issue is the nature of this Israeli aggression. Peoples fight and struggle for known and clear objectives, but Israel commits aggression and each time we discover a new motive for it. Events have proved false the claim that Israel attacks to protect itself. It has been the aggressor each and every time. On the other hand, each such aggression has increased its vulnerability, undermined its security, increased the danger to the region and heightened the possibility of confrontation—all of which expose that entity to still more danger. Representatives are aware, the world is aware and history has recorded that although Israel may win one, two or even 10 rounds, it is bound to lose the final round against peoples which have a superior capacity to endure in every respect, however long the conflict may last, because its existence depends solely on winning military rounds, as has proved to be the case so far.

81. The Israeli adventure is directed at the existence of the Middle East region as a whole—the whole Middle East, with its potential, its capabilities, the independence of its people and their progress and development. Has the history of the world ever known anything more dangerous than this? History has also testified that adventurism against the existence of nations has always ended to the detriment of the adventurer, however long it may take.

82. If we try to confine our discussion to the development of the situation in the Middle East and the acts of aggression and violations of one full year only, from the previous session of the General Assembly to the current session, we find that Israel has continued its aggression, in disregard of the United Nations, and its crimes against the peoples and States in Palestine, Lebanon and Syria. Southern

Lebanon and the Golan Heights continue to be occupied and subjected to all sorts of crimes and violations. The West Bank and Gaza are experiencing forms of injustice, aggression and invasion that were never practised by the Nazis in the darkest days of their occupation of foreign countries.

83. There is no difference between one Government and another in Israel. They are all partners in the crime against the West Bank and Gaza. They are all partners in the crime against the Golan. They are all partners in the crime against Lebanon. They have been partners in the crime against Palestine. They are still partners, as long as the land is occupied and the people do not enjoy their full and absolute rights, no matter what the language of the official declarations and the unofficial promises by their numerous parties. Those crimes that have been committed are not the result of a month-old or year-old decision. They are part of the Zionists' scheme from the beginning of their designs against Arab lands, starting with Palestine.

84. In the Golan, they have shamelessly declared the annexation of Syrian territory. In the West Bank and Gaza, they have been shamelessly silent on acts of Judaization, expulsion, land confiscation and building of settlements. Lebanon, an independent country, was arrogantly invaded and occupied in 1982 and its right of sovereignty is being bargained over today.

85. Of all the crimes that Israel has committed there is not a single one that has not been the subject of a warning by the United Nations; nor is there a single one that has not been condemned afterwards by the United Nations and which Israel has not been asked to refrain from committing. On the other hand, not a single one of those crimes has been abandoned by Israel out of respect for the United Nations or international law.

86. I should like to say to those who attempt to protect and support Israel in the United Nations or who keep silent on its crimes that they are doing the worst disservice to the Zionist entity, because the latter will think that such protection can insulate it from the march of history which is moving against it. Moreover, those who are protecting Israel in this international Organization share with it a responsibility that echoes throughout the world, with the worst reverberations in the Arab countries and the entire Muslim world. It is time for them to understand reality and to look beyond their narrow field of vision.

87. Golda Meir, the late Prime Minister of Israel, stated in 1969: "There is no such thing as Palestinians. They do not exist." Golda Meir is gone, but the Palestinians, the rightful owners of the land, remain. But this is the real Zionist objective with regard to Palestine and the Middle East. The tragedy is growing and its dangers are spreading. Israel's former Defence Minister, Sharon, in a lecture to the Center for Strategic Studies in Tel Aviv in 1982, referred to what he called "the remote strategic lands peripheral and vital to Israel". He declared in that lecture that:

"the strategic and security interests of Israel must be widened to include 80 States, beside the Arab, Middle Eastern States and the States of the Red Sea region—States such as Turkey, Iran, Pakistan and other States in the Gulf region and Africa, particularly the countries of North and Central Africa."

88. Let us consider how the Israeli occupation authorities in Lebanon have destroyed the economic infrastructure of the areas they have occupied in order to render them uncompetitive and dependent upon the Israeli economy. They concentrated on destroying industrial installations. They pillaged Beirut Airport and other facilities, including all the modern electronic equipment that had made Beirut Airport and Lebanese factories among the most advanced of their kind in the region.

89. The barbaric massacres perpetrated by the Israeli occupation authorities against Lebanese, Palestinian and Syrian civilians constitute war crimes and crimes against humanity, according to the definitions of international law. Israel must bring individuals and bodies responsible for these crimes to international trial. The report of the international commission established in 1982 to investigate Israeli violations of international law during its invasion of Lebanon,<sup>9</sup> presided over by Mr. Sean MacBride, has pointed out how heinous these crimes were.

90. The immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon is a Lebanese, Arab and international demand. Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) strongly support the determination of the international community to effect the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanese territory.

91. Israel's premeditated and determined aggression and occupation make it fully responsible for reparations. The payment of reparations is one of the basic concepts of international law and includes reparations for the destruction of property and for human and material losses, in addition to other damages caused by the aggressor to States and individuals.

92. The General Assembly must, as a matter of principle, condemn in the strongest terms, and to the maximum extent provided in the Charter of the United Nations, Israel's attitude, actions and practices in the region. Israel must be made to bear full responsibility for the crimes it has committed and for compensation. This responsibility must be borne by its leaders and officials as individuals, and by the Israeli entity as a whole for having put these individuals in positions which allowed them to commit these acts. States that support the Zionist policy in the United Nations must also bear responsibility for supporting these acts and for remaining silent while such acts were being perpetrated. History shows that remaining silent about a crime is just as harmful as the crime itself and leads to the repetition of those crimes. The record of the proceedings of the Nuremberg trials, after the Second World War, bears testimony to this.

93. We must take a firm stand here, leaving no room for misinterpretation of the international community's stand with respect to this series of crimes: crimes against humanity, crimes against States, and crimes against the international community as a whole. We should leave no margin for misunderstanding the international community's firm position rejecting any justification for these crimes and on remaining silent about them, not to mention support for such criminals in one way or another. Just ask the Israeli authorities today if Israel is more secure or better off than it was yesterday. The increasing frequency of its crimes will lead Israel to the same end that every adventurous criminal in history has



met. Injustice does not build the foundations of a State. The Arabs have right on their side, for, as the wise sages once said: "A State based on injustice can last but an hour, but a State based on justice will last to the day of judgement."

94. Mr. KIRCA (Turkey): In joining this debate on the situation in the Middle East, we cannot but feel the heavy burden of a set of serious interrelated problems which have grown in complexity in an atmosphere of constant political and military confrontation during the past 37 years.

95. It was on 29 November 1947 that the General Assembly adopted resolution 181 (II), on the future government of Palestine, recommending the implementation of a "Plan of Partition with Economic Union", by 33 votes in favour to 13 against, with 10 abstentions. Turkey was among those Members that had sufficient reasons to cast a negative vote on that resolution. What happened in the General Assembly so long ago may now be regarded as part of the history of the conflict in the Middle East, but it should also help to remind us of the basic reasons why the problem has remained unresolved, when we recall that even that plan spoke of an Arab State in Palestine.

96. The absence of a Palestinian Arab State, the denial of the national rights of the Palestinian Arab people and the continued occupation of the Arab territories lie at the root of the Middle East conflict.

97. The situation and developments in the Middle East have always been and continue to be of particular interest and importance to Turkey, for a number of vital reasons.

98. The concern we feel for that region is a natural consequence of our geographical location in the Middle East, our historical experience and the mutual ties of fraternity between the Turkish nation and the Arab peoples.

99. The Arab-Israeli conflict and the question of Palestine, which lies at the heart of this bitter dispute, have dimensions that go much beyond those of a regional problem. Therefore, the goal of achieving peace and stability in the Middle East has tremendous importance not only for the region itself but, equally, for world peace and security. The Middle East longs for stability and a just peace, which has been lacking long enough. Contributing to the replacement of the perpetual tension and conflict in the region by a negotiated comprehensive settlement constitutes an important priority of Turkish foreign policy in the Middle East. In this context, we have always felt it our sincere duty to support the just cause of Arab peoples and have joined in the calls for an end to aggressive policies by Israel.

100. The General Assembly and other bodies of the United Nations have, through numerous resolutions, given firm support to the right of the Palestinian Arab people to self-determination and to the creation of an independent Palestinian State, without which no settlement can be comprehensive, just and enduring.

101. There is a direct link between this paramount necessity and the withdrawal of Israel from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including the Holy City of Jerusalem. A policy of annexation and the expansion of Israeli settlements in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories does not lead to a peaceful future in the region and defies the will of the international community. It has been determined by

the Security Council that Israel's policy of establishing settlements in the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967 has no validity and constitutes serious obstruction to the achievement of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Israel has also been called upon to comply with its obligations under the relevant international conventions for the protection of civilian persons and to desist from changing the legal status, physical character, institutional structure and demographic composition of the Palestinian and other Arab territories under its occupation. Israel's violations of human rights and its policies and actions in the occupied territories have been repeatedly condemned by the General Assembly. Israel has the responsibility and obligation to put an end to its repressive policies and to withdraw completely from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967. World public opinion is aware that the violation of human rights in the occupied territories and Israeli practices in violation of international law will cease only when the Palestinian people can enjoy their right to self-determination and the Golan Heights are reintegrated into Syrian territory, where they belong.

102. The Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982 was a grave act of aggression which violated the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of that country and led to a tragic loss of life among the civilian population, including that caused by the massacres in the Palestinian camps of Sabra and Shatila. After repeated calls on Israel during the past two and a half years to withdraw from Lebanon, the talks between the military authorities of Lebanon and Israel can only be described as a step in the right direction. The attention of international public opinion is focused on these talks; the importance of their successful conclusion for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon is recognized. The Lebanese people have endured tremendous suffering and losses. They should be left free to pursue their path of national reconciliation, which will contribute to the overall stability of the region.

103. Turning our attention to the chances of achieving a peaceful settlement in the Middle East, we wish to commend the realistic assessment of the situation by the Secretary-General in his report [A/39/600]. We agree that delay has not facilitated the solution of the problem in any way, and new layers of complexity have been added with each new war in the region and the passage of time. As he has pointed out, the Middle East conflict can ultimately be fully resolved only by a comprehensive settlement covering all its aspects, including the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Arab territories occupied since 1967; respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of every State in the area and for its right to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized boundaries; and a just settlement of the Palestinian problem based on the recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination and the right to create their own independent national State. The preservation of, and the ensuring of respect for, the unique character and special status of the Holy City of Jerusalem also constitute an indispensable element for a just peace in the Middle East.

104. It is obvious that a comprehensive settlement can be achieved only through a process of negotiations in which all the parties concerned participate, including, on an equal footing, the PLO.

105. We believe the time has come for another determined effort to pursue the opportunities created by a number of proposals and plans that have been put forward in recent years, including the eight-point peace plan contained in the Final Declaration adopted on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez,<sup>9</sup> and the guidelines contained in the Geneva Declaration on Palestine and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights, adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983.<sup>10</sup> The convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, endorsed by the General Assembly in resolution 38/58 C, is a proposal which should be patiently pursued in view of the considerable support it enjoys. In order to give fresh momentum to the search for peace in the Middle East, the elements of various initiatives should be constructively utilized to help build a negotiating structure. We believe it is time for all the parties to the Middle East conflict to avail themselves of the services of the Secretary-General in order to move steadily toward this goal.

106. We are confident that, once peace burgeons in the Middle East, all the nations concerned will do their utmost to keep and further promote it, mindful of what they have suffered in its regrettable absence.

107. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Next year we shall be marking the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. The history of the consideration of the Middle East conflict in the United Nations is almost as long. Whole generations of people in the Middle East have been born and grown up against the grim background of war. All the efforts undertaken so far to break the tragic and dangerous circle of violence in this part of the world have led at the very best to fragile truces which sooner or later have given way to new and even bloodier carnage. This conflict has led to untold loss of human life and material damage.

108. One does not need to be blessed with any special powers of perspicacity to see who is responsible for the persistence of the Middle East conflict, particularly the very heart and core of this conflict, the Palestinian problem. Responsibility, first and foremost, belongs to the ruling circles of Israel, since it is they who, for more than three decades, have been pursuing a policy of aggression and expansionism against neighbouring Arab States and peoples. The victims of Israeli aggression have been successively Syria, Jordan, Egypt and Lebanon.

109. However, the main thrust of Israeli aggression has been, and remains, against the Arab people of Palestine, whose land has become the target of a policy of colonial conquest and expansion unprecedented in this last quarter of the twentieth century. For 18 years now the whole world has watched the Israeli leaders methodically and deliberately clearing the way on Palestinian soil for the creation of their own mini-empire.

110. Official statements and practical acts on the part of the Israeli authorities have reflected their clear intent to annex the territory of the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip, which they seized in 1967. Along with the economic plundering of Palestinian land, the illegal alteration of its juridical status, demographic structure and historical character, Israel has systematically escalated terror and

violence against the indigenous Arab population. It is constantly instituting new forms of political, economic, social and cultural discrimination and has been doing everything it can to break the will to resistance of the Palestinians. On the land expropriated by the occupiers, large numbers of Israeli settlements are spreading. Israel stops at nothing in its attempts to exclude the least possibility of a return to the West Bank and Gaza of their legitimate inhabitants and owners, and to deprive the Palestinian people of its inalienable right, the right to an independent life in its own homeland.

111. Israel has also been pursuing a policy of conquest with regard to the Syrian Golan Heights. The open annexation of the Golan Heights by Tel Aviv in 1981, as well as the annexation of East Jerusalem, were acts of naked international brigandage.

112. The culmination of the policy of aggression by Israel was the large-scale invasion of Lebanon and the occupation of the southern regions of that country, which continues to this very day. For three years now, the Israeli occupiers have been holding sway on Lebanese soil, making wide use of their wealth of colonial experience acquired in the Arab territories seized earlier. They have virtually isolated the south of Lebanon where they have established a harsh occupation régime, and every day they are trampling underfoot the most elementary norms of international humanitarian law. Israel has persistently refused to comply with Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), which call for the immediate and unreserved withdrawal of the aggressor's forces from Lebanese territory. They have been doing everything they can to impose on the Lebanese such conditions as would enable Tel Aviv to continue to behave as if they owned southern Lebanon.

113. The blame for the persistence of the Middle East conflict belongs equally to the senior partner of Israel in the "strategic alliance", that is, the United States. It is its generous military, economic and financial assistance which enables Tel Aviv in practical terms to pursue its adventurist policies. It is its limitless and unreserved support which serves as a political shield for the Israeli expansionists.

114. Together with Israel, the United States for many years has deliberately been creating obstacles to constructive international efforts to bring about a radical solution to the Middle East problems. In so far as concerns the American "initiatives" themselves in the field of a settlement, they have always boiled down in one way or another to imposing on the Arabs terms amounting to capitulation.

115. However, the development of events in the Middle East has made abundantly clear the futility of the approach of violence to solving the problems of this region. The policy of imposing separate deals has run up against the staunch resistance of patriotic forces in the Arab world. It was only to be expected that the attempt to impose upon the Palestinians paper autonomy according to the Camp David recipe was a failure. The same fate befell the American plan put forward two years ago for a pseudo-resolution to the Middle East problems, which in essence was a touched-up version of the same Camp David line. The intervention of the United States Marines in Lebanon ended in ignominious fiasco. The Lebanese Government tore up the one-sided imposed agreement.

116. However, apparently the United States and Israel have still not learned their lesson and are continuing to think, in outmoded terms, of separate deals and manoeuvring behind the scenes. How else can we explain the openly obstructionist policy pursued by Washington with regard to the General Assembly resolution approved last year by an overwhelming majority, calling for the preparation and convening of an international conference on the Middle East? A similarly negative attitude to the conference is being demonstrated by Israel's leaders, who are sacrificing on the altar of their ambitions the long-term interests of their own people.

117. In complete contrast to this approach to the problems of the Middle East is the policy of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is seeking no one-sided economic, political or military advantages for itself in the Middle East. Soviet policy is based first and foremost on the recognition of the true vital interests of the States of the Middle East themselves. The Soviet Union is bringing into this area no naval units, it is not sending its marines there, nor is it carrying on any military manoeuvres on foreign territory.

118. The Soviet Union has consistently supported the just cause of the Arab peoples. The Arabs are well aware that in the struggle for the elimination of the consequences of Israeli aggression and for the restoration of their flouted rights, they have always been able to count on our support and assistance. Any idea, therefore, of squeezing the Soviet Union out of the Middle East and undermining the traditional friendly Soviet-Arab relations is as futile as it ever was. Experience has shown that, on the contrary, relations of friendship and co-operation between the Soviet Union and the Arab States are becoming stronger every year. It must be absolutely clear that the Soviet Union has played and will continue to play an active part in the search for peace in this part of the world, which is situated in direct proximity to our southern borders, and in the struggle against attempts to impose upon the Arabs injustice, diktat and hegemony.

119. The Soviet proposals on the Middle East of 29 July 1984 [A/39/368] are based on the universally acknowledged principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. This means that the Israelis must return to the Arabs all the lands they have occupied since 1967: the Golan Heights, the West Bank of the Jordan, including East Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip and the southern part of Lebanon.

120. The Soviet proposals are predicated on the proposition that, without the exercise of the inalienable right of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination and to establish their own independent State, peace in the Middle East is impossible.

121. At the same time, the Soviet proposals do justice to all parties to the Middle East conflict. They are aimed at guaranteeing the right of all States of the region to a secure and independent existence and at ending the state of war and establishing peace among those States. It is proposed that international guarantees of the settlement of the Middle East problem should be given, in which the Soviet Union is ready to participate.

122. The Soviet initiative is not confined to laying down the general principles of a settlement. It indicates practical ways of reaching a settlement—that is, by convening an international peace confer-

ence with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the PLO, as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, as well as the Soviet Union and the United States. The participants in the conference could include also some other States of the Middle East and adjacent areas which could make a positive contribution to the solution of the Middle East problem. Apart from the composition of the conference, the Soviet proposals embrace other aspects of practical organization and the actual work of the conference.

123. The new Soviet initiative is fully in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations and with United Nations decisions on the Middle East and the Palestinian problem. It is very close to the Geneva Declaration on Palestine, adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine held in 1983.<sup>10</sup> Finally—and I want to highlight this point particularly—it takes fully into account the principles embodied in the Final Declaration adopted on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez.<sup>5</sup>

124. In conclusion, I would like to recall the words uttered from this rostrum by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, on 27 September 1984:

“The Soviet Union has recently put forward a proposal on the principles of a Middle East settlement. That proposal is well known and has evoked a broad response. We call upon all parties to the conflict to act with sober-minded regard for each other's legitimate rights and interests, and upon all other States to facilitate the search for a just settlement in the Middle East.” [10th meeting, para. 159.]

125. For its part, the Soviet Union reaffirms its readiness to co-operate with all those who want to see a constructive solution to the Middle East problems and the establishment of the true, just and lasting peace so long awaited by the peoples of the Middle East.

126. Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community. The Ten remain deeply preoccupied by the serious situation in the Middle East. They are particularly concerned at the lack of progress towards settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, the continuance of the war between Iran and Iraq and the continuing violence and tension in Lebanon. Each of these problems is a matter of serious concern in itself and each has serious repercussions for international peace and stability.

127. The Ten have long advocated the need for negotiated solutions to these problems. They therefore particularly welcome the talks which have recently got under way in Naqoura. They commend the Secretary-General for his efforts in promoting these talks. The Ten hope that they will soon result in an agreement facilitating the early withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon, the restoration of Lebanese authority and the re-establishment of peace and security in the area. The Ten consider that the continuing Israeli occupation of a substantial part of Lebanon causes a great deal of human suffering and economic disruption. In the view of the Ten, Israel should withdraw its troops in accordance with the call of the Security Council, and other foreign forces on Lebanese soil whose presence is not authorized by the Government should also be withdrawn. The Ten,

some of whom contribute to observer and peace-keeping operations in Lebanon, reaffirm their willingness to assist that country towards peace and normality.

128. The Ten regard the progress which has been made towards reconciliation in Lebanon under the present Government as encouraging and worthy of support. Violence nevertheless continues to flare up and fundamental problems remain to be addressed if the goal of an independent sovereign country enjoying territorial integrity, which has been affirmed so many times by the United Nations and endorsed by the Ten, is to be achieved.

129. The Ten have repeatedly expressed their grave concern over the humanitarian situation in Lebanon and stressed the need to adhere strictly to generally recognized humanitarian principles. The European Community and its member States have contributed to humanitarian assistance operations in Lebanon. In their statement adopted at Stuttgart on 19 June 1983,<sup>11</sup> the Ten, meeting as the European Council, reaffirmed their deep concern at the distress of the civilian population and expressed the hope that the appropriate international organizations would be allowed to assist that population without hindrance. They are deeply appreciative of the relief work which has been carried out in Lebanon by different international agencies under the most difficult conditions. They call on all parties to co-operate with the agencies as well as with UNIFIL, which, on an interim basis, has been entrusted by the Security Council with important additional tasks in the humanitarian and administrative fields. They take this opportunity to express their appreciation of the work of UNIFIL in its effort to carry out its mandate and its work to maintain stable conditions and protect the civil population in its area of operations. The Ten welcome the recent decision of the Security Council, in resolution 555 (1984) of 12 October 1984, to extend the mandate of UNIFIL for a further period of six months, and they hope that conditions will be created which will soon allow the Force fully to carry out its tasks and play a more effective role.

130. The Ten find it regrettable that there has been so little progress recently in efforts to find a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Fundamental principles for the settlement of this conflict are set out in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). The Ten believe that, in essence, such a settlement must further take account of both the right to existence and security of all States in the Middle East, including Israel, and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, with all that this implies. The Ten continue to be deeply conscious of the importance of the solution of the Palestinian problem for the future peace and security of the Middle East. They firmly believe that a just solution of this problem is an essential element of any comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

131. The guidelines laid down by the international community, which must underlie any solution of the Middle East conflict, are well known. In the view of the Ten, what is needed now is movement by the parties concerned, with the support and assistance of the international community, to negotiate a peaceful solution in accordance with these guidelines. A negotiated settlement will require the continuing and independent expression of the will of the Palestinian people: the Ten have repeatedly said that the PLO must be associated with the negotiations. In the Ten's

view, furthermore, a process of negotiation presupposes mutual recognition of the existence and the rights of the parties to the conflict. The resolution of the problems between Israel and its neighbours should be based on the principles, widely accepted in the international community, of non-recourse to the use of force and the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. For the Ten, this means that, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), Israel must put an end to the territorial occupation it has maintained since the 1967 conflict.

132. For some time now, because of events on both sides and developments elsewhere, there has been a hiatus in attempts to find a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Ten regret this. Each year that passes without a solution makes its achievement more difficult. Attitudes of hostility become more entrenched, and the problems arising from the long occupation become more serious. Outside parties, including the Ten, can play a part in facilitating negotiations and can assist and support constructive steps by the sides. A number of proposals have been set forth, and remain on the table, which could be helpful for a comprehensive settlement, but it cannot be escaped that the parties themselves—Israel, the Arab States and the Palestinians—must sooner or later grasp the nettle and come to terms with each other's existence and legitimate rights. The Ten urge those involved to take steps in this direction. We believe that a start could be made with the renunciation by all parties of the threat or use of force and with the abandonment by Israel of the policy of establishing settlements in the occupied territories, contrary to international law.

133. The Ten have had occasion, most recently in their statement to the Special Political Committee on 20 November [35th meeting], to express their concern at the situation in the occupied territories. They attach the greatest importance to all matters affecting the rights of the population of the Arab territories that Israel has occupied since 1967. The Ten are deeply concerned, because the Israeli policies in the area have led to mounting tension and continued unrest. They reaffirm their position that the settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, as well as any change in the status and demographic structure of those territories, are illegal under international law. The Ten reaffirm that, until an end is put to the territorial occupation which Israel has maintained since 1967, the provisions of the Hague Convention of 1907<sup>12</sup> and the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,<sup>6</sup> are applicable to all these territories. Moreover, the Ten reiterate that the Israeli policy concerning East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights is contrary to international law and therefore invalid.

134. The Ten are concerned at the continuation of conflict between Iran and Iraq and the resultant increased tension in the Gulf area. There has been great loss of life on both sides among combatants and the civilian populations. Enormous material damage has been done. Shipping in the Gulf, including traffic to and from States not parties to the conflict, has been subjected to attacks. Of particular concern was the report issued on 26 March of this year by specialists appointed by the Secretary-General,<sup>13</sup> which ascertained that chemical weapons had been used in areas inspected in Iran. The Ten condemn

without qualification any use of chemical weapons and earnestly hope that they will not be used again in this or any other conflict. We call on both sides to comply with the principles and provisions of humanitarian international law in armed conflicts. We have underlined to Iran and Iraq the importance we attach to freedom of navigation and commerce in international waters, and we recall that the Security Council has more than once addressed this question.

135. More positively, the Ten note with satisfaction the undertaking by Iran and Iraq not to attack purely civilian targets. We compliment the Secretary-General on securing this undertaking and on his work and that of the observer teams in maintaining it. A certain willingness to compromise in order to mitigate the sufferings of the civilian population is an encouraging sign. One of the possibilities offered by the United Nations has been realized. The Ten also commend the other humanitarian efforts of the Secretary-General. The Ten urge both sides to extend the process, leading to a general cessation of military activities in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions and the numerous appeals of the international community. Negotiation aimed at finding a peaceful solution, honourable for both sides, could then begin. Many intermediaries have offered their good offices in this area. The Ten hope that these efforts and those of the Secretary-General will be continued and intensified, and they are ready to support them.

136. In conclusion, the Ten are convinced that every effort must be made to grasp all opportunities for making real progress towards peace in the Middle East. While fully realizing the complexity of the issues involved, the Ten reaffirm that problems can and must be solved without recourse to the use of force. They will continue their best efforts in pursuance of that objective.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*

NOTES

<sup>1</sup>See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1980*, document S/14009.

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, *Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1982*, document S/15265.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, *Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1983*, document S/15657.

<sup>4</sup>See *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1982), vol. 18, No. 35, p. 1081.

<sup>5</sup>See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1982*, document S/15510, annex.

<sup>6</sup>United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

<sup>7</sup>See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-ninth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1984*, document S/16732.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, *Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1983*, document S/15556.

<sup>9</sup>*Israel in Lebanon: Report of the international commission to enquire into reported violations of international law by Israel during its invasion of Lebanon* (London, Ithaca Press, 1983).

<sup>10</sup>See *Report of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Geneva, 29 August-7 September 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21), chap. I.

<sup>11</sup>See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1983*, document S/15867.

<sup>12</sup>Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *The Hague Conventions and Declarations of 1899 and 1907* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1915), p. 100.

<sup>13</sup>See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-ninth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1984*, document S/16433.