



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 33:	
The situation in the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General	1691

President: Mr. Ismat T. KITTANI (Iraq).

In the absence of the President, Mr. Soglo (Benin), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 33

**The situation in the Middle East:
report of the Secretary-General**

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The names of 52 delegations are on the list of those wishing to speak on the present item on our agenda. I would ask those speakers to make their statements in the order in which their names are inscribed on the list, so that we make full use of the time remaining to us. I know that I can rely on members' co-operation.

2. Mr. BLUM (Israel): By the end of the current debate the Assembly will have completed its annual double-feature performance on the items entitled, in the jargon of the United Nations, the "Question of Palestine" and "The situation in the Middle East". These two features are not played at the behest of a clamouring public. They are put on, by and large, for the benefit of a group of States, many of which do not recognize Israel and, in certain cases, consider themselves to be in a state of war with us. In the circumstances, their content, tone and purpose are predictable and can only be understood in the context I have just outlined.

3. For the better part of last week this body was engaged in the first of these perennial double features. Little, if anything, new was said, and certainly nothing emerged to encourage the hope that the cause of peace might be advanced. If this debate follows its predetermined course, it will merely be a replay of that conducted last week. I cannot help recalling that after I had opened this debate last year I was followed by a representative who simply read for the second time, with the minimum of changes, a speech which another member of his delegation had made a few days before on the first of these double features.

4. There is, of course, a simple explanation for the repetitive and theatrical nature of these performances. It is that certain Members of the Organization, particularly the States of the new Arab League, are completely and utterly obsessed with the Arab-Israel conflict. Given the built-in majority at their disposal, they see in the Assembly an ideal arena to further their political warfare against my country.

5. One need only observe that for some years now attempts have been made by the Secretariat and by former Presidents of the General Assembly to consolidate this double feature and unify it into a single item, since the way the two items concerned are debated here, they cover identical ground. That common-sense approach has been stubbornly resisted by those behind the double billing. They refuse to free any of the Assembly's overtaxed time, merely because that would mean forfeiting an additional couple of days indulging their fixation about my country.

6. Those behind this debate may prefer not to look at the Middle East as a whole. But that does not mean that other Members of the Assembly are obliged to go along with attempts to make them adopt a blinkered view of the region by focusing exclusively on one small part of it. The Middle East is a vast region. It straddles an unbroken land mass considerably larger in size than the United States of America or China. It is rich in mineral resources, not the least of them oil, on which much of modern civilization regrettably finds itself dependent. The 20 or so Arab States—and they are by no means all the States of the region—have a combined area of 5,400,000 square miles, that is to say, over 10 per cent of the world's land mass.

7. The entire region is endemically and chronically unstable. There are trouble spots in every corner of it, several of which have grave implications for international peace and therefore should have been of deep concern to the Assembly. Last week the Assembly, as I have said, focused exclusively and laboriously on the Arab-Israel conflict, which is, of course, one of the conflicts in the region, though by no means the most serious, since, in contradistinction to the others, it has been shown in the last few years to be amenable to solution.

8. A practical framework for its solution exists, namely, the framework worked out at Camp David, which has already yielded spectacular results in the form of the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt. Moreover, that framework carries within it the potential for an overall solution of the conflict in all its aspects. And, despite protestations to the contrary, that framework is now firmly embedded in the political reality of the region and has produced one of the few islands of stability in the midst of a large and deeply troubled sea.

9. Indeed, any fair-minded look at the Middle East as a whole would show that the Arab-Israel conflict is not, as often alleged here, the source of all the instability in the region. The Arab-Israel conflict is certainly not connected with the vast majority of the trouble spots in the Middle East, such as the continued occupation of Afghanistan, the Iraq-Iran war, the conflict between Ethiopia and Somalia and the trouble in the Western Sahara, to mention but a few. In fact, a detached view of the Middle East would yield the conclusion that the Arab-Israel conflict is not the cause of the tension in the area, but rather an outcome of it.

10. Let us look at the Middle East cauldron for what it really is. For the most part, the manifold strains, tensions and conflicts in the area are the product of two fundamental elements, namely, the domestic political systems of Arab régimes and the external behaviour of Arab States at large.

11. As regards the first, most Arab régimes are in the hands of authoritarian and often dictatorial rulers and potentates of doubtful legitimacy. Generally speaking, they control their people with an iron fist, brutally suppressing any power centres or voices of dissent, which are perceived as some threat to them. The fragility of any given régime is further compounded on the one hand by a lack of social cohesion in most Middle Eastern States, and on the other by the existence of two thirds of the world's known oil reserves under the area's sandy reaches. This factor, the oil factor, is particularly potent. It brings with it, for the privileged few, staggering wealth of a kind even Midas never dreamed of, which can be parlayed into political power out of all proportion to the State's specific gravity on the international scene, not to speak of dangerous little toys in the form of the most sophisticated weaponry the world has to offer, which in turn can be, and frequently are, used for highly irresponsible purposes.

12. This brings me to the second fundamental characteristic of the Middle East region, involving Arab States at large. The States themselves may be the products of twentieth-century history, but the rivalries among them go back for centuries. The attempts to achieve hegemony over large parts of the region, if not the whole of it, go back as far as the Persian and Assyrian Empires, to name but two. The more modern phenomenon of embarking on foreign adventures to divert attention from domestic troubles only complicates the situation. In this regard, the Middle East States, which bequeathed to the world the legacy of the *hashashin*—transmuted into "assassins" in various European languages—have in recent years developed to a fine art the use of subversion and terror in neighbouring countries and beyond, for the attainment of questionable political aims.

13. Limitations of time prevent me from analysing every conflict in the Middle East today. The process would be tediously long even if, here and there, there might be the odd bit of good news, such as the fact that for the past two weeks the two Yemens are reported to be back on visiting terms. Let us therefore take a swift sweep through the length and breadth of the region, so as to achieve an overview of what the item before the Assembly is all about—namely, "The situation in the Middle East", and not "The situation in the Arab East", as indeed the President of the Assembly termed it in his statement at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez a fortnight ago, when he expressed the hope that the results of that summit would be of help to the General Assembly, first and foremost with regard to the "Question of Palestine" and "The situation in the Arab East". I should add that it is the exclusivistic, intolerant and xenophobic attitude implicit in this particular terminology which has been the cause of much of the suffering endured over the centuries by the non-Arab ethnic minorities in the Middle East.

14. On the eastern flank of the Middle East, we have Iraq. In the last two decades its rulers have come to power in the most brutal and bloody of fashions. In 1958, King Faisal of Iraq was horribly murdered, and the mutilated bodies of his advisers were dragged through the

streets of Baghdad. The various Iraqi dictators and their ruling cliques since then have maintained power through violence and barbarity. The present—

15. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Iraq on a point of order.

16. Miss AL-TURAIHI (Iraq): The representative of the Zionist entity always, in his devious way, knowingly produces misquotations and misinterpretations to try to divert the Assembly's attention from the agenda item under discussion. Let him confine himself to the agenda item, especially the report of the Secretary-General [A/36/655], in which there is a reference to the Israelis' attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor and their condemnation by the Assembly. If the representative of Israel does not have respect for the Assembly, let him not address it.

17. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I invite the representative of Israel to continue.

18. Mr. BLUM (Israel): As we all know, the agenda item before us is "The situation in the Middle East". I can readily understand the agitation of the representative of Iraq. She will hear more about her country, which is one of the countries in the Middle East. I have not quoted yet, so I do not know what quotations she was referring to in the point of disorder which she has just made. But it was evidently prepared in advance and had to be said. I should greatly appreciate it, Mr. President, if you would see to it that no further points of disorder are raised in the course of my statement. With your permission, Mr. President, I should like to continue.

19. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Jordan on a point of order.

20. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): The representative of Israel is not entitled, under the rules and regulations which govern deliberations of United Nations bodies, to misname a point of order a "point of disorder". He should call it what it is, what it is legally and universally accepted to be—a point of order. I hope, Mr. President, that you will rule him out of order in saying that my Iraqi colleague raised a point of disorder. That is unacceptable.

21. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I ask the representative of Israel to be kind enough to continue his remarks.

22. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I should like to thank the representative of the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan for his remark.

23. On the east flank of the Middle East we have Iraq—

24. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Jordan on a point of order.

25. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): It is against the rules and regulations of our United Nations for any representative to misname a country, not to use the proper, legal name of the country to which he refers. The representative of Israel should know, if he does not, that the name of Jordan is the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, and he should pronounce it accordingly. It was the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan before there was an Israel imposed upon the Palestinian people to usurp their rights. I insist on his calling my country as it is named and as it is recognized by the United Nations—the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

26. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.
27. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Under the guise of points of order, various Arab representatives try to interrupt a statement which is not palatable to them. I seek the protection of the President and ask him to instruct them to desist from these tactics.
28. I imagine that when he referred to the misnaming of States, the representative of the Palestinian Arab State of the Kingdom of Jordan had in mind his Iraqi colleague, who referred to my country with a designation that is not proper in this building. I am grateful to him for pointing that out.
29. With your permission, Mr. President, I should like to continue.
30. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I would ask the representative of Jordan whether he has completed his point of order. If he has not, I invite him to continue.
31. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): I still insist, Mr. President—and I think that I am speaking properly and in accordance with the accepted norms of the United Nations in saying this—that every State should be called by its universally recognized name. Anything else would be a distortion.
32. I have no desire whatsoever to interrupt or disrupt the statements of the representative of Israel, because I shall have the opportunity to reply. But at least we should abide by the rules which have been universally accepted. The name of Jordan was the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan before Israel was ever created.
33. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before I call on the representative of Israel to continue his statement, may I ask everyone concerned to consider the fact that we do not have much time to devote to this very important matter. I ask them to show moderation and to act in the spirit proper to an assembly of this kind.
34. I now call on the representative of Israel to continue his statement.
35. Mr. BLUM (Israel): On the eastern flank of the Middle East we have Iraq. In the last two decades its rulers have come to power in the most brutal and bloody of fashions. In 1958 King Faisal of Iraq was horribly murdered and the mutilated bodies of his advisers were dragged through the streets of Baghdad. The various Iraqi dictators and their ruling cliques since then have maintained power through violence and barbarity. The present Iraqi leader, Saddam Hussein al Takriti, is the very model of a modern tyrant—
36. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Iraq is asking to speak on a point of order. I shall call on her, but I would beg her next time to wait until I call on her to speak.
37. Miss AL-TURAIHI (Iraq): This is the second time I have intervened, and I shall go on until he stops—he and the bunch of murderers and terrorists that is ruling that entity. There should be a who's who of their assassins and their terrorism, from Begin to Shamir and the Haganah and Zvei Leumi—
38. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Does the representative of Israel wish to continue his statement?
39. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Point of order, Mr. President.
40. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.
41. Mr. BLUM (Israel): It is intolerable that under the guise of points of order, which I rightly called "points of disorder", the representative of Iraq should try to interrupt every other sentence of my statement. It is already quite obvious that what she is claiming is immunity for the tyrant of Iraq from being mentioned here in my statement. I am going to mention him and, moreover, I would request that you, Mr. President, instruct the representative of Iraq not to speak before you have called on her and not to interrupt another speaker. This is something that is not common in this building. She is probably not aware of this. She is a newcomer to this scene, so she should be told this.
42. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I invite the representative of Israel to continue his statement.
43. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The present Iraqi leader, Saddam Hussein al Takriti, is the very model of a modern tyrant. According to Lawrence Minard, writing in *Forbes Magazine* on 18 August 1980, "President Saddam Hussein has emerged as one of the most brutally repressive rulers in recent history." Representatives will recall that not long before the publication of that article Saddam Hussein al Takriti was involved in the firing-squad execution of 15 top Ba'ath Party leaders, some of them his closest advisers.
44. Since attaining its independence in the 1930s—
45. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Iraq on a point of order.
46. Miss AL-TURAIHI (Iraq): I think it is high time for him to learn from what has been voted—
47. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.
48. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The representative of Iraq is apparently bent on obstructing this statement. Could you kindly inform her, Mr. President, that a point of order is supposed to be a point of order. She has nothing to contribute on points of order. She is just trying to disturb and obstruct this statement. Would you please instruct her to refrain from doing this unless she has a genuine point of order—which she has not had so far.
49. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to repeat what I said just now, namely, that the importance of this debate is such that it demands all our attention. I ask the parties concerned to respect the need for calm in the Assembly.
50. I invite the representative of Israel to continue.
51. Mr. BLUM (Israel): As I said, according to Lawrence Minard, writing in *Forbes Magazine* on 18 August 1980, "President Saddam Hussein has emerged as one of the most brutally repressive rulers in recent history." Representatives will recall that not long before the pub-

lication of that article Saddam Hussein al Takriti was involved in the firing-squad execution of 15 top Ba'ath Party leaders, some of them his closest advisers.

52. Since obtaining its independence in the 1930s Iraq has systematically suppressed its ethnic minorities. Hundreds of Assyrian Christians—men, women and children—were slaughtered by the Iraqi army in 1933. During the Second World War there was a coup d'état in Iraq which brought to power Rashid Ali al Ghailani, who was notable for two things—his collaboration with the Nazis and the bloody pogrom which he authorized against the Jewish community in Baghdad. For almost a quarter of a century after the Second World War the Iraqi authorities methodically engaged in the ruthless oppression of their Kurdish minority. That protracted campaign resulted in the massacre of thousands upon thousands of Kurds in the mid-1970s.

53. And that was by no means the end of this tragic story. Since we observed here in this building yesterday the anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it is only fitting to recall that in its letter of 14 January 1977 to the Secretary-General, the International League for Human Rights presented evidence of

“Iraq's forcible deportation of 300,000 Kurds from their homes in the northern mountains to the southern deserts; the confiscation of Kurdish lands without compensation and the settlement of Arab citizens in those areas; the incarceration of 30,000 former members of the Kurdish fighting force in concentration camps where they have been beaten and tortured, in contravention of the Iraqi Amnesty Law of 1975; the execution of 227 Kurds and imprisonment of over 200 others for political reasons. The Iraqi Government further has prohibited the use of Kurdish in schools, has shut down Kurdish newspapers, has forbidden Kurdish ownership of land in oil-rich areas. . . .”

54. I submit that the time has come to consider the establishment of a special unit on Kurdish rights in Iraq in the United Nations Secretariat. Perhaps Iraq, as a worthy member of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, might wish to initiate proceedings in this regard.

55. And now to the other side of the coin: Iraq's external behaviour. In September of last year, Iraq launched a blatant war of aggression against Iran. That war has continued unabated for the last 14 months even if it has tended to drop from the headlines and has never made the agenda of the Assembly—

56. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Iraq on a point of order.

57. Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): As far as I am aware, the agenda item under consideration today is the item on the Middle East. Each and every one of us knows that this agenda item has been under consideration for several years and has been taken up at every session. I do not know whether this item is in any way related to the crisis between Iran and Iraq. The dispute between Iran and Iraq was discussed in the Security Council, and decisions were taken on this matter and endeavours have been made in the United Nations to solve that problem. But for the representative of Israel to set himself up as advocate for and defender of the aggressor, Iran, is totally at variance with the most elementary rules

which govern the deliberations of the General Assembly, the more so because it is outside the topic we are considering.

58. I feel, Mr. President, that you should call on Israel not to discuss this.

59. Mr. BLUM (Israel): It is gratifying to see that the rank of obstruction has now been upgraded. But I should like to remind the representative of Iraq that we are dealing with the situation in the Middle East. As far as I know, his country is part of the Middle East—not of the Arab East, as he calls it—and the situation in his country as well as the situation between his country and other countries of the region are part of the wider problem of the situation of the Middle East. Obviously, he would like to zero in on my country and turn this into another round of the interminable, vicious tirades against my country. He is free to do so in his statement, but he is not free to dictate what I have to say about the situation in the Middle East. He was not here before, when his colleague started to disturb me—unsuccessfully. I trust, Mr. President, that you will instruct him that these obstructions may take up a little bit of the overtaxed time of the Assembly but are not going to deflect me from the pattern of my statement.

60. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I invite the representative of Israel to continue his remarks.

61. Mr. BLUM (Israel): And now to the other side of the Iraqi coin: Iraq's external behaviour. In September of last year, Iraq launched a blatant war of aggression against Iran. That war has continued unabated for the last 14 months, even if it has tended to drop from the headlines and has never made the agenda of the Assembly. It has led to the devastation, both in Iran and Iraq, of towns, villages and industrial complexes. It is true that when the war first broke out, the Security Council held a number of meetings which considered Iraq's aggression for territorial gains, and the Secretary-General even appointed a special representative to offer his good offices in the search for a solution. But the fact is that these half-hearted attempts led nowhere.

62. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I apologize to the representative of Israel, but the representative of Iraq is again asking to speak on a point of order.

63. Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I am most astonished to see the President allowing a representative at this meeting to accuse Iraq of being an aggressor country, when no Security Council resolution or, indeed, any resolution from any of the main committees of the United Nations says this, and I ask the President not to permit the representative of Israel—

64. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I hope that the appeal I made to the parties to respect the solemnity of our debate will be heard.

65. Since the representative of Israel has asked to speak on a point of order as a result of that raised by the representative of Iraq, I should like to invite them once again, if their interventions come rather under the heading of statements in exercise of the right to reply, to reserve these comments until the end of the meeting, when the right of reply is usually exercised.

66. Once again, I beg them, out of consideration for those who are due to speak after them, to remember how

very little time we have left and not to disrupt this meeting, which has begun to take a turn I prefer not to describe. I therefore appeal to them to facilitate the President's task, and most of all their own, if they want the debate to continue in the sort of order which we all desire.

67. I now call on the representative of Israel to continue his remarks, and I trust he will bear in mind what I have just said.

68. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Mr. President, you have appealed to us, but I do not think I am in need of any appeal. I am in the midst of a statement which is being constantly disturbed and obstructed by the uncivilized behaviour of a certain representative—who will now wish to raise a point of order on my use of the word "uncivilized". That is what it is, but in a way I think it is also an educational experience. It is this uncivilized behaviour of his country which has contributed so much to the problems of the Middle East. Now he has carried this uncivilized behaviour into this building and into this Hall. I should like to ask that if there are any further so-called points of order, you, Mr. President, would be kind enough to ask the Iraqi representative, in advance, what the point of order is, before he starts to exercise his right of reply.

69. This is not the time to exercise rights of reply. That is what he has been doing all along, in an attempt to obstruct my statement.

70. I should like to proceed, Mr. President, with your permission.

71. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Please continue.

72. Mr. BLUM (Israel): It is true that when the Iraq-Iran war first broke out, in September of last year, the Security Council held a number of meetings which considered Iraq's aggression for territorial gains, and the Secretary-General even appointed a special representative to offer his good offices in the search for a solution. But the fact is also that these half-hearted measures and attempts led nowhere.

73. The United Nations has long been remiss in its duty, and the Security Council has not met even once this year to discuss the ongoing hostilities which are a genuine threat to international peace and security, especially in view of the proclamation of Saddam Hussein al Takriti in the National Assembly in Baghdad on 4 November of last year, that "the longer a nation stays in a territory the more rights it gains . . . Khomeini must realize that war created additional rights over and above the pre-war rights".

74. Iraq's contempt for the fundamental rules and principles of international law goes even further than that. Today, the Iraqi Mission to the United Nations circulated the first issue of its new publication entitled *Qadissiyat Saddam*. I did not know that "Saddam" was a name that should not be mentioned in this building. The Iraqi Mission itself entitled its publication by that name. *Qadissiyat Saddam* translates freely into "The Crusades of Saddam", a very fitting name for a publication of a United Nations mission. Let me congratulate the Iraqi Mission on this auspicious event—for it is an auspicious event. It does not happen often that one comes across such an interesting document. It is certainly worth perusing this bizarre publication. It contains some revealing insights

into the mentality and *modus operandi* of the Iraqi tyrant. Its *carte de visite* can be found on the front page and carries the following message: "President Saddam Hussein: 'We are ready to co-operate with the Iranian opposition to topple the Khomeini régime.'" This theme is elaborated at greater length on page 4 of the publication, where the Iraqi News Agency reports from Baghdad that, in addressing the Iraqi National Assembly last month, President Saddam Hussein had reiterated Iraq's readiness to co-operate unconditionally with the Iranian opposition to topple Khomeini's régime.

75. One does not have to be enamoured of the policies and actions of Iran to grasp the gravity of this most revealing statement, which the Iraqi Mission to the United Nations had the audacity to publish under its auspices. It amounts to an open and unashamed admission by the Iraqi dictator that he is engaged in the subversion of the régime of a neighbouring State, in clear defiance and violation of the general rules of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations, which prohibit intervention in the internal affairs of other States. This, of course, will not prevent the Iraqi representatives in the United Nations and elsewhere from continuing to masquerade as the champions of international law and international legitimacy.

76. In the meantime, over two million persons have been uprooted as a result of the Iraq-Iran war, creating a vast refugee problem and dwarfing by far even the inflated figures given by UNRWA for Palestinian Arab refugees. The time has come to consider the establishment of a special agency on the lines of UNRWA to deal with this acute refugee problem.

77. Let us move to the western flank of the Middle East.

78. There, in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, we find Colonel Muammar Al-Qadhafi, whose régime bears many similarities to that of Saddam Hussein al Takriti, even if the personalities and ideologies of the two men may differ somewhat. He too has difficulties in keeping in place his Government, if one can call it that. He does so by the uninhibited liquidation of all opposition. He is prepared to send his "hit squads" far and wide to eliminate any Libyan or other person whom he perceives as a potential threat. It is common knowledge that he is the foremost paymaster of terrorist groups throughout the world. In the past, he has lent his willing support to soulmates such as former President Idi Amin of Uganda, to whom he sent military support. When that failed, Al-Qadhafi offered him refuge before passing him on in almost mint condition to Saudi Arabia, where, as far as can be ascertained, he is enjoying a somewhat luxurious and well-earned retirement.

79. Despite the anomalies of the situation, the Soviet Union has found it convenient to make common cause with Colonel Qadhafi. For reasons which are best known to the Soviet Union, but which are not hard to guess at, the Soviets and their East European satellites have enabled the level-headed leader of Libya to stockpile massive quantities of sophisticated arms, far beyond Libya's capacity to absorb and use. With these weapons at his disposal, Colonel Qadhafi, in the course of this year, occupied almost the whole of Chad and also invaded Sudan. This Organization took no action whatsoever against those flagrant breaches of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the two African countries concerned.

80. Colonel Qadhafi does not confine his criminal aggression to neighbouring countries. Nor, for example, has he restricted his financial assistance to PLO terrorists operating in Lebanon. He has sent his own troops and Soviet-made arms, including SAM missiles, for use in Lebanon. He has thus contributed his modest share to the havoc and tragedy in the battle-torn country.

81. It is impossible to mention Lebanon without speaking of the Syrian Arab Republic, which is located on the northern flank of the Middle East. Representatives are well acquainted with the methods of Syria's ruler, President Hafez al Assad. His power base rests on a minority group in the Syrian body politic, the Alawites, of whom he is one. Only a couple of years ago, the immediate predecessor of our distinguished and urbane Syrian colleague in this Organization held a news conference exposing the brutality, suppression and corruption of Assad's régime. Since his words are a matter of public record, there is no need for me to repeat them here. Let me only say that what was disclosed then by Mr. El-Choufi holds all the more true today. To shore up his questionable régime, President Assad has put his brother, Rifaat, at the head of his crack troops and also at the head of the vast apparatus of the Syrian secret service. Through them they try, by frequent threats and the use of military force, to keep the population down.

82. However, despite their methods, the Assad brothers have not been able to stamp out the widespread opposition to their régime at home. In the course of the last year, their numerous political enemies have picked off a series of government figures, and only last week a car bomb aimed against the régime went up in the centre of Damascus, killing 64 people and wounding 135 more. In brief, violence and repression are commonplace in Syria today; but the gross violations of human rights there do not elicit a whimper from this Organization—presumably because Syria is also a member, and apparently one in good standing, of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

83. Once again, the general pattern which I have been describing holds for Syria's external behaviour as well. What more vivid example does one need than Syria's activities in Lebanon? For almost half a century Syria has been bent on annexing Lebanon, which it regards as part of Greater Syria.

84. It is for that reason that Syria has refused to have diplomatic relations with Lebanon. I shall not elaborate here on the subversive activities carried out by Syria against Lebanon in the 1950s and 1960s, which in their time, were brought to the attention of the Security Council, but I would remind representatives that in 1976 Syria rushed to realize its goal of annexing Lebanon under the guise of peace-keeping in the wake of the civil war there.

85. Since then, it has been pursuing its ambition on two parallel planes. Militarily, Syria has maintained 25,000 and more troops as an army of occupation in Lebanon and as a permanent feature of Lebanese daily life. The images of Syria's indiscriminate brutality in Lebanon are familiar to anyone who watches television news. Most vivid are the pictures this year of the merciless Syrian siege of Zahle, the largest Christian city in the Middle East. That siege went on for months, and, by the time it was lifted, it had resulted in more than 1,000 casualties.

86. The second plane on which the Syrians have operated to further their interests in Lebanon is the political

one. Ever since its occupation of the country in 1976, Syria has denied the Government of Lebanon any semblance of free and independent political decision-making and action.

87. No decisions affecting Lebanese national policies, either internal or external, are taken any more by the Government of Lebanon, and no longer are those decisions made in Beirut, its capital. They are now made by its fraternal neighbour, Syria. To rub things in, Syria, along its border with Lebanon, has eliminated all remaining vestiges of Lebanese sovereignty and authority, especially in the Baka'a Valley. International frontier demarcations between the two countries have been removed, Syrian currency has been introduced, and various Lebanese Government signs have been taken down and destroyed.

88. To the outsider, it may seem that Lebanon has been divided into spheres of influence, principally between the Syrians, who keep their army in the north of the country, and the terrorist PLO, which operates throughout much of the south. But the fact is that the PLO in Lebanon operates under complete Syrian control: it is Syria which oversees the supply of the PLO's armaments and logistic facilities. It is Syria which decides how that terrorist organization will be deployed and what tasks it will undertake within the framework of wider Syrian and Arab designs.

89. In this connection, permit me to mention again *Qadissiyat Saddam*. On page 9 of this valuable publication we read that an Iraqi working paper on Lebanon was submitted to the Arab foreign ministers' meeting at Fez last month. Regarding the so-called Arab deterrent force in Lebanon—which, of course, is a euphemism for the Syrian occupation of that country—the paper said—and I now quote from *Qadissiyat Saddam*: "The force delegated to Lebanon now belongs to one country, which necessitates a reconsideration of the composition of the force to include troops from other Arab countries and restricting it to its tasks without interference in Lebanese internal affairs."

90. It is heartening and gratifying to learn that on page 9 of *Qadissiyat Saddam* the Iraqi Mission rejects intervention in the internal affairs of another State, notwithstanding the fact that on page 4 it had, as I have already pointed out, endorsed such intervention. But minor inconsistencies should not be considered as a reflection on the coherence of Iraq's foreign policy and of the lucidity of those who are responsible for it. I trust that the Iraqi Mission to the United Nations will wish to enlighten us on this matter in the forthcoming issue of *Qadissiyat Saddam*, which we all look forward to.

91. In all these years, the Organization has still not seen fit in any of its principal organs to devote any time to Syria's occupation of Lebanon and to its illegal activities against that country, except for the five desultory minutes—five minutes—which the Security Council accorded the topic on 6 October 1978,¹ more than three years ago. Given that the Organization has developed a penchant for film-making—has gotten into the movie industry—it might do well to consider producing a documentary on Syrian crimes against Lebanon, which have been committed in open violation of the Charter of the United Nations and all it stands for.

92. If some need is felt to broaden the base of that film, some fascinating footage could be devoted to Syria's rela-

tions with its eastern neighbour, Iraq. Just over a year ago, for example, an official Syrian newspaper, *al-Ba'ath*, felicitously described fellow Ba'athist Saddam Hussein of Iraq as a "pervert" and as "an agent of imperialism and reaction who wants to play the role of the Shah" as the predominant power in the Persian Gulf. And this was reported in *The Washington Post* of 8 October 1980. A solemn note could be struck in the United Nations film on Syria by featuring the profound grief expressed by the Syrian Ambassador in the Security Council in the debate following the destruction of the Iraqi nuclear reactor this summer.

93. I am sure that the Assembly does not need to be reminded that it is the same super-Power which pulls the strings in Syria as in Libya, encouraging the Tripoli-Damascus axis in its endeavours to destabilize the entire Middle East.

94. I now come to the southern flank of the Middle East. There we are confronted with a slightly more enigmatic phenomenon which nonetheless conforms with the pattern I have described. I have in mind, of course, Saudi Arabia. Its ruling house has rightly been described as the only family business to have been accorded membership in this Organization. In Saudi Arabia, more than anywhere else in the Middle East, one finds that highly unstable combination of an almost feudal society in possession of staggering wealth, which makes Saudi Arabia a danger not only to the Middle East but indeed to the world as a whole.

95. I shall not discuss Saudi Arabia's appalling human rights record, since that is a matter of common knowledge. But I am bound to make a few remarks about the purposes to which Saudi oil wealth is being put.

96. In the first place, Saudi Arabia is indulging in a buying spree of arms, the likes of which the world has never known. In 1978, Saudi military expenditure was virtually equivalent to that of all the members of the Organization of African Unity [OAU] put together; see *World Military and Social Expenditures, 1981*, pages 26 and 27. The same publication gives the Saudi population as just under 9 million, as against the combined population of the OAU countries of about 415 million. For the years 1977 to 1980, Saudi Arabia ranks second in absolute terms among the third world's major weapon-importing countries, as indicated in the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute [SIPRI] Yearbook for 1981, entitled *World Armaments and Disarmament*, page 198. And I should add, parenthetically, that the other countries I have mentioned in this survey of the Middle East—Iraq, Libya and Syria—all rank together with Saudi Arabia in the top six—the top six—of the third world's major weapon-importing countries, according to the same source. These disturbing facts have not gone unnoticed by the Secretary-General, who draws attention to them in a slightly different form in paragraph 159 of his report entitled "Study on the relationship between disarmament and development" [A/36/356].

97. The enormity of Saudi Arabia's arms appetite is growing year by year. It will come as no surprise to the members that as of now Saudi Arabia ranks number one in the world for military expenditure per capita. On 3 May 1981, the Saudi Ministry of Finance announced, according to *The New York Times* of the following day, that \$25 billion of its total budget for this year of \$90 billion has been allocated for military expenditure. This arms allocation is equal to that of the United Kingdom and ex-

ceeds the combined allocations of Canada, Belgium, Norway, Denmark, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Turkey, which together make up over half the membership of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO]; see *The Military Balance 1981-1982*, published by The International Institute for Strategic Studies in London in 1981. Saudi Arabia has no demonstrable need for the weapons it buys, except for offensive purposes. The experience of the past clearly demonstrates that even if its ability to use its arms is limited, Saudi Arabia is prepared to place its arsenal at the disposal of other Arab countries with which it makes common cause.

98. Being immensely wealthy, Saudi Arabia prefers to sit back and bankroll the PLO, for example, to the tune of over \$100 million a year. It prefers, to give just another example, to do everything in its considerable political power to try to subvert the Camp David peace accords. To that end, it has engaged in economic warfare against Egypt by halting the economic aid it once extended to that country. In parallel, it has called for a holy war, or *jihad*, against Israel, in total violation and defiance of the principles of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations, which prohibits not only the use of force but even the threat of force, and it has used its enormous assets to blackmail countries in an overt attempt to force them to desist from providing any support and assistance—both moral and material—to the real peacemakers in the Middle East.

99. Over and beyond its regional designs, Saudi Arabia, while posing as a moderate, has taken control of the Organization of Petroleum-Exporting Countries [OPEC] and through OPEC has squeezed the world at large, by regulating the flow of its oil and the price thereof as best suits its political ends. As a result, Saudi Arabia has probably done more than any single country to jeopardize the world economy, and particularly to inflict insufferable economic burdens on the developing countries of the third world, which now find they can afford neither oil nor development.

100. Third-world countries have seen through these attempts at Arab petro-hegemonism, led by Saudi Arabia. As the Zambian scholar Siyanga Malumo bitterly notes in his article entitled "African Economics and Oil Price Increases", published in London in *International Relations* in May 1980, "African economics have suffered more since the beginning of the oil price jump in January 1974 than at any time since the beginning of colonization on the continent."

101. This then is something of the situation in the Middle East. Although I have focused on just four countries in the east, west, north and south of the region, what I have described is characteristic of the whole. Because of the limitations of time, I have not tackled another vital aspect of the situation in the Middle East, and that is how the conflicts in the region spill over into countries contiguous with it and thus represent a threat to international peace and security in a still wider sense.

102. The Assembly will miss the opportunity presented to it annually to discuss the real situation in the Middle East if it merely chews over for the umpteenth time the question of the Palestinian Arabs. I trust that the Assembly will wish to rise to the occasion—despite contrary indications from Iraq and others who have obstructed my statement—and not let this opportunity slip through its fingers, as has invariably happened in years past.

103. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): When the representative of Iraq and I raised points of order, we based them on the substantive items which are annually discussed and which are spelled out in the Secretary-General's report [A/36/655], which has the following items: Introduction; Status of the cease-fire; Activities of UNTSO, Activities of UNDOF, Activities of UNIFIL; Situation in the occupied territories; Palestine refugee problem; Palestinian rights; and, finally, Search for a peaceful settlement.

104. It was not, therefore, in any attempt to stifle whatever the Israeli representative's views are on our countries that we made our points of order. We made them simply because he went out of the context, out of the matrix, of the item which we have been discussing for the past decade or more, since Israel's aggression of 1967.

105. The representative of Israel referred to "perennial repetition". But, if there is any repetition, it is not of the kind he had in mind. It is actually twofold. First, there is the repeated licence of the Israeli representative in indulging in insulting and derogatory remarks about the solemnity and integrity of the United Nations—the General Assembly, the Security Council and all the other bodies of the Organization. Yet the United Nations represents mankind as a whole, and Israel is the only country which was created by the United Nations. It was accepted into the Organization on condition that it abide by General Assembly resolution 181 (II), which provided for the creation of a Palestinian Arab State alongside a Jewish State and, subsequently, the repatriation of the Palestinian refugees to their ancestral homeland, Palestine. Secondly, there is Israel's repeated efforts to avoid the fundamental issues of the Middle East, which today pose the gravest and most imminent threat to world peace and security, and will continue to do so unless they are resolved.

106. If these issues are regarded by the Israeli representative as irrelevant, then he must be living in a dream world of his own making. His purpose is, of course, to avoid discussion of the usurpation of the rights of the Palestinian people and the continued occupation and colonization of Palestinian and Arab territories, which now amount to almost 40 per cent—at least in the West Bank—and possibly far more in the Golan Heights.

107. The Israeli representative casts aspersions on the Governments of the countries of the Middle East. But he conveniently overlooks the fact that Israel is a military dictatorship, appearances notwithstanding. It is no secret that it is the most militaristic State in the world. He accuses some of the Arab countries of buying arms—and I might say that when they do so they use their own precious resources. But Israel does not have to import arms, because it is producing them itself, with the assistance of its strategic ally, the United States of America. Every single Israeli man, woman and child carries a machine gun at all times, directed at the totally unarmed Palestinian and Arab civilians in the occupied territories, whose only means of resistance is to throw a few stones or burn a few tyres.

108. Let the Israeli representative remember that the expansionist State of Israel is the most militaristic State in the world. Where else in the world can one find 3 million persons in a country carrying machine guns every minute of their life? Is that the kind of world the Charter envisaged?

109. The Israeli representative talks about "terrorists". He forgets that it was the Israelis who introduced the

massive massacring of innocent civilians. They have systematically indulged in this, from 1947 and 1948 up to the present. They have killed tens of thousands of innocent Palestinians. That has been the cause of the tragic, catastrophic diaspora, unequalled in contemporary history. Never before in the history of mankind have the rights of any people been so brutally and totally trampled upon. The Palestinians have been treated as though they were not human beings, not a part of the human race which God created to live together in peace and harmony.

110. The Israeli representative should be the last person to talk about terrorism. Until recently—presumably, until he became Prime Minister—the present Prime Minister of Israel was on the most-wanted list in the United Kingdom. His Foreign Minister, Shamir, was directly involved in the cold-blooded murder on the streets of Jerusalem of one of the most outstanding statesmen and humanists who ever lived—God bless his soul. I remember the day he left our side of Jerusalem after luncheon and crossed the demarcation line. A couple of hours later we learned that he had been murdered in cold blood along with his French aide-de-camp. I am referring to Count Folke Bernadotte, a celebrated figure during the Second World War. He was murdered while acting as a special envoy of the United Nations, seeking to the best of his ability a just and lasting peace. If he had succeeded, if he had not been murdered, he would have spared all the parties—including the Israelis—the suffering, the agony, the wars that have afflicted our part of the world.

111. When the Israeli representative speaks of "terrorists", let him remember that his people have been practising terrorism and continue to practise it indiscriminately against the Palestinian people—not only inside the occupied territories but even in the exile and diaspora of the Palestinians, living in tents and huts. Volumes have been written about Israeli terrorism. I would ask the representative of Israel to speak about any other subject except terrorism. For we know so much about it; he knows so much about it; and the world community knows so much about it.

112. The question of the Middle East has been the subject of debate in the General Assembly in the aftermath of Israel's treacherous sneak attack against Egypt, Jordan and Syria at 7.30 on the morning of 5 June 1967. Since that day of perfidy and in spite of numerous Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, Israel has not only remained in occupation of substantial Arab and Palestinian territories, but has also engaged in a systematic programme to colonize and annex those territories, thus posing a grave potential threat to peace and security in the Middle East and far beyond. We are living in an inter-related world, and we should never forget that fact. The passage of time has merely compounded and seen the proliferation of fundamental issues posed by the 1967 aggression, thereby rendering the attainment of a just and lasting peace ever more unachievable: hence the importance of discussing the situation in the Middle East to bring the situation up to date. It is not a ritual; it is not a vain exercise. It is the present and continuing danger to the peace and security of the entire world.

113. Only 10 days ago I had occasion to address the Assembly on the question of Palestine [81st meeting]. Today I shall speak on the situation in the Middle East under item 33 of the agenda as delineated and spelled out in the Secretary-General's report.

114. The two items are naturally and inextricably intertwined and would normally have been discussed as one item. The fact that the question of Palestine is discussed separately is in order to underline categorically and emphatically the centrality of the usurped inalienable rights of the Palestinian people in literally every event, development, turmoil and war which has afflicted the Middle East since the appearance on the scene, early this century, of the alien conspiracy hatched by a handful of fanatical, retrogressive and unscrupulous Zionist manipulators to usurp Palestine—and here I make a distinction between those people and the people who genuinely adhere to the true Judaic faith, which is also a part of our religious and cultural background—the geographical and spiritual heartland of the Middle East and the ancestral homeland of the Palestinian people.

115. To achieve that plan, a grand design had to be implemented, encompassing every country in the region and beyond. There was destabilization. The Israeli representative has been complaining about events in Iraq knowing full well that it was his own people who tried to foment anti-Semitism. Mr. Adis was the leader of that movement because the Zionists wanted to bring the Jews to replace the Palestinians in their homeland. There were brainwashing, deceit, sabotage, terrorism, vivisection, upheavals and even a calculated resort to fomenting anti-Semitism to convert the unenthusiastic—there were many unenthusiastic Jews, including extremely prominent figures in the United States—and the ambivalent and outright opponents in the Jewish communities of the world to this Zionist delirium. Empires were torn asunder. God-made geographic entities which had existed for thousands of years, such as Syria, had to be vivisected, cut up under the Sykes-Picot secret agreement to facilitate the usurpation of the Palestinian homeland.

116. As for the unfortunate conflicts that erupt in and between States adjacent to usurped Palestine, their roots have been pretty well documented, and I have dwelt on them on many occasions, quoting Israeli official sources which leave no room for doubt as to who has been behind the suffering, the turmoil and the bloodshed that, alas, has afflicted the Middle East over the past several decades. Before the advent of Zionism, the Middle East was a region of tranquillity, peace and amity among communities belonging to every religious, ethnic and cultural background. We were one family and we still cherish thoughts of those days.

117. An area of consensus and tranquillity and the cradle of modern civilization has been transformed into an area of dissension, and in practically every instance, setting aside the inevitable pains and stresses of social, cultural and economic transformations from which no area in the world is immune—they occur in every country, whether industrialized or developing—we find a vast litany of Israeli-Zionist machinations and conspiracies that would be too long for me to enumerate. The havoc thus wrought has not only almost devastated two sisterly Arab peoples in the region, namely, the people of Palestine and the people of Lebanon, but has also caused a schism which, I am confident, the 150 million Arabs, with a heightened and more incisive awareness of the plot against their destiny, will sooner rather than later surmount and overcome. Fundamentally there is no such thing as inter-Arab divisiveness. The Arabs are one people belonging to one nation sharing a common origin, system of values, culture, language, cohesion and national aspiration. Whatever conflicts arise stem from varying reactions, responses and approaches as to how best confront a

present and growing Zionist danger. If there is no confluence of appraisal as yet, it will surely come through trial and error and eventual concerted judgement.

118. Let the representative of Israel rest assured that the Arab world views the sustained and unabated Zionist aggression and arrogance with poise, determination and patience, for his authorities have irrevocably chosen the path of blatant challenge and confrontation. I do not know to what extent their acquisition of the weapon of atomic blackmail has to do with that intransigence, but still it is there. But the greater the challenge, the greater will be the response; and years, even decades, are but fleeting moments in the history of encounters between justice and injustice, legality and usurpation. The dimension of time is relative and does not change ultimate realities. Dynamic tension is a sign of strength and not of weakness. Conformism is an attribute of flocks of sheep and not of peoples confronting unprecedented and mortal danger and challenge.

119. The representative of Israel pretends not to know the geopolitical contours of Mandated Palestine, which is hardly surprising. Is it pathetic ignorance or deliberate and vicious distortion when the Israeli representative alleges that the Palestinian Arabs have long enjoyed self-determination in what he calls their own State—the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan? Are peoples, like river beds, amenable to changes of location?

120. I do not need to explain to this learned Assembly—I do so solely to lay bare the virulent distortion of an aggressive Zionist entity—that the land of Mandated Palestine, which had been subjected to the self-confessedly illegal Balfour promise, is very meticulously delineated on highly accurate maps, both by the League of Nations and, subsequently, by the British Mandatory Power, and, lastly, by the United Nations itself, which has those maps in its files and basements here. Its boundaries extend from the Mediterranean and the Egyptian, Syrian and Lebanese borders right up to the River Jordan—and not one inch beyond. The maps of Jordan are equally meticulously delineated by those very same international bodies.

121. Indeed, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan was an independent State before there was ever an Israeli State. When the General Assembly adopted its partition resolution 181 (II), it categorically provided for the establishment of a Palestinian Arab State on Palestinian soil, one much larger than that delineated by the General Armistice Agreement of 1949,² and on Palestinian soil, not on Jordanian soil.

122. Jordan has belonged to its own indigenous people—to the same degree as Mandated Palestine had been the abode of the Palestinian people—from time immemorial, as I explained at length in my statement before the General Assembly only 10 days ago when speaking on the question of Palestine.

123. The fact that Jordan, as a sisterly country, has given temporary refuge to substantial numbers of Palestinians forcibly expelled from their homeland can under no logic or norm mean that a guest, no matter how close, would or should abuse the hospitality of his host, any more than it would mean that those Palestinian victims, whether refugees or displaced persons, had thereby forfeited their inalienable right to return to their homes and homeland in Palestine, as it is properly called, as delineated by the United Nations. I think that by making his

shameful suggestion the Israeli representative has merely laid bare that alien and aggressive entity's designs against both the people of Jordan and the people of Palestine.

124. The mandates under which the Israeli representative takes thinly disguised cover were imposed not only upon Palestine and Jordan, but also upon the Syrian Arab Republic, Lebanon and Iraq. Indeed, Egypt, Morocco, Tunisia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Algeria, the Gulf States and others were under varying forms of protectorates, colonialism and foreign domination, as were many esteemed Members of the United Nations. Does that mean that those countries too are to be usurped or coveted as substitute homelands for the Palestinians? The Palestinian people would not forgo their homeland for the promised Paradise itself. Has Mr. Blum not heard of the glorious process of decolonization over the past quarter of a century? I am certain it was not to his liking, because it exposed and isolated aggressive Israel as the pariah it is in the march of humanity towards liberation and self-determination. Self-determination is not our invention; it was the great Woodrow Wilson who formed that concept as early as the First World War, when he expressed his conviction that war settlements should not end in the colonization of the peoples victimized by those wars. Let me remind the Israeli representative that Britain itself, which had been the illegal donor of the Balfour promise, requested and obtained the approval of the League of Nations to except Jordan as a State and territory from the introduction and application of that lethal Balfour promise in 1922, some 60 years ago, a promise contracted between two individuals.

125. Another Israeli allegation is the preposterous suggestion that the Arab States have an interest in perpetuating the Palestinian people's agony. Does anybody in his right senses believe for a moment, in light of a Zionist onslaught that has already devoured their strategic heartland and its people and that has caused them unspeakable agony and unlimited sacrifices, diverting their resources from building up their developing economies neglected for centuries on end to the purposes of self-defence, that the Arab States have any interest in the perpetuation of the Palestinian catastrophe? Does anyone in his right senses believe that this can ever be the case?

126. The original premises for a settlement of the Middle East situation, namely, Israeli withdrawal from all the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories and the restoration of the full rights of the Palestinian people, have since proliferated into a multiplicity of issues that have profoundly compounded the situation in the Middle East and rendered the prospects for a just and lasting peace ever more unrealizable.

127. The year 1981 has witnessed a qualitative and quantitative escalation of confrontational Israeli policies and actions which can only be termed policies of hegemonism. It has witnessed Israel's striving to subdue to its will by overt and covert action the national policies and decision-making processes of the other States and peoples of the region through blackmail and threats of aggression beyond the territories already under occupation and colonization. That such policies are destined to suffer a crushing defeat has not, as yet, been a deterrent to their continuance.

128. I shall cite a number of actions that manifestly prove that Israel has adopted a policy of colonial hegemonism to which expression is conclusively being

given, by word and deed, in the region of the Middle East.

129. First, the unprecedented sneak attack in June of this year against the Iraqi nuclear installation, Osirak, devoted solely to scientific research and peaceful purposes. Inasmuch as Iraq has signed and ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] and has subjected its nuclear research facilities to regular international control and inspection, that attack, though universally condemned, has seriously undermined the foundations upon which non-proliferation is predicated.

130. As if this were not enough, the Israeli authorities have openly and audaciously declared their determination to carry out similar aggression against any new nuclear research facilities—more than 1,000 kilometres away—which will be established in Iraq and even beyond, in countries opposed to Israeli aggression and expansion. Israel, as we all know, has adamantly refused to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and is bent on maintaining nuclear monopoly and blackmail. This is not only aggression against Iraq and the Middle East but is equally an attack against the community of nations, which refuses to be blackmailed by atomic power or any other lethal weapon.

131. Secondly, 1981 has witnessed a serious escalation in Israeli aggression against the sisterly State of Lebanon and its Palestinian refugee guest population. Attacks by air, from the sea and on the ground became almost daily occurrences, to the point where the media almost ceased reporting them until they had escalated to a virtual 14-day war, in which the firepower, including incendiary and cluster bombs, which Israel's military arsenal unleashed exceeded that of the latest of regional wars.

132. That the aggression failed to weaken the resolve of the will of the Palestinian and Lebanese defenders should be a lesson to the Israelis that their victims will never be intimidated by Israel's policies of occupation, usurpation and hegemonism. They are willing to perish rather than accept injustice. That must be understood by the Israeli leadership. The defenders are willing to settle for a just and lasting peace, but they will never accept an unjust peace. They would rather perish.

133. Thirdly, there is the audacious claim by Israel to arrogate unto itself the aggressive role of policing the skies of adjacent countries—Lebanon, Syria, possibly Jordan and Saudi Arabia. Israel's overflights have been carried out systematically and openly. It has even created an atrocious crisis over the deployment of purely defensive Syrian missiles, a mere score of miles from the heart of Damascus, with the sole aim of asserting its hegemony over two independent sovereign States—Syria and Lebanon. To deceive the world the Israelis talk about that deployment of defensive anti-aircraft missiles as though it were the famous missile crisis of the early 1960s, which could possibly have involved a nuclear war.

134. The Israeli insistence on removal of defensive missiles must also be viewed in the light of Israel's openly declared determination to launch yet another massive attack against Lebanon, Palestinian refugees and Syria some time in 1982. It evidently dreams of having a free ride in dumping its deadly weapons without paying the cost of its aggression. If that is not a quest for hegemony, what is? What meaning is left to our lives, to our dignity, to

our freedom in the entire region if we are to accept this Israeli *diktat*?

135. Fourthly, there was Israel's decision in 1981 to construct, unilaterally and in defiance of all norms of international law, a canal linking the Mediterranean and the Dead Sea. This is a blatant act of aggression against the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan as well as the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. A whole country and people—I am now talking about the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan—can be as effectively decimated by rendering their lands non-arable and their water saline for many generations to come as by atomic devastation. The General Assembly has condemned this destructive and unilateral project. That condemnation was all but unanimous, the exceptions being Israel and the United States. We are grateful to all the Member States which have scrupulously and with integrity respected the norms of international law and justice and asserted life affirmation without any regard to extraneous and malign influences.

136. Fifthly, even though we regard the Camp David accord on the fate of the Palestinian people as stillborn, dead and undeserving even of mention, and in spite of the fact that the United Nations has categorically rejected it as a liquidation of Palestinian rights and acquiescence in perpetual Israeli occupation, colonization and annexation, my delegation feels impelled to reiterate its categorical and irreversible rejection, in view of continued assertions by Israel and its supporters that it is the only framework for solving the Palestinian problem, which is the core of the Middle East situation. The party most directly concerned—the Palestinian people, whose sole legitimate representative is the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO]—has rejected it outright, both within the occupied territories and in the diaspora.

137. No Palestinian, no Arab, would ever sign a document which prescribes Palestinian obliteration. No individual would ever countenance the alienation of Jerusalem, which is the soul of our entire legacy and that of other great religions and which embodies Palestinian habitation in Jerusalem and Palestine over 6,000 to 7,000 years since the Jebusites, a branch of the Canaanites, built the Holy City with their own sweat and toil.

138. Many people are confused about the Begin plan, or what is called the Camp David accord, on the future of the Palestinians. Why is it that the Palestinian people, who are under occupation and suffering, and the Arab countries, which have all the interest in the world in solving the problem justly and devoting their energies to something else, have rejected it? I feel compelled to repeat the question. Why is it that the people whom the Camp David accord on the future of the Palestinians is supposed to benefit are rejecting it outright?

139. One reason is that the accord is a *de facto* perpetuation and legalization of the existing *status quo* of military occupation masquerading under a deceptive, and to the world somewhat more palatable, term of "autonomy" or "self rule". It would maintain Israel's military occupation and official annexation of the Arab sector of Jerusalem, the rest of the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and, of course, the Golan Heights, although the Golan Heights is not mentioned in the accord. Under the plan Israel would continue to assume responsibility not only for external security but also for internal police duties. A few military governors would presumably lose the dubious glamour of being called military governors. They would not have the shining stars, but they would still be gover-

nors and would continue to assume the powers of such positions under a different guise. The mayors would, of course, continue to take care of the water systems, the sewerage and other municipal functions, which they are doing already. But what military governor would want to do that in the first place? If I were a military governor I should want someone else to do the job of looking after those menial tasks.

140. Secondly, Israel would continue to exercise veto power—as a matter of fact, more than veto power—over the repatriation of Palestinians from their dispersal. This includes the almost 1 million inhabitants of Arab Jerusalem, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip who have become displaced persons since 1967, not to mention the 1,750,000 Palestinian refugees, who would be completely left out in the wilderness of their diaspora. The rights of those victimized people to repatriation or compensation are covered by General Assembly resolution 194 (III), which was introduced by the United States in 1948 and which is sponsored and reiterated every year by the United States and passed unanimously by the General Assembly.

141. Thirdly, the administrative council proposed under the self-rule plan would have no jurisdiction or authority over Israeli settlers who have already colonized the heartland of East Jerusalem and the West Bank. Thus, the Israeli settlers in those areas would enjoy extraterritorial privileges, which may have belonged to the age of colonialism but are totally anathema in the post-decolonization era of the present. Thus, the Palestinian problem and catastrophe is reduced by a single stroke to a matter of municipal autonomy in one small segment of 1948-mandated Palestine and to one small portion of the Palestinian people. Why, then, this plan? I know that it was floated in 1974 by Mr. Shimon Peres when he was Minister of Defence long before there was a Camp David accord. He discussed this with all the mayors and leaders of the occupied territories, in all likelihood to separate the 1.3 million Palestinian Arabs from the mainstream of life by offering them an option of acquiring Jordanian or Israeli citizenship, without Jordan even being present to offer or withhold such citizenship, and to cordon off those people into reservations like the bantustans so as to complete the colonization of their territories until such time as life became so untenable and oppressive and forbidding that the Palestinian inhabitants either vanished through natural attrition or were forced by various means to leave their ancestral homeland.

142. Theoretically, Palestinians in the occupied territories would be able under the self-rule plan to settle in Israel and Israelis in East Jerusalem, the West Bank and Gaza. But ask any ordinary Palestinian about this seemingly generous offer and he will tell you that it is devoid of meaning, for he knows that practically all land in Israel has been made a State domain and is therefore inalienable, or is in the ownership of the Keren-Kayemeth, the Histadrut and other arms of the State of Israel. In the fertile triangle plains which were taken over by Israel in 1949 and where the inhabitants remained, Israel confiscated 90 per cent of their land. They are resilient, high-quality farmers, and one of them told a West Banker: "If only we were allowed not to take back, but to purchase back, the 90 per cent confiscated from us, we could buy our land back with the proceeds of a few years of the 10 per cent which has been left to us". The same applies to Galilee and other places where there is Arab habitation.

143. Peace could be achieved within 24 hours, with the details to be worked out in due course among the parties, if the Israeli leadership terminated its agonizing over the question of "Israel" or "imperial Israel". Are they willing to live and let live, or are they not? Armaments will never provide a final answer to this tragic and potentially catastrophic dilemma. What will provide the answer is a fundamental reappraisal of Israel's innermost attitude.

144. Fourthly, the Palestinian people has always played pivotal roles in all the larger conglomerates of which they were an important part. They sent congressmen, ministers, high military commanders and high spiritual dignitaries to the seat of the empire in Istanbul. Before the era of the Mandate, their independence was recognized by the League of Nations, the British Mandatory Power and the United Nations. They will never settle for the status of satellite home rule, to look after garbage and cleaning streets, to which the Israelis wish to doom them. And besides, a settlement *ipso facto* implies agreement and consent. If the idea is to impose a meaningless and denigrating settlement by force, then no agreement is needed because military occupation has already imposed it and it is therefore totally unacceptable under any circumstances. Why do the Israelis want our signature? They are in occupation of the territories.

145. Fifthly, all other relatively feasible solutions have been consistently and adamantly shot down by the Israelis. If hegemony is what the Israelis are after, then they should concede that fact and cease talking, with their love of rhetoric, about peace.

146. Sixthly, the latest and potentially the most dangerous development in the Middle East situation has been the signing of a strategic alliance agreement between the United States and Israel. Which Israel? Nobody knows. I do not. What are its boundaries? Nobody knows—not even the Israelis, whose penchant for expansion is displayed on the walls of the Knesset, showing Israel extending from the Nile to the Euphrates. The official platform of the Herut Party, whose Chairman is the Prime Minister of Israel, Menachem Begin, speaks of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan as part of Israel. And yet, the Israeli representative alleges and claims that the PLO is out to destroy Israel, forgetting that Begin himself, the Prime Minister of Israel, has not only achieved the destruction of the Palestinian people, but is also planning to attain the adjacent territory of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. Has anybody asked this pertinent question?

147. Such being the case, any strategic alliance between the United States, a super-Power, and an unidentified Israel, in unlawful occupation of Palestinian and Arab territories, is tantamount to acquiescence in and support for Israeli aggression, regardless of how extensive or limited such co-operation would eventually turn out to be. It was a framework—nobody knows how extensive or limited it could be. It is a hostile act against the entire region of the Middle East and particularly against the victimized Palestinians of the occupied territories and far beyond, and portends the most dangerous consequences to the peace and stability not only of the area, but of the world at large. This is because it is inevitably going to bring about a polarization in the Middle East which the non-aligned movement has been trying to avert since its creation in the early 1960s.

Mr. Kittani (Iraq) took the Chair.

148. It is startling, to say the least, that a super-Power would throw its weight behind a country which is already

condemned for its unlawful occupation of other peoples' territories and whose appetite for further expansion is insatiable and avowed.

149. To put what I mean in concrete terms and give the General Assembly a feeling of what is happening on a daily basis—because we have been discussing the question to the point where familiarity perhaps does not convey the true situation—I have chosen at random three areas of ongoing and relentless colonization—news about which I have only received today—as well as bestial treatment meted out to the citizens of the occupied territories.

150. On colonization, Abraham Rabinovich, editor of *The Jerusalem Post*, wrote the following on 20 November 1981. He stated that plans are being prepared to establish at least one major urban conglomerate outside the boundaries of the city of Jerusalem. He added that this location reflects the absence of any co-ordination in the intensive planning efforts which are at present under way for the district of Jerusalem and its environs, which the Israeli refers to as a metropolitan area, by a multiplicity of agencies. There are probably seven agencies engaged in this task.

151. The writer adds that those responsible for expansion of colonization of a city and its environs, including governmental personnel, are warning that the future of the demographically and politically unique character of Jerusalem is exposed to serious danger in the light of the thrust to concentrate the colonization effort outside the area of expanded Jerusalem itself.

152. An official Government spokesman disclosed this week that plans have been prepared to construct a large urban centre which would accommodate thousands of colonizers in the village of Anata, which is less than one kilometre from the French Hill to the north of Jerusalem. He added that several thousand other units have been allocated to the colony of Pesagot, which will be constructed adjacent to the Arab city of Al Bireh, the twin city of the Arab city of Ramallah, in the heartland of the West Bank to the north of Jerusalem. The Chief City Planner, Amnon Neeve, stated that he has recently learned that 6,000 additional colonization units are in the stage of preparation, to be constructed in the Arab village of Anata, within the occupied West Bank. He added that even though the Israeli occupation authorities had approved the Anata project half a year ago, the Department of Settlement had not disclosed the details of the plan, including the number of units planned for construction, which would possibly exceed more than 6,000 housing units, three times the existing units in the massive residential quarter on the French Hill to the north of Jerusalem, but within Jerusalem.

153. He further added that the colony of Pesagot, which is at present the district centre of the area and which comprises 500 units, will be expanded in the future.

154. The Israeli occupation authorities—I am not going to go into more detail—also decided on the establishment of 20 new colonies during the next two years on the Arab lands of Galilee, the Syrian Golan Heights, the Negev and the West Bank. This plan is called the Karmim project. It includes two new colonies on the mountains of Hebron, and other colonies—and I do not need to mention their names.

155. Yahuda Dekel, the new Director General of the New Settlement Department of the Jewish Agency, declared that the Agency is planning to establish five additional Israeli agricultural and collective projects along the mountains of Hebron.

156. The movement Agudat Israel has this year constructed a new collective colony in the Arab area of Latrun, having demolished the three major villages in that area immediately after 1967.

157. The Israeli occupation authorities are also planning to construct a large settlement colony to the south of the city of Hebron within the overall colonization programme which aims at establishing six additional colonies, the implementation of which started in 1970.

158. The Settlement Department in the Jewish Agency has adopted a detailed programme for the settlement of an additional 100,000 Jews in the West Bank during the coming four years.

159. With these ongoing colonies, the plan is to settle more than one million Jewish colonists by the year 2010. Is this the Israel with which the United States has agreed to enter into a strategic alliance? If the Americans in general, whom I know to be decent people, knew these ugly facts, they would certainly be shocked.

160. I have received only today a letter which I think will show you the real face of Israel. It is from Bir Zeit University, and presumably sent by a non-Palestinian, possibly an American. With the President's permission and indulgence, I shall read it:

"Bir Zeit University remains closed. Despite mounting international and local indignation and protest, the Israeli military authorities are still pursuing their policy of collective punishment and repression of academic freedom. As part of this escalation, the closure of Bir Zeit University has been followed by a systematic campaign of harassment and intimidation directed against members of the administration, faculty, and student body. On November 9, only five days after the closure, Dr. Gabi Baramki, Vice-President, was summoned by the Military Governor to Ramallah Military Headquarters at 10.00 p.m. He was released around midnight and asked to report the next morning. When he did, he was placed under town arrest in Ramallah and was told not to hold any meetings or attend any functions related to the University during the closure period. Other members of the University Council (the University administrative body which includes all vice-presidents and deans) were also detained at different hours the same night. Dr. Izzat Ghurani, Vice-President for Financial and Administrative Affairs, was placed under house arrest for three days. Ramzi Rihan, Assistant to the Vice-President/Academic Affairs, was placed under town arrest in Nablus. All three, as well as the deans of colleges in the University, were told not to hold or attend meetings or perform any functions related to the University.

"Individual faculty members were also harassed; as an example the University faculty apartments were raided on the night of November 14 by army and plainclothes personnel, terrifying the residents who happened to be American nationals. In addition, other members were detained and/or interrogated, or placed under town arrest.

"The students, however, fared the worst. Members of the Student Council were hunted down one by one and detained; they were subsequently placed under town and/or house arrest at the towns of their residence and ordered to report daily to their local police stations. Some who were not immediately found suffered the further injury of having their parents mistreated or detained in their place until the students themselves were located. In at least two instances, it was confirmed that the students were badly beaten. The President of the Student Council, Mufid Abed-Rabbo, is still in detention, without any charges filed against him. Such actions are not isolated instances of repression and intimidation directed solely against the Bir Zeit University community; rather, they are concrete examples of a determined campaign which seeks to undermine existing Palestinian institutions and prevent the development of others—in essence, to deny the Palestinian people their right to self-determination.

"In response to an order by the Supreme Court, which convened at the request of a member of the faculty and three students, the Military Governor of Ramallah, Colonel Shmuel Penial (Shmulick), 'limited' the period of closure to two months as of 4 November. Also in compliance with the same court order Shmulick later detailed in writing the 'reasons' for the closure. It is unfortunate that cultural and educational activities such as the annual Palestine Week and the ongoing Adult Education (Literacy) Programme were viewed as subversive activities by the military authorities. Previous closures were also cited as justification, although no system in the world condones 'double penalty', and no form of logic justifies an error (or an oppression) by citing others. Furthermore, unsupported accusations of political activity and incitement were levelled against the administration, the faculty and the Student Council in generalized abstractions that bear no relationship to objective reality. Predictably, the whole document is dominated by the parroting of traditional Israeli propaganda which presents Bir Zeit University as a 'centre and source of incitement and instigation of the area as an expression of its active resistance to the Military Governor and the State of Israel'.

"Again, the Israeli military authorities have distorted reality in an attempt to justify their arbitrary actions and repressive policies. They have ignored not only the widespread resistance to the occupation which has swept through the whole occupied territories, but also the academic functions and integrity of the oldest academic institution in the area. The occupation authorities delude themselves in attempting to deceive the rest of the world by projecting a false image. Furthermore, such rationalizations cannot disguise the fact that the occupation is the cause of trouble in the area and not Palestinian institutions or individuals.

"Your solidarity with Bir Zeit University and your efforts to reopen the University are a significant contribution to the cause of academic freedom and internationally recognized human rights. We call upon you to intensify your efforts to get the University reopened and to protest the Israeli policy of harassment and intimidation."

161. We have already witnessed, during the debates on the items pertaining to the Middle East, how mechanically, automatically and consistently the United States and Israel have voted in confluence and in isolation, regardless of the merits of any and all cases.

162. It is a tragedy of the first degree that the area of the Middle East, which has had a long and very warm relationship with the United States, should find itself in an adversary position because of myopic policies being pursued against its people. It is also a tragedy of the first degree that the Middle East, which has every potential for pursuing peaceful development and progress, should find itself, against its will, an arena of world power conflict.

163. The situation in the Middle East, which was initially debated in the context of ending the consequences of Israel's aggression of 1967, has taken a precipitous turn for the worse. The stage has been set for a collision course whose consequences the year 1982 might begin to disclose.

164. Mr. THUNBORG (Sweden): Once again we are debating the situation in the Middle East. We have been doing so ever since the United Kingdom decided to relinquish its Mandate over Palestine in 1947. No other question has attracted so much attention and brought about so much action in the United Nations. My own country, Sweden, has been actively involved ever since the creation of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine in 1947, with Judge Sandstrom as its Chairman. Count Bernadotte, Secretary-General Hammarskjöld, Ambassador Jarring, Commissioner-General Rydbeck and thousands of Swedes serving with the United Nations peace-keeping operations in the area have in different ways been engaged in efforts to solve that problem. So have many others.

165. This year, at least nine items on the agenda of the General Assembly are devoted exclusively to the Middle East problem, and we all know that that is only the tip of the iceberg. A great many other agenda items lend themselves easily to a Middle East debate here, as also in many of the meetings of the specialized agencies and special United Nations conferences. This time and effort should be used constructively and in support of the peace-making process.

166. The problem may seem to have been the same ever since 1947—how to reconcile Jewish and Arab claims to the same territory and how to make the peoples in the region live peacefully side by side. But every year in which the conflict has remained unresolved new aspects have been added to the old problem. This year we are faced with the Israeli attack on the nuclear installation in Baghdad, which my Government considers a flagrant violation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the rule of international law, and with the Israeli project to construct a canal from the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea through the occupied Gaza Strip, which would clearly go beyond the rights of an occupying Power.

167. On the more positive side, we welcome the continuing normalization of relations between Israel and Egypt and the cease-fire on the border between Israel and Lebanon. These two developments are certainly for the better, but neither of them is good enough. The Camp David agreement, which is the basis for the normalization between Israel and Egypt, also contains stipulations for full autonomy regarding the West Bank and Gaza. Little progress has been made on this vital issue, and the parties still seem far from an agreement. In the meantime policies pursued by Israel in the occupied territories, including the eastern part of Jerusalem, continue to cause concern to the international community. Israel's settlements policy in the occupied territories in violation of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Per-

sons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,³ constitutes a serious obstacle to the peace process. A dismantling of the illegal settlements on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip would be a constructive step.

168. The rights of civilians in these territories must also be upheld in accordance with the Geneva Convention, and the Israeli authorities should take measures to eliminate breaches of human rights. Ill treatment of citizens in the area, as well as the increasing number of Jewish settlements, raise serious doubts as to Israeli intentions for the future of the occupied territories and their Palestinian population. The same goes for the occupied Golan Heights.

169. Similarly, the cease-fire along the Israeli-Lebanon border does not solve the tragic situation in which Lebanon finds itself and the end of which is difficult to see before there is a viable solution of the Palestinian question.

170. Violence and terrorism against civilians committed by any side of the conflict can never be condoned, be it against Arab or against Jew, against refugee camp or against kibbutz. But the argument that one cannot negotiate with people who are responsible for terrorism is not one that stands the test of history. Neither do we accept the theory that in the days of modern weaponry any border can remain secure without international recognition.

171. A final peace settlement can be reached only in negotiations between all parties concerned. That is to say that Israel and the PLO must face each other at the negotiating table. We urge them to do so. The PLO, for its part, must recognize Israel's right to exist within secure and recognized borders. Israel, on the other hand, must recognize the legitimate national rights of the Palestinians, including their right to establish, should they so wish, an independent State.

172. We believe that Israel has both a right and a duty to live in peace with its Arab neighbours. We believe also that if the Palestinians' exercise of their right to self-determination should result in the establishment of an independent State, that Palestinian State would have the same duty and right to live in peace with its Israeli neighbour. In this light we would plead with the parties to study carefully those diplomatic initiatives which are now coming forth from various quarters on the basis of the eminently relevant, although incomplete, Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), in order to bring about a comprehensive settlement. Efforts that bear within them many of the elements vital to a just and peaceful settlement, such as the Saudi Arabian initiative, deserve a better fate than implacable rejection. It should be clear that no peaceful progress is possible without compromise. There is no alternative to negotiations but violence and war, and we would think that the parties should by now have realized how little closer to a lasting solution of their dispute another war could bring them.

173. Mr. SIRCAR (Bangladesh): Last month, in Bangladesh, we were able, in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of Bangladesh, to hold presidential elections in our country. In one of the first statements issued by the newly elected President of Bangladesh, Justice Abdus Sattar, he said that there would be no change in Bangladesh's foreign policy. Therefore, my presence in the United Nations within a fortnight of the formation of the new Government is to underscore primarily three points.

174. First, we maintain continuity in our foreign policy. Secondly, we emphasize our firm conviction of the importance of the United Nations as a forum and a body for maintaining international peace and security and upholding the principles embodied in the Charter, not least amongst which is the right of peoples to self-determination. Thirdly, we reaffirm our solidarity with our Arab brethren and support oppressed peoples throughout the world waging a just struggle against imperialism, colonialism or racialism; we wish to consolidate, preserve and strengthen fraternal relations among Moslem countries based on Islamic solidarity as incorporated in article 25 of the Constitution of the People's Republic of Bangladesh and to emphasize Bangladesh's strong commitment to solving the Middle East problem on the basis of the various resolutions of the United Nations—in particular, resolution 3236 (XXIX) and subsequent resolutions of the General Assembly on Palestine and the Middle East.

175. What we find of particular concern is that, far from any progress having been made to resolve the Middle East problem, the situation in the region has further deteriorated. Peace hangs in the balance. We have seen one act of naked aggression follow another. The repeated acts of wanton aggression committed by Israel against the people and State of Lebanon, the acts of terrorism and cruelty inflicted on the local Arab population in Israel and the occupied territories and the barbaric attack on the Iraqi nuclear plant are all clear indications of Israel's deliberate plan to heighten tension in the region and to ensure that any efforts to solve the Middle East problem peacefully are rapidly drowned in a wave of war hysteria. The State of Israel, by its every action, is the very antithesis of peace. Nothing makes this more apparent than its wanton disregard for the United Nations and the resolutions of the United Nations, its wanton disregard for international public opinion, its wanton disregard for basic human conduct.

176. The State of Israel has arrogated to itself the right to decide what is right and what is wrong—arrogated to itself the right to deny the undeniable to the Palestinian people, on whose very land it has created its State. While Israel has shown no reticence in committing acts of international terrorism and ruthless persecution of Arabs in occupied territories and the desecration of Moslem Holy Places, it has refused to acknowledge the true and internationally accepted representative of the Palestinian people, the PLO, on the pretext that the members of the PLO, which has championed the cause of the Palestinian people, are terrorists, when in fact the world sees them as heroic freedom fighters.

177. The Middle East problem continues to be the most critical test of the credibility and viability of the world community of nations. As the Secretary-General said in his report on the work of the Organization:

“The situation in the Middle East with all its complexities and ramifications continues to be of central concern to the entire international community, containing as it does an explosive potential of conflict endangering world peace.” [A/36/1, sect. IV.]

178. For more than 30 years the United Nations has grappled with the Middle East problem, seeking to cure what it had failed to prevent: the virtual imposition of an alien people upon the Arab world through the creation of Israel.

179. Bangladesh's stand on the Middle East question is unequivocal and consistent; it is not based on political expediency. Our consistent position stems from our firm belief in the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. It is founded on our enduring commitment to the cause of oppressed peoples all over the world struggling to free themselves from the bondage of colonialism, aggression and exploitation—peoples engaged in establishing their inalienable right to self-determination, national freedom and political independence. It is rooted in the ideals of tolerance and the conviction that men and women of all religions, of all races, can live together in an environment of peace, justice and equality. It is geared to upholding the right of every people freely to determine and build up its own social, economic and political system by ways and means of its own free choice.

180. To that end, Bangladesh views the essentials of any meaningful peace plan in the Middle East as a composite whole—as a comprehensive settlement—every part thereof being integrally related to the other.

181. It is now universally recognized that the core of the Middle East question—the cause and essence of the problem—revolves around the legitimate rights and aspirations of the Palestinian people. As President Abdus Sattar of Bangladesh stated in his message on the occasion of the special meeting to commemorate the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People:

“The Palestinian situation continues to challenge the international community as a major test of the credibility and capacity of the United Nations in pursuit of its fundamental responsibility for preserving peace and security in the world. No other problem has provoked so much thought, unleashed so much indignation or polarized the emotions of nations and individuals alike. It is our duty to promote a lasting and durable peace. If the peace is to endure it must be based on justice, and justice demands the redressing of all wrongs done contrary to international law and adherence to the norms and principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter and to the establishment of fundamental rights.

“There cannot be any doubt that the people of Palestine are a definite political entity. To ignore their presence is to discount a reality recognized by the overwhelming majority of States and, indeed, all mankind. Thus the fundamental element of a durable and permanent Middle East peace revolves around the recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to a State of their own in their own homeland.”

182. The problem of the Middle East is that of a people deprived of their natural birthright, dispossessed of their lands and forcibly uprooted by aliens. It is essentially a problem of restoring the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. It is not only their land that has been unjustly taken away, but their right to live as a free and independent people with a sense of dignity as members of a sovereign State, a right which has been freely acknowledged in the case of the States Members of the United Nations. Yet, in spite of all the resolutions we have adopted in previous years, we have denied to the Palestinian people this basic right, which is in consonance with the principles of the Charter. In essence this is a political problem: the struggle of a people for their right to self-determination and the achievement of their legitimate national rights.

183. The tragedy of this situation has been compounded by the fact that this reality has been deliberately obscured and diffused by treating the problem not as a political one but as an essentially humanitarian one. For 25 years the United Nations itself persisted in this fictional approach, ignoring the rights of the people, their existence as an entity and their status as a people and treating them with the indignity of helpless refugees permanently dislodged and dependent on charitable dole. Those who remained behind in the territory or who became victims of further illegal conquest were systematically reduced to the status of second-class citizens under the glare of the permanent suspicion of an armed occupation.

184. It was not until 1974 that the General Assembly, after a quarter-century of diffused and piecemeal deliberations on the problem of Palestine, finally dealt with the question in its totality, encompassing all its aspects: historical, political and juridical. By an overwhelming endorsement, in its resolution 3237 (XXIX) the Assembly recognized the right of the Palestinian people to present their own case and participate in the deliberations through their duly recognized and acknowledged representatives, the PLO, representatives who have secured for themselves such specific recognition as full membership in the non-aligned movement, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the League of Arab States, and, through resolution 3237 (XXIX), the status of observer at the United Nations.

185. Today there can be no doubt that the people of Palestine are a definite political entity. To ignore their presence is to discount a reality recognized by the overwhelming majority of States. To dismiss their cause and their existence would have incalculable consequences for a Middle East peace.

186. Thus, the fundamental element, the cornerstone of a durable and permanent Middle East peace revolves around the assurance of the rights of the Palestinian people in Palestine to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty and the rights of the Palestinians to return to their homes and property, from which they have been displaced and uprooted. The Palestinian people must remain a principal party to any Middle East peace settlement.

187. The second basic imperative for a permanent peace settlement revolves around the occupied territories. The maintenance of the present *status quo* is absolutely untenable. It is essentially a *de facto* and illegal situation, based on the unacceptable premise of occupation by conquest. *Ex post facto* rationalization predicated on security interests or claims of legitimacy derived from some ancient biblical link can have dangerous and unpredictable consequences. In a situation of conquest, attempts to legitimize such conquest through transactions for purchase of land, through payment of compensation or through acquisition by other normal means cannot be recognized to have even a minimum degree of validity. If recognition were given to them, this would inevitably change the map of the world. Such claims constitute a dangerous precedent which would nullify the fundamental injunction of the Charter against the acquisition of territory by force.

188. Israel's continued indiscriminate justification of its occupation on security grounds has arbitrarily converted an exception into a rule of conduct. It negates the letter and spirit of the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907,⁴ respecting the laws and customs of war on land, and the

Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949.³ The measures now being taken by the occupying Power appear no longer to be even remotely relevant to security considerations. The encouragement and sanction given to the establishment of new settlements, the prospective plan for a network of such settlements and the belated attempts to justify legal claims to those territories based on the precedent of ancient history are clear indications that Israel is bent on a policy of expansionism through what is known as creeping annexation.

189. It is not my intention to dwell at any length on the scale and degree to which Israel has violated the human rights of the inhabitants of the occupied territories. This has already been the subject of discussion elsewhere. Suffice it to say that international law considers occupation by force to be totally illegal. But Israel has remained by force in these lands for a full 14 years now and has been taking measures of a permanent nature through the pursuit of a policy incompatible with its obligation as an occupying Power and contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

190. It follows, therefore, that the second essential premise for a Middle East settlement is the withdrawal from all territories occupied by Israel since June 1967, the return of the Palestinians to their homeland and the restoration of their rights and properties, and the restitution to the Palestinians of their inalienable rights to self-determination and to a State of their own in their homeland. No exception to this can be brooked, for the consequences would make a mockery of the most fundamental injunction of the Charter—prohibiting the acquisition of territory by force.

191. A third intrinsic element for any comprehensive programme for peace is the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem under Arab sovereignty. This, as is well known, touches the sensibilities not only of the Arab nations but of the entire Moslem community of 800 million people and, beyond, to hundreds of millions of Christians.

192. Bangladesh believes that those are the three fundamental foundations for a Middle East settlement—the content and substance of peace with justice. Without their fulfilment, a comprehensive peace will remain impossible to attain.

193. The situation in the Middle East is explosive. The international community must exert all its efforts towards finding a just solution. The more this is delayed, the more intractable will the problem become, posing a threat to international peace and security. It is therefore incumbent on all parties concerned to act, and act decisively, with a view to reaching a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem.

194. Mr. KLESTIL (Austria): The Middle East remains one of the most dangerous crisis areas of the world. The political and human dimensions of this conflict, which pits two peoples violently against each other, and its dangerous global impact on international relations became evident long ago. Today we are all aware of the threat to the security and peace of the international community inherent in this conflict.

195. When we discuss the situation in the Middle East we have to address several different issues which interact dynamically. It is indeed this interaction which makes the Middle East more explosive than ever.

196. The key word, whenever we speak of a solution to the Middle East conflict, is that it has to be a "just" solution. Such a solution to the Middle East conflict requires, first of all, recognition of the right of all States in the area, including Israel, to exist within secure and recognized boundaries and recognition of the national rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to have a State of their own. We wish to emphasize that there exists on this issue a broad international consensus which encompasses the nations of Western Europe.

197. In our view the Palestinian people furthermore have the right to participate in the search for a solution to the Middle East question. They have the right to take part in this process through representatives of their own choice. As a consequence, the Austrian Government recognizes the PLO as the representative of the Palestinian people.

198. Another essential element of a solution is the withdrawal of Israel from the territories occupied in 1967, including Jerusalem.

199. Austria has joined in the international consensus that Israel's policy in the territories occupied since 1967 is in contravention of the Geneva Convention,³ which defines the rights and duties of military occupation. The continuous expansion of the Israeli settlements, the expropriation of land for this purpose, the eviction and displacement of the local population and the expulsion and imprisonment of elected officials are in violation of international law.

200. Austria has consistently maintained the view that a just and comprehensive solution to the Middle East problem can best be achieved through negotiations between all the parties concerned, including the PLO.

201. We reiterate our call upon Israel and the Palestinian people to enter, without pre-conditions, into exploratory talks between representatives chosen by each side. Such talks should eventually lead to a comprehensive settlement. We are aware of the obstacles on both sides to engaging in such talks, but we are confident that they can and will be overcome.

202. Many efforts in the search for a solution have been undertaken within the framework of the United Nations—in the General Assembly and in the Security Council—as well as outside the Organization.

203. The Camp David accords have brought about a peace process between Israel and Egypt which is now a reality. In this context we wish to pay a special tribute to the memory of the late President Anwar El Sadat.

204. A comprehensive settlement, however, requires further steps. Most recently, we have followed with great interest and attention the submission of an eight-point programme by Prince Fahd ibn Abdul Aziz of Saudi Arabia.⁵ We have welcomed this step as an important Arab proposal constituting a valuable framework for the search for peace.

205. I should like to point to the efforts of the European Community in the terms of the Venice Declaration.⁶ The dialogue initiated between the Community and the parties to the conflict can only contribute to a better understanding of the respective positions.

206. Those initiatives and efforts serve a constructive purpose. There is no alternative to dialogue and negotiation, and for this reason we hope that all these endeavours will be continued and will eventually lead to the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

207. The resort to violence and the use of force can only aggravate the situation and lead to further violence, thus creating new obstacles on the road to peace. Therefore, we reject unequivocally any use of force whatsoever by any side.

208. Austria clearly condemned the air attack carried out by Israel against the nuclear installations in Iraq and the air attacks against Beirut as most serious violations of international law. Austria cannot accept the argument of the right to pre-emptive retaliation which was put forward by Israel in justification of those acts.

209. In this context, I should like to state that Austria also condemns all acts of terrorism intended to sabotage the promotion of a peaceful and just solution of the Middle East problem.

210. At this moment, when so much attention is focused on promoting negotiation, it is imperative that all parties to the conflict, but especially Israel and the Palestinian people, refrain from all actions which might further aggravate the situation and endanger the prospects of a negotiated settlement.

211. For historical and geographical reasons, Europe's relations with the Middle East—a region where today old civilizations are experiencing an intellectual, political and economic revival—have been and will continue to be close and intense. Mutually constructive relations depend on the stability of this region; therefore, a just and lasting solution to the Middle East conflict must be found for the benefit of all people.

212. We are aware of how difficult it is to reverse a process of mutual fear and distrust, but we also know that it is a highly dangerous illusion for any party in this conflict to believe that advantageous and lasting results can be obtained more easily by force and confrontation than by negotiation.

213. Every party to the conflict has to be guided by self-restraint, taking into account the interests of others. We trust that on the basis of this recognition the political will and courage will be found to put a stop to the vicious circle which has kept this region in turmoil for so long.

214. Mr. NISIBORI (Japan): As a country which seeks its own security and prosperity in the context of world stability and peace, Japan is always attentive to developments in the Middle East. In the year since the General Assembly last considered the situation in the Middle East various incidents have occurred in the region, and there are as yet no prospects of the restoration of stability there. The Government of Japan deeply regrets that this unstable situation persists.

215. This year we have witnessed an alarming deterioration in conditions in southern Lebanon. The unstable situation there is, of course, closely related to the achievement of peace in the Middle East. Japan urges once again that the parties concerned, including Israel and the PLO, refrain from the use of force and that all parties respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of

Lebanon. We hope that the present cease-fire, based on an extremely delicate balance of relations, will be consolidated and that the problem will be settled by peaceful means, in conformity with world opinion as unanimously expressed in Security Council resolution 490 (1981).

216. Tensions in the Middle East were further heightened when in June of this year Israel undertook the outrageous act of bombing an Iraqi nuclear reactor, violating international law and the Charter of the United Nations. This act also constituted a challenge to the efforts of countries promoting the peaceful use of atomic energy while committed to nuclear non-proliferation. Japan strongly condemns this act and calls on Israel to accede in good faith to Security Council resolution 487 (1981), which was adopted unanimously and contains the minimum demands of world opinion.

217. In reviewing the events of the past year, we were deeply saddened by the tragic death of Egypt's President Anwar El Sadat. It is Japan's sincere hope that the cause of peace to which President Sadat dedicated his life will continue to be vigorously pursued there.

218. The continued fighting between Iran and Iraq is another source of deep concern, and we urge these two countries to cease fighting without delay and to settle the conflict by peaceful means, in accordance with the principles of the Charter. To this end, we hope they will cooperate further in the conciliation efforts of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, the non-aligned countries and the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

219. Most of the incidents which have taken place in the Middle East during this past year must be seen in the light of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Japan believes that only honest effort based upon mutual confidence among the parties concerned can lead to the achievement of a just, lasting and comprehensive peace. Numerous attempts to settle the problem have been undertaken throughout the year and efforts towards the final stage of the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Sinai peninsula are now being made. The Government of Japan hopes that the withdrawal will constitute a firm step towards the achievement of peace in the region. Those endeavours must not be in vain.

220. The basic position of the Government of Japan on the Middle East question has been presented on various occasions and may be summarized as follows: first, peace in the Middle East should be just, lasting and comprehensive; secondly, such a peace should be achieved through the early and complete implementation of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and through recognition of and respect for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination, in conformity with the Charter; and thirdly, each and every path towards the achievement of such a peace must be explored, with careful consideration given to the aspirations of all peoples in the region, including the Palestinian people, and to the legitimate security requirements of the countries in the region.

221. In accordance with these principles, Japan believes it is essential, in order to solve the question of Palestine, that both the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and Israel's right to exist be mutually recognized and that the PLO, representing the Palestinian people, participate in the peace process.

222. My Government appreciates the efforts which the United Nations is making to reduce tensions and to mitigate the various destabilizing factors in the Middle East. In particular we recognize the valuable contributions being made by the two peace-keeping forces which the United Nations is deploying in the region. Japan reaffirms its support for UNIFIL and for UNDOF, which is stationed between Israel and Syria, and expresses its sincere gratitude to the commanders and soldiers of those forces for the dedication that they bring to their important task.

223. We are convinced that if peace in the Middle East is to be achieved, perseverance, courage and a flexible attitude among the parties concerned are essential. Japan earnestly hopes that they will continue their efforts with a renewed commitment to the search for a solution that is satisfactory to all. It is my country's sincere desire that a just, lasting and comprehensive peace be established without delay. For its part, Japan is ready to co-operate to the best of its ability in the pursuit of our common goal, the achievement of peace in the Middle East.

224. Mr. BARBOSA de MEDINA (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): The serious situation in the Middle East is the subject of general concern in the international community, which rightly considers the peaceful settlement of that crisis to be one of the most pressing tasks before it in the pursuit of world peace and security. The problems besetting the Middle East are of extreme importance, either because of the values and interests at stake or because of the world-wide risks involved.

225. The responsibility of the international community and, therefore, of the Organization in the search for a solution to the problem of the Middle East is thus a fact on the existence of which there is a consensus. It implies, furthermore, no less responsibility on the part of the various States. Portugal is particularly committed because a vast complex of relationships based on old historic and cultural links ties it to the leading countries of the area, not to mention the fact that its location in the framework of the Mediterranean leads it to consider with concern any event that could endanger the balance in that geographic zone.

226. Throughout the work of this thirty-sixth session my delegation has referred several times to the specific questions concerning the Middle East. It has therefore been able to emphasize the interest that the Portuguese people attach to the whole set of problems at the heart of which the Arab-Israeli conflict constitutes the catalyst. It has also expressed my Government's conviction that it would be unrealistic to entertain any idea of reaching a solution of the problem of the Middle East without first resolving the Palestinian question.

227. The need for a negotiated, comprehensive and peaceful solution is also a point on which there is clearly an international consensus. It follows that if there is to be a negotiated solution everybody must work together; if there is to be a comprehensive solution all the parties concerned must be committed, without exception; and if there is to be a peaceful solution there must be unequivocal condemnation of any unilateral act that could make more difficult, or even prevent, the negotiations. There must, in particular, be condemnation of acts that could modify the geographical structure, demographic nature and legal status of the territories concerned and, above all, of violent and repressive measures, civil or military, which are the real source of a great many of the

fundamental problems that constitute one of the essential aspects of this crisis.

228. A peaceful and comprehensive settlement of the situation prevailing in the Middle East presupposes the existence of negotiations between the parties concerned, a broader dialogue in which all would take part in order to achieve the desired agreement. That settlement must stem from an agreement whose goals have been defined in the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, in which respect for the right to exist and to security for all States in the area, including Israel, would go hand in hand with recognition of the legitimate and inalienable right of all the peoples of the area to exercise fully their right to self-determination, with all the consequences that such recognition implies, particularly for the Palestinians, in relation to whom the denial of the exercise of that right, which is today universally acknowledged, constitutes a striking anachronism in the light of the fundamental legal co-ordinates of the international community.

229. Those two points constitute the very purpose of the negotiations that are being advocated and not the starting-point on which they should be based. It would not be realistic, therefore, to make their acceptance a pre-condition of any negotiations, just as the exact determination of the various stages by which such negotiations should proceed should not be used as such a pre-condition. It is for the momentum of the process to make them acceptable, interdependently, and to ensure their implementation through the balanced play of mutual guarantees.

230. However, we know that the complete withdrawal by Israel from all the Palestinian and Arab territories occupied since 1967, the definition of the provisional authority when that withdrawal takes place, the fixing of the conditions for the exercise of the right to return and to self-determination, security guarantees, the status of Jerusalem and free access to the Holy Places are all pillars on which the political and peaceful settlement demanded by the international community will be based.

231. Condemnation of acts that could hinder the search for a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict and acceptance of the duty of all States to contribute to the search for a comprehensive solution to the questions of the Middle East have, in this context, two basic consequences to which, in view of their importance, my delegation feels bound to make specific reference. The first is the need to eliminate all sources of tension that might tend to aggravate the regional crisis and, in particular, to ensure the inviolability of the frontiers and the territorial integrity of Lebanon. The second is that we must support any diplomatic initiative designed to promote comprehensive peace negotiations, and in particular that taken by the European Community, the essential bases of which were defined in Venice in the Declaration of 13 June 1980,⁶ as well as that of the Council of Europe. The latter, in its statements of 2 December 1980⁷ and 1 July 1981, formulated principles and suggested initiatives corresponding to the points of view put forward by my delegation in the context of the Middle East question.

232. The true security of States lies in their ability to be accepted by neighbouring countries and in their being able to maintain peaceful relations with them. We know how difficult the task of suppressing fear and overcoming mistrust can be for Governments and peoples. But we also know all the dangers for the various States in dispute implicit in harbouring the illusion that it would be easier to achieve decisive results through confrontation than

through co-operation. The cessation of the Arab-Israeli conflict is of vital importance, for nowhere else is peace so important, not only for the States torn by the conflict, but for the whole of the international community, which has an undeniable duty to promote the search for a peaceful solution.

233. Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At the outset of my statement I wish to inform the Assembly of the following, in view of the risks it entails for the situation in the Middle East, which we are now discussing. At 8.30 this evening, Beirut time, Israel bombarded El-Aishiyeh, a town in the south of Lebanon, with heavy, 155 mm artillery. The bombardment was resumed at 10.15 the next morning, Beirut time, and it is clear that Israel has begun the bombardment as the beginning of a new large-scale attack on Lebanese territory and on the Palestinian refugee camps there. I have been informed by the PLO that instructions have been given to the armed Palestinian forces to exercise restraint and to refrain from returning fire. Since this new aggression is fraught with risks and represents a deterioration of the serious situation in the area, I have felt it imperative to inform the Assembly of this dangerous development.

234. As was stated in the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in the Middle East, that situation contains an explosive potential for conflict that is a danger to world peace and security. The vast gap separating word from deed is continually growing wider. Whenever the international community builds a bridge, Israel resorts to subversive manoeuvres in an attempt to create a new *fait accompli* and thereby set up an insurmountable obstacle to the achievement of a just and lasting settlement to what has by tradition come to be called "the Middle East problem". That gap is clearly and specifically illustrated by the approach being taken through international diplomatic action to achieve a just and lasting settlement, and by the opposite approach that Israel has adopted to eliminate, one by one, all prospects of the success of those endeavours.

235. Throughout the years since the June war of 1967, in which it occupied Syrian and Egyptian territory, the Gaza Strip and the Palestinian West Bank, Israel has consistently employed an old Zionist tactic that consists in the continuous creation of new fronts in order to divert the attention of the enemy and the international community from the basic problem that constitutes the basis of the Arab-Israeli conflict, namely, the question of Palestine. All the wars Israel has waged and all the aggressions it has committed and is continuing to commit against neighbouring and other Arab States—such as the aggression against the Iraqi nuclear reactor near Baghdad, which is still fresh in all our minds—are nothing but desperate attempts to create a smoke-screen to conceal the fact that Israel is built upon the lands and goods of the Palestinian people. Nor does Israel refrain from occupying even more Arab territory whenever possible in order to achieve the Zionist dream of expansion from the Nile to the Euphrates, thus confirming a well-known psychological fact—that the criminal always attempts to conceal his first crime by committing further crimes, until he eventually receives his just punishment. I need not cite proofs and evidence; the history of Israel in the area is replete with them. Israel constantly reminds us by its very conduct that it is an alien entity in the region in which it was implanted and is based on hatred and aggression. It is truly regrettable that this aggressive and expansionist entity has become, along with the other racist régime in South Africa, the preoccupation of the international com-

munity. It is neither an exaggeration nor a distortion of truth to state that Israel and the Government of South Africa are largely responsible for preventing the fulfilment of the mission and purposes of the United Nations, which is supposed, *inter alia*, to serve the progress and well-being of mankind. That is because those two régimes take up the majority of the efforts to solve the problems of development which concern the rest of the world.

236. We are speaking the truth when we say that if some major Powers that are permanent members of the Security Council had not spread their protective umbrella—especially in the form of the political, military and economic support that flows unceasingly to Israel from the United States—Israel would not have been able to persist in its arrogance and flagrantly to defy and reject every relevant United Nations resolution. As an example, we mention General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX), on the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people in Palestine, and Security Council resolutions 446 (1979), 452 (1979) and 465 (1980), which state that all measures taken by Israel to change the physical character of the Palestinian and other occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem, have no legal validity and which call for Israel to dismantle existing settlements and to stop setting up new ones, as well as other resolutions demanding the full withdrawal of Israel from the Arab territories occupied since 1967.

237. Israel's attitude towards the Organization is not confined to the rejection of its resolutions, which embody an international consensus, but has gone beyond that to become direct defiance of the international community and the world conscience. Israel creates obstacles to impede the mission of the international observation forces in southern Lebanon, sometimes by taking up arms against those forces and sometimes through its lackeys. Furthermore, Israel ridicules the mission of the United Nations forces in the area by its continued underhanded acts of aggression against the territory and sovereignty of Lebanon. Can we forget that barbaric raid on Beirut in which hundreds of innocent victims were killed? It was not the first raid in the area, and it will not be the last. Events there have proved that the Israeli thirst for blood is insatiable.

238. In the light of those facts we can only reaffirm that the direct threat to the area of the Middle East at present, a threat which must be faced by the international community as a whole because it could involve the most serious consequences for world peace and security, is simply and clearly Israel, which annexed Arab Jerusalem and claims it as its eternal capital; Israel, which devours Palestinian territories by gradual Judaization and which aspires to devour the Golan Heights; Israel, which makes Lebanon the theatre of its barbaric military operations against Lebanese and Palestinian civilians; Israel, which has arrogated to itself the right to frustrate any Arab endeavour to achieve progress and development and which committed aggression against the sovereignty of Iraq in a treacherous raid in which it destroyed Iraq's scientific nuclear installations; Israel, which rejects the norms of international law and which still insists on being the sole possessor of nuclear weapons in the area, making them a tool of intimidation and blackmail. Is it logical for a super-Power to establish a strategic alliance with Israel to protect the area from any other enemy?

239. The delegation of Qatar therefore reaffirms its support for General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on the Middle East, as well as the resolutions of the

Arab summit conferences, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the non-aligned movement, and reaffirms its adherence to those resolutions which stipulate that the Palestinian question is the essence of the Israeli-Arab conflict.

240. The delegation of Qatar also calls upon the Security Council to fulfil its responsibility to force Israel to implement United Nations resolutions calling for its complete withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories, especially from Arab Jerusalem; recognition of the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people; and respect for international law and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, which prohibits the acquisition of the territories of others by force. The only way to achieve that is through the imposition of mandatory sanctions in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter.

241. Recent developments in the Middle East have confirmed what we have declared from the beginning: that unilateral, partial solutions cannot achieve a lasting and just peace in the region. Events have also confirmed beyond a doubt the importance of the participation of the PLO in any process to establish genuine peace in the area.

242. Qatar, which is one of the States in the Middle East, a region fraught with tension and anxiety that could have serious consequences, hopes that this session will contribute to the speedy achievement of a just solution to this issue, which is of concern to the whole world.

243. Mr. KAMIL (Indonesia): Again this year the General Assembly is devoting much of its time to discussing the Palestinian issue and the Middle East question. The initiators of this move will undoubtedly be accused again and again of wasting the time and resources of the Organization. But for my delegation this is constructive and essential action, and reflects our resolve and firm determination to find a peaceful solution. Our deliberations have throughout these years shown an unmitigated expression of profound concern that the critical situation prevailing in that region threatens the peace and security not only of the region itself but also of the world as a whole.

244. Israel has been warned on numerous occasions that the continued violation of Arab territorial integrity and the denial of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians are contrary to the very principles of the Charter on which the Organization was founded. Consequently, an overwhelming majority of the Member States have held that failure to adopt effective measures to redress this injustice will result in further escalation of conflict, bringing about dangerous consequences.

245. The General Assembly and the Security Council have on several occasions stated in no uncertain terms that the main threat to peace is Israel's disregard of relevant United Nations resolutions. Indeed, that country's record is replete with examples of such disregard of the United Nations, for Israel has systematically rejected all of its decisions stating unequivocally that Israel must abandon its policies of annexation through settlements and of subjugation of the people in the occupied Arab territories.

246. Developments in the Middle East during the past year have made it clear that, despite the fervent hopes of the international community for Israel's positive response regarding a peaceful solution, Israel has not only inten-

sified its aggressive policy and oppressive measures in the occupied territories but has also further demonstrated its arrogance by committing attacks against neighbouring Arab countries. The air raid against Iraq, which is signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, was a premeditated attack and set a very dangerous precedent. As regards the bombardments of Lebanon, the targets hit were all civilian, and the action left in its wake an immense loss of human life. These new developments in the region have further aggravated the already tense situation, rendered a peaceful solution infinitely more difficult and call into question Israel's sincerity about living in peace with its neighbours.

247. There is no doubt that if peace in the Middle East is to be restored and the Palestinian question solved, the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council must be implemented. There is also a consensus in this Hall that three elements for a just solution must be accorded recognition. These elements, as we all know, are: total Israeli withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories; fulfilment of Palestinian aspirations, including their right to establish an independent State under the leadership of the PLO; and the restoration of Jerusalem to Arab custody. My delegation fully concurs with these positions.

248. We believe also that the international community must continue to strive for a comprehensive solution. In the present tense situation, with the ever-deepening crisis, the community of nations must strongly urge Israel to cooperate in working towards a just and durable solution in the context of the basic elements to which I have just referred.

249. We have always recognized that peace in the region cannot be separated from our quest for world peace. It is therefore pertinent to note that other recent developments in the area have further complicated the international efforts to find a just solution. The search for genuine peace in the region has now been subordinated by certain countries to their own interests in the context of their global strategy. This trend is leading us to a slippery road, and its consequences could be disastrous for the region and the world as a whole. We must step back from this dangerous brink. In our common endeavour to secure peace and harmony, we must take into consideration the paramount interests of the peoples of the region.

250. My delegation believes that the unified determination of the international community, particularly the nations in the region, has become more imperative than ever in solving the conflict. Only on this basis of unity and determination can we move in a concerted manner to make Israel comply with the United Nations resolutions

and the norms of international behaviour. My delegation, for its part, is prepared to support any effective measures sanctioned by the Charter to implement the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. Any further delay in taking appropriate measures may well lead to consequences of an incalculable magnitude.

251. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Cuba, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

252. Mr. CABALLERO (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to propose the following. In view of the absence of the majority of delegations and the fact that we barely have a quorum for the debate on an item of such importance to the international community, my delegation calls for the adjournment of the meeting under rule 76 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

253. The PRESIDENT: I think we have a quorum and I should like to correct the representative of Cuba on that point. However, quorum or no quorum, he has invoked rule 76, which reads as follows:

"During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the suspension or adjournment of the meeting. Such motions shall not be debated but shall be immediately put to the vote. The President may limit the time to be allowed to the speaker moving the suspension or adjournment of the meeting."

254. So I put to the vote the motion of the representative of Cuba that we adjourn this meeting.

The motion was adopted by 36 votes to 16, with 8 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

NOTES

¹See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year, 2089th meeting.*

²*Ibid.*, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 1, document S/1302/Rev 1.

³United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973, p. 287.

⁴Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. *The Hague Conventions and Declarations of 1899 and 1907* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1915).

⁵Expounded in a radio interview broadcast by Riyadh Domestic Service on 7 August 1981. For a transcription of the interview, see Foreign Broadcast Information Service, *Daily Report*, FBIS-MEA-81-153, of 10 August 1981, vol. V, No. 153, p. C3.

⁶See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1980*, document S/14009.

⁷*Ibid.*, Supplement for October, November and December 1980, document S/14285.