

UNITED NATIONS JUL 28 1983

UN/SA COLLECTION



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

**1722<sup>nd</sup>** MEETING: 12 JUNE 1973

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1722) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
(a) Security Council resolution 331 (1973):	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General under Security Council resolution 331 (1973) (S/10929) .....	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

## SEVENTEEN HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SECOND MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 12 June 1973, at 10.30 a.m.

*President:* Mr. Yakov MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Australia, Austria, China, France, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1722)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in the Middle East:
  - (a) Security Council resolution 331 (1973);
  - (b) Report of the Secretary-General under Security Council resolution 331 (1973) (S/10929).

*The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The situation in the Middle East:

- (a) Security Council resolution 331 (1973)
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General under Security Council resolution 331 (1973) (S/10929)

1. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I should like to inform members of the Security Council that, as President of the Council, I have received a number of cables from non-governmental organizations concerning the item now before the Council—the situation in the Middle East. I have received cables from the Chairman of the Sixth International Professional Conference of Transport, Port and Fishery Workers, which was held in Warsaw from 4 to 6 June 1973, from the leaders of the Moslem and Christian communities in Jordan, and from the Bulgarian Peace Committee. In addition, I have received letters from the Women's International Democratic Federation of Berlin, the Federation of Arab Canadian Societies of Toronto, Canada, and the Manitoba Peace Council of Winnipeg, Canada. If they wish, members of the Council may look at these communications in the United Nations Secretariat. I assume that, in accordance with the appendix to the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council concerning the procedure for dealing with communications from private individuals and non-governmental bodies, the communications I have mentioned will be included in the next list of communications from private individuals and non-governmental bodies relating to matters of which the

Council is seized, which will be circulated to all members of the Council.

2. In accordance with decisions adopted by the Security Council at previous meetings, I propose, with the Council's consent, to invite the representatives of Egypt, Israel, Jordan, the United Republic of Tanzania, Chad, the Syrian Arab Republic, Nigeria, Algeria, Morocco, the United Arab Emirates, Somalia, Guyana, Mauritania, Kuwait, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Lebanon to take part, without the right to vote, in the Council's examination of the situation in the Middle East.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. H. El-Zayyat (Egypt), Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel) and Mr. A. H. Sharaf (Jordan) took places at the Council table; and Mr. S. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. H. G. Ouangmotching (Chad), Mr. H. Kelani (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. E. O. Ogbu (Nigeria), Mr. A. Bouteflika (Algeria), Mr. M. Zentar (Morocco), Mr. A. Al-Pachachi (United Arab Emirates), Mr. H. Nur Elmi (Somalia), Mr. R. E. Jackson (Guyana), Mr. M. El Hassen (Mauritania), Mr. A. Y. Bishara (Kuwait), Mr. J. Y. Jamal (Qatar), Mr. O. Sakkaf (Saudi Arabia) and Mr. E. Ghorra (Lebanon) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.*

3. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I should also like to inform members of the Council that, as President of the Council, I have received a letter from Ambassador Hoveyda, the representative of Iran, requesting that the delegation of Iran be given an opportunity to take part in the consideration of the agenda item before the Council today. In accordance with established practice and the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council I propose to invite the representative of Iran to take part, without the right to vote, in the Security Council's examination of the situation in the Middle East. Since there are no objections, it is so decided. Accordingly, I invite Ambassador Hoveyda, the representative of Iran, to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber. He will be invited to take place at the Council table when it is his turn to speak.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. F. Hoveyda (Iran) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.*

4. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I call on the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Guinea, who is first on the list of speakers.

5. Mr. CISSOKO (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, before taking up the item on our agenda may

I be allowed, on behalf of the delegation of the Republic of Guinea, to congratulate you on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council at a time when once again this body is met to consider one of the most urgent problems that has confronted it for more than a quarter of a century. It is also my duty to pay a special tribute to your personal qualities as an able diplomat whose common sense and love for peace and freedom of peoples are sure signs of the success of our deliberations.

6. It is also my duty to express my gratification concerning the excellent relations of friendship and co-operation which exist between our two countries and the spirit of active solidarity which has always characterized the relations between our two Governments.

7. I would be derelict in my duty if I failed to greet and congratulate here the outgoing President, Ambassador Abdulla of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan, for having guided ably and wisely the work of the Council during the month of May.

8. Continuously, for more than a quarter of a century, the United Nations has been discussing the serious question of the Middle East, of which it is still seized. No solution likely to restore peace and security in that part of the world has yet been found to the problem. The Zionist State of Israel, encouraged by certain great Powers, systematically opposes it and is pleased to maintain this region in the painful situation of neither war nor peace, which we all know and deplore.

9. The most explosive development in the situation in the Middle East goes back, as we know, to 5 June 1967, when Israel, with the solid support of international imperialism, launched its war of aggression against three Arab countries—Egypt, Syria and Jordan—and occupied with impunity a part of their territories. Since that time the United Nations has adopted many resolutions the result of which, unfortunately, is a constant defiance of the international community, despite all of the goodwill displayed by the Arab States which are in favour of a final solution of the conflict.

10. It becomes clear from the report of the Secretary-General [S/10929] that immediately after the hostilities and following upon the adoption of resolutions 233 (1967) of 6 June 1967 and 234 (1967) of 7 June 1967, the Governments of Jordan, Syria, Egypt and Israel announced in turn that they accepted the cease-fire called for, while Israel at that stage was already installed on the East Bank of the Suez Canal in Egypt and also occupied the West Bank of Jordan and the west region of the Golan Heights in Syria.

11. Starting from these strategic positions occupied by Israel, it was thus easy for it to violate the cease-fire although it had subscribed to it, and it has violated it constantly.

12. Actually, shortly after the beginning of hostilities on 5 June 1967, the Security Council adopted resolutions 233 (1967) and 234 (1967) which called for an immediate cease-fire. But, already in July, Israel was violating the

cease-fire in the sector of the Canal. On 9 and 10 July the Council repeated its appeal for respect for the cease-fire.

13. In resolutions 240 (1967) of 25 October 1967, 248 (1968) of 24 March 1968, 256 (1968) of 16 August 1968, 258 (1968) of 18 September 1968, 262 (1968) of 31 December 1968 and 265 (1969) of 1 April 1969 the Security Council unequivocally condemns Israel for these violations of the cease-fire, for its premediated military action against civilian targets in Upper Egypt and in Jordan.

14. As if to make a further mockery of the international community, on 28 December 1968, pursuing its expansionist aims, Israel extended its raids to another Arab country, Lebanon, spreading death and destruction at the international airport of Beirut. This new act of aggression, which was not the first act of terrorism committed by Israel against the Arab countries, was also condemned by the Security Council and by world public opinion. Successively in its resolutions of 270 (1969) of 26 August 1969 and 280 (1970) of 19 May 1970 the Security Council again condemns Israel for its premediated military action, declaring in its resolutions that these armed attacks could no longer be tolerated. It repeated its solemn warning to the effect that if Israel reverted to such actions the Security Council would take effective measures in pursuance of the relevant Articles of the Charter to give effect to its resolutions.

15. As is clear from a reading of the whole of document S/10929, for the content of which we pay a tribute to the Secretary-General and to his Special Representative, Ambassador Gunnar Jarring, we find only condemnations of Israel and the ever-renewed intention of the Security Council to envisage new measures provided by the Charter against Israel.

16. My delegation seriously thinks that the game has gone on too long and that it is time for the Security Council to discharge its responsibilities. The defiance of the imperialist and Zionist alliance, which is also that of all of the forces of colonialism and fascism in Africa and throughout the world, has lasted too long, endangering the credibility of the United Nations. The United Nations is duty bound to take up this challenge by energetic and effective action.

17. How can we tolerate having Israel, which was created out of whole cloth by a United Nations decision through depriving the Palestinian people of their national territory, able today to defy this Organization to which it owes its existence? How can we continue to tolerate its intransigence and its arrogance?

18. We continue to believe that Security Council resolution 242 (1967) is still the most appropriate framework for a solution. Indeed, the Security Council, under that resolution, first of all

“1. *Affirms* that the fulfilment of Charter principles requires the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East which should include the application of both the following principles:

“(i) Withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict;

“(ii) Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force;

“2. *Affirms further* the necessity

“(a) For guaranteeing freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area;

“(b) For achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem;

“(c) For guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every State in the area, through measures including the establishment of demilitarized zones”.

19. As can be seen, those provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of resolution 242 (1967) have laid down the basic principles for a peaceful settlement. There is no doubt that their correct and sincere application could lead to an equitable settlement. We repeat that if, unfortunately, such is not the case and has not been the case heretofore, that is because, above all, of the attitude of Israel which, to say the least is negative. Indeed, in the face of the constructive proposals formulated by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Israel always took an attitude that was negative in the extreme. The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt, for its part, has shown courage and goodwill by responding positively to those proposals.

20. Thus, Ambassador Gunnar Jarring's mission, because of Israel's refusal to co-operate, has found itself bogged down in an impasse. The question still remains in all its dimensions and the prospects for a just and lasting settlement of the problems of the Middle East remain not very encouraging.

21. Despite the numerous efforts of the international community, Israel continues to occupy the territories of three Member States of our Organization and the Arab populations displaced as a result of that occupation continue to live in exile, in despair. Other efforts to restore peace in the region have failed. The negotiations of the four Powers, which were carried out within the framework of the Security Council, to assist the Jarring mission, also met with failure.

22. The members of the Security Council will recall, for that matter, that the President of the United States of America and the leaders of the Soviet Union, at their summit meeting in Moscow in May 1972, restated their support for any peaceful settlement in the Middle East, in accordance with resolution 242 (1967), and confirmed their desire to contribute to the success of Ambassador Jarring's mission.

23. Europe, for its part, has shown a steadily growing desire to put an end to the situation which is neither war nor peace that now obtains in the Middle East. The Jidda Conference and the third session of the United Nations

Conference on Trade and Development in Chile also dealt with the serious situation in the Middle East and its dangerous and harmful effects.

24. The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the non-aligned countries which met at Georgetown in August 1972 adopted a resolution [see S/10944] on the Middle East which emphasized that all the measures taken by the Israeli authorities, that is to say the occupying authorities of Israel, designed to change the demographic, ethnic and political structure of the regions occupied, were null and void.

25. Africa, which in times gone by suffered so much humiliation and still knows foreign domination and its effects in the southern part of the continent, Africa which is devoted to the sacred principles of peace although it has been despoiled of some of its territories in upper Egypt, has not hesitated to give a mandate to 10 of its Heads of State to contact Israel, Israel the aggressor, to seek to bring about the implementation of resolution 242 (1967). That mission of peace was met in Israel by arrogance and contempt. Africa, again giving a mandate to eight of its Ministers for Foreign Affairs—and I have the privilege of being one of them—to come and follow the work of the current series of meetings of the Security Council, once again wanted to bring its message of peace.

26. Will Israel continue to remain deaf to Africa's message?

27. The Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity which met at Rabat in June 1972, and the meeting that was recently held at Addis Ababa, each adopted a resolution calling upon Israel to withdraw immediately from the occupied Arab territories and fall back to the 5 June 1967 positions, in accordance with the provisions of resolution 242 (1967). By those same resolutions, Africa makes a pressing appeal to the States Members of the United Nations to refrain from delivering weapons, military equipment and the like to Israel and to refrain from giving it moral support which would enable it to strengthen its military potential and to perpetuate the occupation of Arab States.

28. Should a military conquest serve as a pretext for territorial expansion? Can a State which enlarges its boundaries by war, destruction and territorial annexation, claim to be peace loving and worthy of being a Member of our Organization under the provisions of the Charter? If Israeli expansionism proceeds from a plan conceived by the Zionists, the execution of such a design certainly rests on the sizable material aid that it receives from international imperialism.

29. International opinion will recall that on 5 July 1968 the Israeli Defence Minister expounded on the plan which, by stages, was to result in the creation of a “Greater Israel”. The ambitious gamble of General Moshe Dayan were expressed in these terms:

“Our fathers reached the frontiers recognized in the partition plan of 1947. Our generation has reached the frontiers of 1949. But the generation of the six-day war

was able to reach Suez, Jordan and the Golan Heights in Syria. And that is not the end because, after the present cease-fire lines, there will be other new lines, but they will extend beyond the Jordan, perhaps as far as Lebanon and perhaps even into central Syria.”

30. That statement, as the Council can note, testifies to the unbridled ambitions of Israel and explains the reasons for its persistent refusal to give effect to the Security Council resolutions and in particular resolution 242 (1967).

31. In its reply to the special envoy of the Secretary-General on 26 February 1971, Israel declared [3/10403, annex III] that it would not withdraw to the lines obtaining prior to 5 June 1967. It has stated repeatedly that it will not withdraw from the City of Jerusalem, that it would continue to occupy the Golan Heights and the Gaza Strip, and that it would appropriate sizable segments of territory on the West Bank of the Jordan. Those tendencies of Israel were confirmed by the Prime Minister, Mrs. Golda Meir, herself, when on 23 November 1972, in an interview which she granted to the Italian magazine *Europeo*, she stated:

“Israel will never abandon Jerusalem. It is inadmissible, Jerusalem is out of the question. We will not even agree to discuss Jerusalem.”

As far as the West Bank of the Jordan is concerned, she confided:

“Although the Israeli Government has not yet taken any decision on the subject, the majority of Israelis would be ready to give back to Jordan a part of the West Bank of the Jordan.”

32. With respect to the Palestine sector of the Gaza Strip, she stated that Gaza would remain a part of Israel, although she would have no objection to the Arabs raising the question of Gaza if negotiations were to take place.

33. On the question of the Golan Heights, which belong to Syria, she said she was ready to negotiate with Syria on the condition that new frontiers would guarantee Israel a presence on the Syrian Heights.

“In other words,” she stated, “the Syrians are today precisely at the point where the frontier should be fixed. On this point, we shall not yield. I will not give way.”

34. With respect to the Egyptian peninsula of the Sinai, in this interview Mrs. Golda Meir stated that Israel wanted only to control Sharm-el-Sheikh and a strip of the desert linking Israel to it.

35. Speaking about the Palestinians, Prime Minister Golda Meir ruled out any possibility of their coming back to Israel and said that she could not accept the creation of a third State between Israel and Jordan—that is, she does not accept the creation of a Palestinian State. However, in considering what the United Nations calls the problem of the Palestine refugees, the General Assembly has year after year—in 1969, 1970, 1971 and 1972—adopted resolutions in which it has recognized that the problem derives from

the fact that the inalienable rights of the Palestinian refugees, as those rights are proclaimed in the United Nations Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, have been denied them and that full respect for the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine is indispensable to the restoration of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

36. Even today, the Palestinian people lives enclosed in refugee camps or wanders throughout the world prey to despair and injustice. Deprived of its inalienable right to life, deprived of its existence as a nation, it strikes wherever it can.

37. The delegation of the Republic of Guinea reaffirms its unqualified support for the just cause of the Palestinian people. Like Israel, Palestine has the right to a homeland, to a country. The United Nations, which created the problem of the Middle East, is in duty bound to find a solution to it. The great Powers, which we have repeatedly held responsible for the maintenance of the explosive situation in the Middle East, are in duty bound to take more appropriate measures.

38. Will the Security Council, which, we repeat, has ever since 1967 proposed taking appropriate measures against Israel, now be prepared to do so? Will the allies of Israel finally be prepared to help the international community emerge from this impasse?

39. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, Ambassador El-Zayyat, in his moving statement of 6 June [1717th meeting] reaffirmed his faith in the principles of the United Nations Charter and proclaimed his Government's acceptance of all United Nations resolutions concerning the present problem. However, he emphasized that the price would not be abandonment of territorial integrity or the inalienable right of the Palestinian people as a nation to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

40. Israel, assured of the unconditional support of its allies, for its part reaffirms through the mouth of its permanent representative, Mr. Yosef Tekoah, that it will not abandon its “right” at any price; it will not accept any other substantive changes—changes in balance or interpretation—in resolution 242 (1967). Now, that is clear.

41. We repeat that the time has come for the Security Council to face up to its responsibilities. Like all the previous speakers, we reaffirm that the eyes of the world are fixed on the Security Council. Is it going to measure up to this historic test? Is it now going to abandon the methods which have proved fruitless in the past? Is it finally going to take the efficacious measures provided by the Charter to give effect to its decisions? It is for you, the members of the Council, to answer those questions.

42. The continuing alliance between imperialism and zionism and the encircling noose extended by South Africa, Portugal, Rhodesia and Israel and tightened by their allies cause a serious threat to hang over peace and security in Africa and throughout the world. My colleagues from Algeria, Nigeria, Chad, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Sudan and Kenya and I have, with a mandate from our

Heads of State, come here to emphasize to you once more—no longer only in the name of our respective countries but on behalf of the whole of Africa united within the framework of the Organization of African Unity—the serious danger that hangs over our continent. The threat of such a danger would be confirmed by the incapacity of the Security Council to remove the causes of the persistent disruption of peace which has existed since 1967.

43. In any event, the delegation of the Organization of African Unity will draw the appropriate conclusions from this historic series of meetings, once again held in June.

44. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Guinea for his statement and for the remarks which he addressed to my country and to me personally. For my part, I should like to note with great pleasure that the relations of friendship, mutual understanding and co-operation between the Soviet Union and Guinea have been developing and growing stronger since the independence of the Republic of Guinea was first proclaimed. The Republic of Guinea was one of the first African countries to gain independence and since that time it has played an active part in the life of the African continent, in international life as a whole and in the work of the United Nations. The Republic of Guinea has set a very good example in appointing as its representative Ambassador Cissé, who is one of her country's outstanding politicians; we have great respect for her and take great pleasure in working with her in considering the problems which arise both in the General Assembly and in the Security Council.

45. The representative of Morocco is next on the list of speakers. I invite the representative of Morocco to take a place at the Council table.

46. Mr. ZENTAR (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, first of all I should like to thank you and all the members of the Council for allowing me to speak in a debate which is of concern to my country—as an Arab and African country of course, but also as a State Member of the United Nations aware of its duties in everything having regard to the defence of justice and the safeguarding of international peace and security.

47. I should also like to hail your personal accession to the presidency of the Council this month not only because of your personal qualities, which have always been of the greatest benefit to our Organization, but also because many of us regard your presidency as a good omen at a time when the Council is beginning its debate on so important and so sensitive a topic. Your country, the Soviet Union, in view of its international responsibilities, in view of its power and the great influence it wields, has played and is still called upon to play a role of the first importance in the service of justice and law in the solution of the problem which is once again before the Council today.

48. There was a time when all of us would hang on every word of the Israeli spokesmen, looking for an indiscretion or an unguarded statement which might at last give some hint of the deep-seated intentions of the Zionist authorities

with respect to Palestine, the Palestinian people and the neighbouring Arab countries.

49. It is true that the minds of the Arab peoples directly concerned, and more particularly the Palestinian people, were already made up. For them the settled determination of the Zionists to establish themselves and to spread out in the region was no longer open to doubt. A typical colonialist type of operation was going on in their territories to the detriment of their interests, their sovereignty, their very existence.

50. But a doubtful international opinion had to be convinced of this fact, an opinion that was still under the sway of sympathy, which was legitimate at the outset but which was all too soon enlisted in the service of a tragic hoax on an unprecedented scale which plunged the Middle East into an era of violence and killing which has been going on for a quarter of a century and which, alas, is far from being over.

51. The Israeli aggression of June 1967 and its far-reaching consequences for the military balance in the region to the benefit of the aggressor have had the unexpected effect, particularly for us Africans, of unmasking once and for all the true face of the Zionist State, its racist nature and its expansionist aims.

52. Thanks to an eloquence which owes much to the heady intoxication of success, many Israeli leaders no longer make any secret of their designs or of their appetites. They throw down arrogant challenges to the international community, to the charters and to the laws with which it has vested itself and to the decisions and the resolutions adopted by its organs.

53. The report submitted to this Council by the Secretary-General pursuant to resolution 331 (1973), despite its brevity and its circumspection, offers proof of Israel's standing refusal to co-operate with the United Nations and with its qualified representatives with a view to the restoration in the region of a situation in conformity with law, justice and the fundamental principles which govern the international community.

54. But we have even more overwhelming and unambiguous testimony, this time emanating from the highest Zionist authorities themselves, which shows why all the international efforts so far have been fruitless and why they can never be successful. Many preceding speakers, and most recently the Foreign Minister of Guinea, have already referred to this testimony, but it may be useful to repeat some of these statements, because they are so clear and symptomatic that we need to consider them very closely. Thus, Mrs. Golda Meir stated in May 1971 that Jerusalem will remain unified and an integral part of Israel; that Israel will never leave the Golan Heights; that Arab troops shall never again cross the Jordan.

55. General Moshe Dayan, for his part, said much the same thing, and here I am again repeating what the Foreign Minister of Guinea quoted. Mr. Moshe Dayan stated:

“Our fathers reached the frontiers recognized in the partition plan of 1947. Our generation has reached the

frontiers of 1949. But the generation of the six-day war was able to reach Suez, Jordan and the Golan Heights in Syria. . . . That is not the end, because after the present cease-fire lines there will be other new lines, but they will extend beyond Jordan, perhaps as far as Lebanon and perhaps even into central Syria."

We took careful note of this.

56. Mr. Abba Eban, the Foreign Minister of Israel, also stated late in 1971:

"... the kibbutzim established in territory under Israeli control in Sinai, Gaza, Jordania and Golan are in places that Israel intends to keep in the future and has no intention of giving back to the Arab countries."

57. The other day these words were corroborated in this Council by Ambassador Sharaf of Jordan [*1717th meeting*], who told us that to his Government's knowledge some 50 settlements had already been established in various places in the occupied territories, and he gave us their exact names and geographical locations, some of them being places very far from the old demarcation lines.

58. There has been no denial of this statement and for good reason.

59. If I have referred to statements to which I have already made reference in the past and which have been followed by others since, and in the same vein, it was to illustrate once again the fact that Israel is pursuing in the Middle East a standing policy of aggression and annexation in an inexorable process which is going forward unremittently and more and more without the mystery in which international skulduggery on this scale is ordinarily veiled.

60. Israel takes no more account today than it did in the past, in 1967, in 1956, or in 1949, of the rights of peoples, of international laws or of the authority and prestige of the United Nations.

61. But what is the representative of Israel now saying? What replies does he make to the overwhelming accusations levelled against his Government? What was his reply to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, Mr. El-Zayyat, who simply asked him whether his Government recognized the principle of the non-acquisition of territories by force?

62. Far from protesting against these accusations, far from offering us the slightest hint of evidence that the Zionist régime was not pursuing a policy of aggression and unilateral annexation of territories belonging to States whose integrity is guaranteed by the United Nations Charter, the representative of Israel more or less said the following: that resolution 242 (1967) was accepted by Israel, but that it was accepted because it creates a new situation, and he explained to us that that resolution did not mean the restitution of all the territories occupied after the June 1967 aggression. He also added that there was no rule or international principle to prevent changes through treaty of pre-existing and recognized frontiers. He repeated several times subsequently that recognized boundaries were not inviolable.

63. But then everything is clear. That is why Israel stubbornly demands at any price that the Arab countries come to the negotiating table as vanquished countries.

64. Israel refuses to subscribe to the principle of the non-acquisition of territory by force.

65. Israel refuses to give the African wise men the only proof of good will which they really need: and that was that Israel should state that it was not interested in the annexation of Arab territory.

66. Israel refuses to give a favourable response to Mr. Jarring's aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971 because Israel cannot accept the return to the international frontiers that existed before the aggression.

67. Lastly, Israel interprets resolution 242 (1967) as not implying the restitution of all territories occupied by force. Israel thus wants secure and recognized boundaries, but it demands and wishes to impose a solution whereby these frontiers would pass somewhere through Egyptian national territory, through Syrian national territory and through Jordanian national territory. This is not only a challenge to international conscience, to our Charter and to our institutions. It is a provocation.

68. Israel seems to be in no hurry to abandon so unjust and so intransigent an attitude. Other calculations have given it reason to suppose that with the passage of time it can improve still further on its conquests. Meanwhile Arab Jerusalem continues to be occupied. The holy places of Islam and the holy Christian places remain in captivity, despite the wounded sensibilities of hundreds of millions of Muslims and Christians the world over.

69. Throughout this time the Palestinian people, shuttled between ghettos and camps that are scarcely any better, are being transformed into a phantom people no longer referred to except in terms of "refugees", stripped of personality, identity and even territory.

70. During this period Israel, so sensitive to the introduction of a single rifle in the region, continues its policy of arming itself from all possible sources, in the name of declared solidarities, the reliability of which will be demonstrated in the near future, or through shady deals which always come to light in the end. The Arab peoples will thus distinguish between their friends and those who let pass good opportunities to become or to remain such.

71. The assertion that Israel must, among other things, enjoy permanent military superiority over all its neighbours combined indicates better than any other argument the nature of the Zionist military régime and how much confidence it has in the justice of its cause, and in any event leaves no doubt as to the instrument it means to use once again in order to resolve with the countries and peoples of the region the difficult dispute of which it, Israel, is the sole source and origin.

72. It would be wearisome to go over the impressive sum total of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council on the Middle East crisis and more



particularly on the conduct of Israel vis-à-vis the populations of the occupied territories, of their property, of the holy places, of respect for international law in the occupied territories and outside them. Nevertheless it may be useful to note that the two following essential elements show up in many pertinent resolutions.

73. The first is the continuous reference by United Nations bodies to the Charter of the Organization, to the obligations flowing from international conventions, to the fundamental principles of our community as reaffirmed in the solemn Declaration on the strengthening of international Security [*General Assembly resolution 2734 (XXV)*].

74. The second element to be noted is the insistent appeals addressed to Israel that it act in conformity with the principles set forth in the Charter, with the decisions taken by the Organization—appeals warning Israel again and again that in case of further non-compliance adequate steps would be taken in order to implement the resolutions.

75. These two elements constitute for us the essential poles on which our present concerns and also our need to establish the duties and responsibilities of all concerned are founded.

76. His Majesty King Hassan II, at the beginning of this present debate, sent a message to Mr. Kurt Waldheim, the Secretary-General, conveying to him his deep concern at the grave situation prevailing in the region. The King added in his message:

“Six years after its aggression, Israel still persists in its uncompromising and negative attitude to all the peace initiatives taken by the United Nations and by the great Powers and the Organization of African Unity; it obstinately refuses to comply with the various General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and with the resolution adopted unanimously by the Council on 22 November 1967, in particular. Consequently we feel it is a matter of necessity and urgency that the United Nations should discharge, in these serious circumstances, all its responsibilities by taking definite and energetic action to compel Israel to comply with and implement strictly those resolutions, which entail the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from all the occupied Arab territories, and respect for a guarantee of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Any other attitude than one of firmness on the part of the Council is liable to weaken decisively the confidence in the Organization still shown by the peoples and to lead inevitably to a new flare-up in the region, thus seriously threatening peace and security in the world.”[S/10942.]

77. Thus we are confronted with Israel's intransigent refusal to co-operate with our Organization and its qualified representatives in their efforts to restore peace in the region by bringing to bear just and equitable solutions in conformity with law and the principles recognized by the international community.

78. Israel, taking advantage of the present fait accompli that is the result of the force of arms and has been maintained in the same manner, stands by resolution

242 (1967) while giving it the tendentious interpretation with which we are all familiar, that is that Israel regards that resolution as allowing it to legitimize annexations carried out and maintained by force. This tendentious claim will not hold water: the resolutions of the United Nations are inseparable from the principles and objectives of the Charter; inseparable too from the solemn declarations of the Organization, such as the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security; inseparable from all our obligations flowing from conventions and international rules; inseparable, finally, from the other resolutions adopted in the same area. These resolutions frequently affirm the fundamental principles which we espouse. Such is the case also of resolution 242 (1967). Does not that resolution speak first and foremost of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force? Does it not refer specifically to Article 2 of the Charter, which stipulates in particular that the Members of the Organization shall “refrain . . . from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of any State . . .”?

79. How, in these circumstances, can Israel interpret the resolution as an authorization given it by the Security Council to define its boundaries wherever it sees fit through territory belonging to countries enjoying international frontiers clearly identified and recognized?

80. Before this organ and in this Organization only law and justice count. Blackmail based on the use of force and pressure must be, and happily is, outlawed here.

81. The representative of Israel complained the other day before this Council of coercion brought to bear on his country—coercion to which, he asserted, Israel would not yield. What coercion was he referring to? He told us himself: it was coercion by resolutions of the United Nations and other international organizations, it was coercion by the two great Powers, the four great Powers, the *ad hoc* committees, the special committees, the advisory committees—and, I might add, probably the 10 wise men of Africa, Mr. Jarring and so forth. It is true that the Arab countries have had recourse to these means of coercion, but they have done so because they perhaps have made the mistake for six long years of trying to prevail on Israel through these entirely peaceful means, to respect law, justice and freedom, and to bring Israel to heed the injunctions of the international community. In this Organization we can have recourse to no other weapons, no other means of coercion than those about which the Israeli representative complained.

82. Israel, which is one of the few Members of the United Nations to elevate terrorism to the rank of a State doctrine, is using barbarous and genocidal methods against the people of Palestine in order once and for all to eliminate that embarrassing and accusing witness to the intolerable injustice on which the structures of the Zionist State rest.

83. We can never repeat too often before this Council that there is no hope for peace in the Middle East unless justice and dignity are restored to the Palestinian people, whose misfortunes are the starting-point and the standing cause of the entire Middle East crisis.

84. In the face of Israel's defiant and arrogant attitude, I should nevertheless like to welcome the wisdom and spirit of co-operation displayed by the Arab Republic of Egypt, which, confident in the rightness and legitimacy of its cause, is giving its unstinting support to all international efforts to bring about a peaceful and equitable solution, which is desired so much by the international community. Similarly, I should like to hail the determination of the Arab Republic of Egypt to yield at no price and in no circumstances a single inch of its national territory to the aggressor. In showing that determination, Egypt is protecting its territory, but it is at the same time protecting and consolidating the rule of law and international order for the benefit of all peace-loving States of the world. In defending its sovereignty and territorial integrity, the Arab Republic of Egypt, like Syria and Jordan, can count on our unreserved support and on our full solidarity.

85. The Powers that are giving economic and military support to Israel must understand the grave responsibilities they are assuming before history in supporting an enterprise of violence and criminality against the elementary rights of a people, the people of Palestine, and of a number of sovereign States, the Arab States victims of aggression and military occupation at the hands of Israel.

86. We think that the United Nations for its part is far from having exhausted its entire arsenal, and that it has too often brandished, without ever using, the weapons which it could long since have effectively wielded.

87. Once again, today, we call on this Council, to which the Charter has conferred primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, to discharge those responsibilities by taking specific and energetic measures to oblige Israel to abide by the resolutions of the United Nations and to withdraw its armed forces from all the occupied Arab territories without delay, to respect and guarantee the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people in its national territory.

88. The prestige and authority of our irreplaceable Organization have suffered most grievous blows from the successive challenges of Israel, from the constant contempt of the Zionist State for our debates, our resolutions, our laws and our principles.

89. This Council must one day at last understand this situation which imperils, first of all, the credibility of the Organization but also, and above all, international peace and security, of which you, the members of the Security Council, are the protectors and guarantors.

90. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): Before calling on the next speaker, I should like to inform members of the Security Council that, as President of the Security Council, I have received a letter from the representative of Bahrain requesting that he be permitted to take part in the Council's examination of the situation in the Middle East. In accordance with established practice, I propose to invite the representative of Bahrain to take part, without the right to vote, in the examination of the situation in the Middle East. Since there are no objections, it is so decided. Accordingly, I invite the representative of

Bahrain to take the place reserved for him in the Council chamber, on the understanding that he will be invited to take a place at the Council table when it is his turn to speak.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. S. M. Al-Saffar (Bahrain) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.*

91. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, for two reasons it gives me special pleasure indeed to congratulate you on assuming the presidency of the Council for the month of June. The first reason is that you are a most worthy representative of your great country, the Soviet Union, with which independent, socialist and non-aligned Yugoslavia enjoys friendly and developing relations in many important fields. Our two countries, during the trials of the Second World War, stood firmly together in those most crucial moments of modern history, and their equal co-operation has always been to the benefit of both of them and in the interests of co-operation, security and peace in the world. The second reason is that we know your quite exceptional personal qualities and your almost unprecedented experience in the field of world affairs, especially in the work of the United Nations and particularly of the Security Council. These qualities eminently qualify you to guide us through the complex tasks of the Security Council in this month of June. The month of June has never been an easy one for the Security Council, as I remember from last year. This year the responsibility of steering us through the historic Middle East debate, among other things, has fallen to your lot, and we do not see how we could be in better hands. These reasons, as well as our excellent personal relations, make it doubly sure that you can count on our readiness to make your tasks easier.

92. Allow me to take this opportunity to stress how impressed we were with the splendid manner in which my good colleague and friend the Ambassador of the Sudan, Mr. Abdulla, led us through the important events of the month of May.

93. The Yugoslav delegation approaches the current consideration of the situation in the Middle East by the Security Council under resolution 331 (1973) with an earnest sense of responsibility, for several major reasons.

94. Far from being solved, the grave situation, fraught with immediate and future dangers, is being further complicated by new disquieting developments within the narrower and broader region of the Near and Middle East. The Secretary-General's report describes in detail how the period of the cease-fire has been actually a period of ever more frequent and dangerous aggressive attacks by Israel against the neighbouring Arab countries.

95. At the same time, the territories conquered by force remain under occupation, and vital resolutions of the Security Council and decisions of other United Nations bodies remain unimplemented, while the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter are violated and trampled upon, precisely at a time when their observance is most needed by the largest number of members of the international community.

96. The situation in the occupied territories is worsening all the time, while Israel, contrary to United Nations resolutions and elementary and uncontested norms of international law, is in the process of changing the demographic, economic, political and social structures of those territories.

97. The position of Palestinians, of a people deprived of the right to its homeland, is becoming ever more serious.

98. Yugoslavia, as a European and Mediterranean country, situated in an area closely linked to developments in the Middle East, is directly interested in the removal of the causes of the crisis through a just settlement of the Middle East problem. As a non-aligned country, it wishes, together with all the members and active factors of the policy of non-alignment, to contribute, as much as it can, to the overcoming of the Middle East crisis on the basis of elimination of the consequences of the aggression and respect for all the basic principles embodied in the relevant decisions of the United Nations.

99. When now the Security Council, as the United Nations organ upon which the Member States have conferred, under the Charter, primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, approaches a debate like this one, probably the first question to be considered is a determination and appraisal of the scope and gravity of the crisis, the degree of the threat to international peace and security. We feel that the following facts cannot be seriously questioned.

100. The Middle East crisis is not of a narrow, local, regional character. What is in question is a conflict and a constant trouble spot which, owing to the involvement of so many vital interests and principles, has resulted and may again result in widespread confrontation, with unforeseen consequences.

101. The crisis in the Middle East, as the major hotbed of war and tension in the world, has not at all been affected by the trends of *détente*. If anyone supposed that the unresolved Middle East crisis could be safely built into the system of *détente*, then the further possible escalation of the conflict in the field would indicate that this cannot be considered to be a reliable calculation. We have seen, time and again, that the cycles of Israel's frequent armed attacks and the consequent increase of armaments in the area and around it, as well as the intensification of tensions because of strategic considerations are liable to lead, in this region, to the outbreak of war or to international crises such as those that have already brought the world to the brink of conflagration several times. If no essential changes take place soon in this situation, it will not be possible to avoid this pattern either now or in the future. The negative consequences of this crisis are affecting, in a very palpable manner, the actual political and economic interests of the whole international community, the interests of every one of us.

102. The so-called state of "no war and no peace" is actually an illusion, as war is constantly being waged against the Palestinian people and the neighbouring Arab countries. On the other hand, use is being made of this state of affairs

to perpetuate and legalize the occupation and to sanction the fruits of conquest.

103. As far as the Arab States and peoples of this region are concerned, the occupation of their territories, the armed attacks and vast devastation to which they are subjected and the spending of a very large part of the national wealth for their self-defence prevent or greatly hamper the over-all development of these otherwise rich, talented and industrious peoples and countries. Mankind is deprived of their full contribution to the economy, culture and science of the world and to its peace and security, just at a time when it is in the greatest need of them and when, without such a contribution, mankind finds it ever more difficult to satisfy some of its primary interests and needs.

104. On the other hand, for its part, instead of being a factor of coexistence and equitable co-operation between its own people and the neighbouring Arab peoples, with whom it is bound by fate in the same area, Israel devotes a huge part of its energies to means of war and occupation, undermining thereby its own true national interests, while its position in the international community is constantly deteriorating.

105. It is high time for the simple truth to be realised that in "one and an ever smaller world" no one can fare well because someone else fares badly, and that the maintenance of the present state of affairs is not in Israel's interest either.

106. My delegation fully agrees that the gravity of the situation, the seriousness of this debate, and the imperative need to do all in our power to overcome the present state of paralysis and to advance the cause of peace in the Middle East by making the most careful use of all existing and potentially favourable and useful elements, wherever they may be found, make it incumbent upon us to approach our common task with the deepest sense of responsibility.

107. Proceeding from these considerations, we have again noted that we are, in fact, confronted with two policies. On the one side is the policy of the Arab Republic of Egypt and other Arab States, which is a policy of basic orientation towards the solution of the crisis and the satisfaction, by peaceful means, of their legitimate and universally recognized interests, in accordance with the United Nations Charter and Security Council resolutions, as well as readiness to pave the way to an agreed over-all political settlement. On the other hand, the world is confronted with the policy of Israel which manifests itself as a policy of occupation, of retaining of occupied territories, of territorial expansion and annexation, contrary to the United Nations Charter and the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

108. We are, of course, aware that there exist also different interpretations of various resolutions or parts thereof, and of the sequences of the causes and consequences of the situation in the Middle East. But it seems to us that nothing illustrates with such clarity and in such an incontestable manner the differences between the two policies I have outlined as a juxtaposition of the following two passages from the replies of the Arab Republic of

Egypt and Israel to the aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971 of Ambassador Jarring, Special Representative of the Secretary-General [*S/10403, annex I*]:

Arab Republic of Egypt: "When Israel gives these commitments, the United Arab Republic will be ready to enter into a peace agreement with Israel containing all the aforementioned obligations as provided for in the Security Council resolution 242 (1967)." [*Ibid., annex II.*]

Israel: "Withdrawal of Israel armed forces from the Israel-United Arab Republic cease-fire line to the secure, recognized and agreed boundaries to be established in the peace agreement. Israel will not withdraw to the pre-pre-5 June 1967 lines." [*Ibid., annex III.*]

109. In previous debates in the Security Council we have had the opportunity to draw attention to the characteristic attitude adopted by Israel which, whenever what had been alleged to be a seemingly insurmountable obstacle to the solving of the conflict was removed, would respond by raising the next one, again as an "absolute" requirement for making any progress. When the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt and Governments of other neighbouring Arab countries endorsed the principle of indispensable respect for, and guarantee of, the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State of the region and its right to live in peace within recognized and secure boundaries, free from the threat or use of force, then the demand for a direct conclusion of a peace treaty with Israel was put forward.

110. When the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt, as an essential factor, agreed to this, then it was stressed that the military presence of a foreign factor rendered the solution impossible. When a change occurred also in this situation, then the impossible and, consequently, unreasonable demand was made to the effect that each Arab Government should bear direct responsibility for, and should absolutely prevent, any action undertaken anywhere by Palestinian organizations against Israeli occupation, otherwise there cannot be any solution—not to mention the fact that the aforementioned Arab factors have accepted the principle of free navigation through international waterways, the principle of demilitarized zones, the presence of the United Nations as an additional measure of security, and so on.

111. Not only have these and other important proofs of readiness and ability for ensuring a peaceful solution of the conflict given repeatedly by the Governments of neighbouring Arab countries, essential factors in the solution of the conflict, not been made use of, but they have not even been properly acknowledged, while, on the other hand, abundant use has been made of stands and statements made in different contexts which are less topical and more removed as to time and space. And this with a view to proving the outdated thesis that the Arab neighbours are not prepared to admit the fact of the existence of Israel with its legitimate rights as they are recognized by the United Nations. It is evident that the actual purpose of this is only to conceal the real policy of annexation and domination behind the, by now, untenable notion that what is involved is the very survival of Israel.

112. The contrast between the two policies, between the two ways of formulating positions and attitudes towards the conditions of settlement, is, unfortunately, only a formal diplomatic expression of material behaviour and reality. We are merely quoting data from the first part of the Secretary-General's report when we say that in 8 out of a total of 17 resolutions and decisions adopted by the Security Council since July 1967 Israel was condemned for its military actions in 8 resolutions, while in 11 resolutions Israel was called upon to desist from such actions, that is to say, not to resort to them again. Several resolutions deplored all acts of violence and one of them condemned all such acts. The Security Council resolutions on Jerusalem have either condemned Israel or have proclaimed its measures of annexation as null and void.

113. It is a fact that, in spite of all the insistence of Israel upon being endangered, we are faced with the following parallel and mutually linked phenomena in its activities and positions since the proclamation of its independence 25 years ago: through consecutive fighting the territory annexed and occupied by Israel has grown bigger, while the number of Arab refugees and displaced persons was constantly growing; the number of Israel's settlements in occupied territories is augmenting; the number of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions condemning Israel for its ever more frequent and serious military attacks has increased; the number of States Member of the United Nations, from all regions, voting for those resolutions has been on the increase all the time.

114. International experience and history teach us that countries, particularly small ones, fighting for a just cause usually increase, with the passage of time, the number of their supporters and find wider support in the international community, and not vice versa.

115. Here I should also like to comment that in the contemporary world, which is not the world of the nineteenth century, or the beginning of the twentieth century, what makes one's borders secure is not the possession of this or that strategically superior ground. In our time and age of sophisticated arms, to interpret secure borders only in territorial, physical terms is, to say the least, outmoded. The security of one's borders is best maintained through policies and realities of coexistence, co-operation and good-neighbourly policy, and not by means of inherently unstable annexations through conquest.

116. The total and constant dedication of Yugoslavia to peace, to the active and peaceful coexistence of all countries and peoples, regardless of differences or similarities of social systems, size and levels of development, as well as the reasons—mentioned by me at the beginning of this statement—for our approaching this debate with such an earnest sense of responsibility, have guided and promoted Yugoslavia's persistent and active search for a solution to the Middle East problem throughout the period since 1967.

117. There is no doubt that in this the role and personal initiatives of President Tito have held a particular place. His visit under the most complicated circumstances, imme-

diately after the June war in 1967, to the Middle East, where he proposed and obtained important acceptance for the well known five points, his participation in the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries in Lusaka in 1970, his numerous meetings with Presidents Nasser and Sadat, and his exchanges of messages and visits with the Heads of State of great Powers and other partners, have constituted a special and tireless personal effort on his part. The activity of the Yugoslav Government and diplomacy in all actions of non-aligned countries, at the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries in Georgetown in 1972, at the sessions of the General Assembly and during our membership in the Security Council, are also a matter of public record.

118. From the very outset the Yugoslav stand proceeded from the following basic principles and positions that we have not changed and which, in the opinion of my delegation, have always provided a sound foundation for overcoming the impasse in which the crisis and fighting in the Middle East have been stagnating so dangerously for many years.

119. The first principle is the rejection of policy based on force, non-recognition of gains through conquest; the inadmissibility of Israel's acquisition of any territories by force, as a result of the aggressive war against its neighbours, and restoration of territories taken by force. This is one of the most crucial principles of the entire body of United Nations decisions and resolutions. Consequently, no changes effected in the occupied territories can be recognized.

120. Second, total and unconditional withdrawal of Israel's armed forces from all territories occupied as a result of the 1967 war; withdrawal to the pre-5 June 1967 lines.

121. Third, respect for all international, internationally recognized, boundaries in the region.

122. Fourth, the right of all States of the Middle East, including Israel, to independence, national sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-interference; the right to live in peace and free development within secure and recognized borders. We have always made a difference between Israel's right to existence, security, recognition of its sovereignty and national identity, which Yugoslavia, as is well known, has never brought into question, and the repudiation of Israel's policy of territorial expansion to the detriment of its Arab neighbours, its policy based on force and annexation.

123. Fifth, respect for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, as peace in the Middle East can be lasting only if it respects the legitimate interests of all the peoples of the region. Nothing of lasting value can be built, either in the Middle East or elsewhere, on the enslavement of a people whose only demand is that its right to its homeland should be also secured and recognized.

124. Sixth and finally, the solution of the Middle East conflict by peaceful, political means, which is a basic interest and constant demand of the international community as a whole. Of course, this cannot be construed to

mean that the oppressed and occupied peoples are deprived of the right to fight for their liberation. The demand for a peaceful solution, by political means, makes sense only if the other side, too, is prepared for such a settlement.

125. We are convinced that in their logical correlation these principles constitute a platform with which no one in favour of a solution of the Middle East question that would combine the legitimate interests of all the factors involved could find any substantive fault.

126. In our opinion, these principles also constitute the foundation upon which a just and lasting peace should be based. The achievement of such a just and lasting solution is precisely the aim of resolution 242 (1967), adopted unanimously by the Security Council.

127. If all the parties concerned endorse these principles clearly and unequivocally in spite of the different approaches adopted and the difficulties so far encountered in the search for a peaceful solution, then we are convinced that the way to peace will be finally opened. In particular, if Israel accepts what is actually the core of the problem—the non-acquisition of territory by force and respect for international boundaries—we are certain it will then be possible to find mutually acceptable solutions for the remaining problems. Actually, it would be easier to reach agreement concerning the definitive and comprehensive peaceful solution of the conflict if agreement was reached beforehand with regard to the common foundation upon which peace in the Middle East can alone be based. The absence of such a clear approach on the part of Israel towards these basic issues, and its reluctance to accept the principles of non-acquisition of territory by force and respect for international boundaries—as shown by the whole course of the efforts exerted by the United Nations over a period of six years with a view to achieving a peaceful solution—have also prevented the reaching of agreement on modalities and on the successful operation of the mechanism for negotiations foreseen by resolution 242 (1967).

128. We also consider very important the statements contained in the concluding part of the Secretary-General's report that

“For more than 25 years, the United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, has had a major and universally recognized responsibility in relation to the Middle East question” [*S/10929, para. 115.*]

and that

“no Government or group of Governments has been able to solve [this problem] outside the framework of the United Nations”. [*Ibid., para. 116.*]

129. The Yugoslav delegation has repeatedly had the opportunity to explain in the General Assembly and in the Security Council the reasons why the Middle East question, as one of the major international problems linked with the United Nations from its inception, should, can and must be solved only within the framework of and in co-operation with the United Nations.

130. At the same time we continue to believe that the great Powers or the permanent members of the Security Council could make a concrete contribution provided they proceed from the position and necessity of ensuring the implementation of the basic decisions of the United Nations that take into account the legitimate interests of all the parties concerned, and provided they secure the broadest support of the international community for their action. There exist instances of useful international experience showing that such responsible action by the great Powers can produce valuable and universally acceptable results.

131. The great Powers, which as permanent members of the Security Council undoubtedly bear a special responsibility with regard to the finding of a peaceful solution—and that is in their own interest also—could in this way exercise influence for the more rapid maturing of conditions for the final implementation of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

132. In the formulation of those positions and views, our policy is firmly based on resolution 242 (1967) and other resolutions of the Security Council, on the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly—especially those adopted at its twenty-fifth, twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh sessions—and on the resolutions of the meetings of non-aligned countries which in relation to the Middle East have always tried to exert political influence in the sense of a just and peaceful solution. The growing number of non-aligned countries—a phenomenon which will manifest itself so impressively at the summit meeting of Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries in Algiers in

September of this year—and their dynamic presence in the United Nations and elsewhere should not lightly be discounted as representing only some numerical automatic strength. Both newly born countries and those that have existed for a long time are entering the ranks of non-alignment. Their views on the Middle East are precisely the views of that large number of countries which have suffered most from aggression, annexations, oppression, insecure borders, threats or use of force, coercion, hegemonistic designs, and so on. Therefore they cannot be unmindful of the rights and interests of all small and weaker countries.

133. We hope that this long overdue consideration of the whole Middle East problem and all relevant efforts within the United Nations framework will make it easier to overcome the obstacles that have made it impossible so far to make any progress towards a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

134. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Russian*): I thank Ambassador Mojsov, the representative of Yugoslavia, for his statement and for the friendly remarks which he addressed to the Soviet Union and to me personally. I fully share his opinion and can, for my part, express sincere satisfaction at the development and strengthening of the relations of friendship, co-operation and mutual trust between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. I can assure the representative of Yugoslavia that the Soviet Union will continue to do everything necessary to ensure the further development and strengthening of friendly relations with Yugoslavia.

*The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.*

---

### كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

#### 如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

#### HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

#### COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

#### КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

#### COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

---