

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



**2100th
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 6 December 1972,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 21:	Page
The situation in the Middle East (<i>continued</i>)	1

President: Mr. Stanisław TREPCZYŃSKI (Poland).

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Espinosa (Colombia),
Vice-President, took the Chair.*

AGENDA ITEM 21

The situation in the Middle East (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): A draft resolution on this item, sponsored by Afghanistan, Chad, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Pakistan, Senegal, Somalia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia, has been circulated in document A/L.686.

2. Mr. ČERNÍK (Czechoslovakia): The Middle East crisis, the settlement of which is constantly being delayed through the fault of Israel, the world Zionist forces and imperialism, has to be regarded as a source of grave danger, with respect both to peace in that region and to the over-all positive developments in the international situation. In spite of considerable efforts exerted over a period of many years by many peoples in the interest of a just solution of this issue both in the United Nations and outside this body, it is becoming evident that the chances of establishing peaceful relations in that region are still remote. Instead of a gradual calming and settling of the situation, which would correspond to the interests of both sides, the war tension has recently been again increased by further aggressive acts committed by Israel against Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic. It seems that the Israeli Government is not willing to contribute to a just settlement of the grave crisis in the Middle East. The representatives of Israel should realize that their policy of conquest and expansion is to the detriment of the people of Israel and that they are thus placing the future of that people on an unstable basis. The only path Israel should follow would be to implement the relevant United Nations resolutions, particularly Security Council resolution 242 (1967), and to adopt a policy of understanding and co-operation with the Arab peoples.

3. The tactics of delaying a just solution of the Middle East conflict, used over a period of many years by Israel in co-operation with its allies, can only lead to increased complications and aggravated tension in that region, and will have only a negative influence on the general trend aiming at the reduction of tensions which we have recently witnessed.

4. Security Council resolution 242 (1967) constitutes a generally recognized basis for the re-establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. It is essential and necessary to implement that resolution consistently and without delay. A significant role in that respect is played by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Ambassador Gunnar Jarring, who was assigned by Assembly resolution 2799 (XXVI) the task of continuing his mission and of completing it by achieving a positive result. The Czechoslovak delegation highly appreciates the efforts exerted thus far by Ambassador Jarring in that respect. It is, however, necessary that he be assisted in his difficult mission not only by the Arab States but also by the other party, by Israel, which has thus far rejected any co-operation.

5. The Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is of the opinion that the initiative of Special Representative Gunnar Jarring, contained in his well-known aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971,¹ which is based on Security Council resolution 242 (1967), is of particular importance in that respect. Everyone is aware that the Arab Republic of Egypt immediately gave a positive reply to that aide-mémoire.² The constructive approach taken by the Arab Republic of Egypt to the initiative of Gunnar Jarring was appreciated, *inter alia*, both in Security Council documents and in Assembly resolution 2799 (XXVI). It is likewise known that Israel gave no reply to that aide-mémoire, does not recognize it, and even requests that it be withdrawn from the agenda. The world public was thus given another proof of who is in favour of a peaceful settlement in the region and who, on the other hand, is in favour of escalating the conflict.

6. The fundamental part of the peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict is, according to Security Council resolution 242 (1967), the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from all Arab territories occupied as a consequence of the 1967 aggression and the achievement of a just solution with respect to the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

7. The delegation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is of the opinion that the United Nations may not remain in the future a passive observer of Israel's policy of consistently ignoring and not implementing all United Nations resolutions pertaining to the settlement of the Middle East crisis. The United Nations should take effective measures aimed at full implementation, particularly of resolution 242 (1967).

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10403, annex I.

² *Ibid.*, document S/10403, annex II.

8. The current session of the General Assembly is thus confronted with an immensely responsible task—to prove that the principles of the Charter and the resolutions of the United Nations are significant and that they may have an effective influence if they are given determined support by the States Members of the United Nations.

9. Czechoslovakia remains a consistent supporter of a political settlement of the Middle East crisis, since it is not difficult to imagine where a solution by means of armed confrontation would lead. The course of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly has proved, *inter alia*, that not all Member States favour a political settlement of this conflict in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967). It has shown that they speculate on carrying out their policy aimed unscrupulously at the Arab peoples. They would like to see the ruins of cities and villages in the Middle East, the tragedy of millions of innocent Arabs and Israelis. It is not difficult to see that behind these wishes are megalomaniacal political demagoguery and pseudo-revolutionary uproar.

10. The Czechoslovak delegation is of the opinion that all States and all peace-loving forces must at the current twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly exert such pressure on Israel—using all means provided for in the United Nations Charter—that it will be impelled to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967), as well as other relevant United Nations resolutions which emphasize in particular the necessity of the withdrawal of the Israeli troops from all Arab-occupied territories in the interest of reaching permanent and lasting peace in that region. An inseparable part of that solution is also the full securing of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

11. The Czechoslovak delegation fully shares the view that the cause of peace in the Middle East would be greatly facilitated if certain Member States of the United Nations ceased to provide Israel with supplies of arms and other military equipment, which enable it to strengthen its military potential necessary for the continuance of the occupation of Arab territories and for the carrying out of its further aggressive campaigns in that region.

12. The Czechoslovak delegation also supports the just demand for the non-recognition of any changes in the occupied Arab territories that are carried out by the Israeli Government in violation of international agreements in order to strengthen the position it has gained as a result of the 1967 aggression.

13. The position Czechoslovakia took on the Middle East conflict and on the just struggle of the Arab peoples for the elimination of the consequences of Israeli aggression is a position of principle. It is unalterable and it has been formulated more than once in many international documents, as well as from the rostrum of the United Nations. It proceeds from a consistent observance of the United Nations Charter and its resolutions and declarations in the interest of the strengthening of international peace and security. It proceeds from the sincere friendship between the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and all Arab States striving to strengthen peace, progress and social justice, and from their lasting and progressive co-operation.

14. Mr. GHOBASH (United Arab Emirates): The United Arab Emirates, a small country that has newly won its independence, sees in the United Nations the fulfilment of the long cherished dreams of man, a triumph of the will of nations to establish a forum for concord, peace and fruitful international co-operation. The Organization has since its foundation compiled a distinguished record of efforts to help peoples who have been victimized by foreign domination, in its various forms and manifestations, and by its consequences, backwardness and under-development. Unfortunately, not all peoples living in bondage are freed; not all racial excesses are checked; not all unprovoked aggressions are punished. But our hopes, our common efforts, should be centred on the attainment of justice and freedom for all peoples, so that our resources, material as well as spiritual, can be diverted to meeting the greatest challenge ever to face man: the fight against, and final victory over, under-development in the disadvantaged countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

15. The Middle East, of which my country forms a part, is endowed with rich resources. It is anxious not only to vanquish its own backwardness but also to give a helping and brotherly hand to many other nations. Being the birthplace of three world religions and the luminous teachings of old Persians, the Middle East can assume an important role in the fight for the progress of man.

16. Unfortunately, the Middle East is afflicted by perpetual aggression and war. The element that sowed discord, fermented conflict and has prevented and prevents the establishment of peace and accord does not belong to the cultural and spiritual climate of the region. It is foreign to its tradition, alien to its spirit. Its advent on the political scene of the Middle East was heralded by an army of colonial conquest. I mean Zionism. Zionism was nurtured in the same moribund atmosphere in which two other "isms" were born and nurtured—namely, anti-semitism and nazism. Those racial currents represented a negation and distortion of all that is humane, noble and positive in the culture of European peoples.

17. The impact of the three "isms" has been tragic. The devastating results of the usurpation of power in Germany by Hitler and his gangs, their subjugation of the brilliant German people and the subsequent utilization of that people as an instrument of barbaric deeds committed against Europeans and other peoples of the world is recent history. Anti-semitism of all colours and shades inflicted suffering on the Jewish communities in Europe and elsewhere, culminating in the horrible crimes of the Nazi fanatics.

18. Today, we witness the ordeal of the Palestinian people at the hands of the Zionists. The Arab people of Palestine is subjected to a cruel and sinister form of colonization unique in the annals of history. In its efforts to accomplish its goal—the creation of a State with ever-expanding borders based on the myths of racial superiority and exclusiveness—Zionist conquest endeavours to change and obliterate the cultural and physical landscape of the territories that fell prey to its occupation. Zionist dreams of the further conquest of territory at the expense not only of the Palestinian people, whose homeland is already usurped, but

also at the expense of neighbouring Arab countries are also brutally illustrated by Israel's forward-shifting borders.

19. To complete the picture, let us take a glimpse at what is happening inside those territories. The report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, in accordance with operative paragraph 10 of General Assembly resolution 2851 (XXVI), states the following under "Conclusions":

"In its second report, the Special Committee stated that the evidence that it had received reflected a policy on the part of the Government of Israel designed to effect radical change in the physical character and demographic composition of several areas of the territories under occupation by the progressive and systematic elimination of every vestige of Palestinian presence in those areas." [A/8828, para. 83.]

In its entirety, the report is an indictment of the unlawful behaviour of the Israeli extremists, who are racially minded and prone to plunder and conquest. Not only have they embarked on the obliteration of the identity of the Palestinians, but they also seek the destruction of his physical person.

20. Taking as a pretext unfortunate and isolated cases of violence to which the Palestinian was driven by despair, Israeli hawks unleashed their lethal supersonic warplanes to destroy at random innocent human life. The major targets of those aircraft were the squalid and shameful refugee camps, hundreds of miles away from the borders of Palestine. Needless to say, the majority of the victims were women, children and infants. It is the policy of the Israeli extremists to terrorize the civilian population into panic, to uproot it and to deport it to live in misery, and, if the deportees raise a finger in protest, then to use their technological superiority to effectuate the mass annihilation of the hated Palestinians. What a striking similarity with the *Auflösung*—the "final solution". It is an irony of destiny that European Jewry, which lived and flourished in central and eastern Europe, producing the best that human intellect can produce, enriching the lives and cultures of their fellow citizens, were also terrorized, uprooted and deported amid scenes of humiliation and, when their very existence seemed unbearable to Nazi fanatics, physically annihilated. *Der schmutzige Jude*—the dirty Jew—was not to be allowed to coexist on one soil with the members of the exalted *Herrenrasse*. That was the slogan of the Nazi.

21. So it is today. How could a Palestinian aspire to live as a citizen on the only soil he and his forefathers ever knew when his land, by decree of racially-minded Zionists, is reserved for another, racially superior, people? He should cross the River Jordan; he should disappear. Those Palestinians whose presence can be tolerated see themselves toiling for the benefit of the war economy of the conqueror, see their identity degraded and their national aspirations humiliated. Again, a parallel is to be found in recent history—the treatment of the populations of conquered European countries in the Second World War. The same arguments are advanced and advocated by all sorts of racial supremacists and arrogant colonial administrators who claim that the subjugation of peoples is a service to the

peoples in question. Fortunately, the united efforts of the peoples of the world defeated the Nazi fanatics and exposed their misdeeds to the eternal scorn of the human race.

22. The winds of change of the early 1960s, stirred by the stubborn and relentless struggle of the oppressed and downtrodden, brought the colonial structure to collapse. It is high time that the United Nations, in whose Charter the aspirations of man towards justice and dignity are reflected, intervened vigorously to check Israeli excesses, to help bring peace to the Middle East, to free the Arabs and the Jews alike from the oppression of Zionism, a movement that disturbs the normal life of the Jews of many countries, uproots them from their homelands and drives them into racial exclusiveness on the soil of Palestine.

23. Israel was created as a result of the resolution on the partition of Palestine adopted by the General Assembly [resolution 181 (II)]. Knowing the malice and the dangerous seeds of violence inherent in the nature of Zionism, the Arabs resented the partition plan. They advocated instead the establishment of a democratic Palestinian State where the two communities could work and flourish together.

24. Unfortunately, the course of events took another turn. The State of Israel was established and, as a result, more than 1 million Arabs were rendered homeless. Now, 25 years after that fateful event, a panorama opens in front of our eyes, and one sees Israeli battalions occupying not only the entire territory of Palestine, but, exceeding it by far, a sizable amount of territory belonging to neighbouring Arab countries: Egypt, Syria and Jordan. Israeli tanks, armoured cars and warplanes cross the cease-fire line and penetrate deep into Arab territories on punitive expeditions, leaving behind them death and destruction.

25. The vandalism and the brutality of Israel's aggressions during its numerous attacks on Arab countries and its continual acts of terror and suppression against the population of the occupied territories have aroused the international community to protest and condemnation. The General Assembly, the Security Council, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity [OAU], held in Rabat in June, the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Nations, held at Georgetown, Guyana, in August, and the Thir Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, held in Jeddah in February and March, have all exhorted Israel to renounce its policies of aggression, to withdraw its troops from the Arab lands conquered in 1967, to respect the sacred right of Palestinian Arabs to return to the homeland of their ancestors and to live and practise their political rights there. The outrageous annexation of the Arab city of Jerusalem and the efforts that the Zionists have made to change beyond recognition the physical, cultural and religious features of that city induced the Security Council and the General Assembly to adopt resolutions declaring null and void all measures, legislative and administrative, taken by Israel to change the status of Jerusalem, including the expropriation of land and the transfer of people. The demand was made that Israel should refrain from taking measures which prejudice the rights of the inhabitants and do harm to the efforts of the international community, which strives to establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

26. The anguish and the fervent calls of the international community have fallen on deaf ears. Israel's policies of settlement of the territories under its occupation are pursued with vigour and candour. Dozens of permanent settlements have sprung up in the Gaza strip and the Golan heights and on the west bank of the Jordan. Jewish quarters are injected into and imposed upon Arab towns of the west bank, and the Arab city of Jerusalem is encircled by a mighty wall of new Israeli buildings. All this shows the determination of Israel to carry out the policies emanating from the Zionist dream of creating an empire in the Middle East based on racial exclusiveness and calling itself "Greater Israel".

27. When this dream offends or runs counter to the conscience of the international community, when it contrasts with the image of justice, then to Zionist extremists all calls to reason, all exhortations to abide by the rules of justice are nothing but attacks of Gentiles against the Jew. In the words of Mr. Tekoah, the representative of Israel,

"The avalanche of attacks directed in every debate in this Organization against the Jewish people, against Jewish civilization and Jewish statehood, and the spate of resolutions unmindful of Israel's position, reflect the numerical disadvantage we have lived with since time immemorial." [2092nd meeting, para. 55.]

28. That, of course, is in conformity with Zionist policies intent on creating mistrust between the Jew as such and his environment, on isolating him from healthy and fruitful exchanges with his fellow human beings. Creating mistrust and depriving the Jew of the natural warmth of attachment to the society in which he lives makes his transplanting to Palestine easier. That is blackmail; that is coercion. Fortunately, many Jews are attached—and rightly so—to the countries in which they were born. They live and flourish in brotherhood and harmony with their fellow citizens.

29. The efforts of the international community aimed at finding a just and equitable solution of the problem of the Middle East are jeopardized and intersected by the arrogant demands of Israel for the total surrender of the Arab Governments and the acceptance of Israeli *diktats*. The Arab position is marked by a fervent desire for peace based on justice. The Egyptian Government agreed to abide by Security Council resolution 242 (1967). The Egyptian Government, in reply to Ambassador Jarring's aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971, declared its readiness to accept the modalities and conditions of peace mentioned in the aforesaid resolution.

30. In return, Egypt asked for the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from Sinai and Gaza and the achievement of a just settlement of the refugee problem in accordance with United Nations resolutions. Israel's answer to the above-mentioned aide-mémoire³ was a negative one. Israel would not withdraw to the pre-5 June 1967 lines. On the question of refugees, Israel's answer also is not the implementation of the resolution of the United Nations that gives refugees the choice between a return to their homeland and

compensation [resolution 194 (III)], but only the payment of compensation for abandoned lands and property.

31. The Middle East needs peace and tranquillity, and it is the duty of the international community to help to bring about peace. Peace will come when the will of the nations, united in our Organization, is imposed and Israel's intransigence is broken. A wave of optimism prevails these days in relations among States. An atmosphere of détente and hope makes itself felt. It would be a pity if this momentum of peace were to be dissipated before a solution based on justice and moral values was found in the Middle East. The highest of moral values is the right of people to self-determination, to live in freedom and dignity. The case of the Palestinian people, and of Arabs in general, is no exception to the rule.

32. Mr. ALAINI (Yemen): I have come to participate in the debate on this item during this session because of the importance that my people attach to the United Nations and to the basic and fundamental problem that constitutes the basis of this item. The specific item, entitled "The situation in the Middle East", that is the subject of the present debate is relatively new on the agenda, but in essence it is as old as the history of the United Nations; for ever since the creation of the United Nations it has been discussed under a different title: "The question of Palestine".

33. Twenty-five years ago the United Nations, contrary to the principle of self-determination embodied in the Charter, allowed itself to become an instrument in the hands of certain major Powers that had planted the seeds of tension and turmoil in our part of the world in order to continue to reap the fruits of our natural resources. It was then that the United Nations assumed a basic and vital role in creating a tragedy unparalleled in history. Instead of the United Nations acting as the supporter of the legitimate aspirations of people, it helped to deny that people its basic and fundamental rights. Because of its role in creating this tragedy, the United Nations has continued to the present day to assume the responsibility for the victims of this connivance.

34. Since the early days of the United Nations, the Arab States, of which my country is one, have repeatedly cautioned against United Nations involvement in the machinations and designs of the colonial Powers. We stated that the question of Palestine could only be viewed as a colonial question, despite its different ramifications. The presence of a settler community imported by the United Kingdom to constitute a loyal agent for the protection of British interests—strategic, economic, and military—could not change the true nature of the question. But the architects of the United Nations, the big Powers, were not primarily interested in logic or morality, justice and law, but in furthering their imperialist goals and designs.

35. Since that day the Middle East has been in a perpetual state of tension. Our part of the world has not seen peace and security since the alien enclave was carved out of the Arab homeland. The indigenous people of Palestine were forcibly evicted, dispossessed, uprooted, dispersed and forced to live either as refugees or under a cruel military occupation.

³ *Ibid.*, document S/10403, annex III.

36. The situation in the Middle East did not arise from the aggression by Israel in 1967 against the neighbouring Arab States, an aggression that was envisioned, planned, and carried out in accordance with an over-all master plan of zionism years before. This aggression in 1967 was only a link in a long line of Israeli-Zionist aggressions against Palestine and the Arab States. Unless we view this phase in its proper context it will be impossible for us to reach any concrete results.

37. The conflict in the Middle East is first and foremost between the indigenous people of a country who were living peacefully in their land and waves of alien immigrants from all corners of the world who had only one goal in common, that of colonizing Palestine by de-Arabizing the land and substituting themselves for the indigenous people. The people of Palestine are the primary party to the conflict. Their struggle against the Zionist-Israeli axis is the primary conflict. Only as a result of this conflict, and because of zionism's aggressive, expansionist, racist and exclusivist nature, did the conflict broaden to involve the Arab nation as a whole.

38. Let me state that our opposition to zionism is not the result of any religious bigotry or racial prejudice. Our position would have been the same had any other group, from any other faith or from any part of the world, invaded our shores with such schemes and with such a repugnant philosophy.

39. The Arabs, throughout their long history, have always opened their doors to people who were persecuted and sought refuge, to people who came to live in peace with us and participate in the development and growth of our nation. It is equally true that conquerors, exploiters and occupation armies, without exception, either had to return whence they came, or be Arabized and participate as equal partners in a liberal and open society such as ours.

40. We, the Arab people of Yemen, know from our own experience the nature of zionism as a phenomenon that seeks to alienate man from his fellow man, that emphasizes and utilizes differences among the same people. A Yemeni Jewish community lived among us from time immemorial. The Yemeni Jews shared with us the same language, the same culture and the same destiny. They are Yemenis whose ancestors adopted Judaism as their faith more than 1500 years ago. They formed an integral part of our people. However, because of its philosophy that Jews can only live normal lives if they are gathered together in a racist, exclusivist, supremacist State, zionism saw to it that a segment of our people was transplanted to Palestine, only to find out that their fate was to be that of second-class citizens destined for menial jobs.

41. Had they remained and lived side by side with their fellow citizens, as was the case with other Jewish communities in other countries, the Palestinian people would have been spared all their sufferings, and we ourselves would have been spared this discussion, because the problem would not have existed.

42. The present debate will undoubtedly culminate in one more resolution to be added to a long list of resolutions adopted on the question of Palestine which have never been

implemented. But resolutions, important as they are, can never be a substitute for the real solution. The United Nations cannot, if it wants to live up to the expectations of mankind, afford to see its will flouted, its machinery coming to a standstill, its collective endeavours ignored, and its Charter repeatedly violated. The United Nations today is not what it was in 1947. Scores of peoples have regained their freedom, become masters of their destinies, and joined the membership of our Organization. They bring to it the feelings, sufferings and aspirations of those who lived under the yoke of colonialism and foreign domination. They know what it means to be free and independent. They can look at the manner in which the United Nations handled such vital questions as that of Palestine, a manner that was neither correct nor moral. They can see how those with selfish motives have used this Organization for the perpetuation of their own designs and intrigues.

43. I am sure that if the United Nations today were to discuss the question of Palestine its verdict would be different. For surely it would not have recommended partition as a solution. It would not have condoned the usurpation of the land of a people by the alien community that came as an invading force. It would not have allowed the indigenous people to become refugees a few steps away from their homes, their lands and their country.

44. The crux of the Middle East problem is the question of Palestine, a simple question that has become complex. It is a question of a people denied their inalienable rights: the right of self-determination, the right to their land. Instead of viewing it in this light, the United Nations has been discussing the various manifestations, symptoms, and side effects of the question. What was an integral question has become fragmented into many parts. Even the recent phase of the Israeli occupation has been dissected into different aspects and topics. This is the manner in which fundamental questions become tangential and insignificant. This is the way to weaken the United Nations and erode the Charter. This is the way to frustrate the hopes and aspirations of those peoples who have not yet joined the ranks of the free. This is the way to play into the hands of the aggressors and the exploiters; this is the way to allow them to reap the harvest of their aggression.

45. Countries that need the United Nations cannot allow that to happen, for that will be the end of the rule of law in international behaviour, based on equity, justice and equal rights under the Charter. The Yemen Arab Republic cannot be a party to such schemes and machinations. As a small, developing country, as an integral part of the Arab nation, we choose to be on the side of the Charter, on the side of the law, justice and morality. It is because of this conviction, and because our destiny is organically linked with that of the rest of the Arab nation, that we stand with our brothers against the forces of aggression, usurpation, and alienation.

46. We believe that the presence of Israel in our midst is not a natural historical development. Israel's creators and protectors conceived it to serve their interests by keeping our nation preoccupied in perpetual confrontation in which we must exercise our national right to self-defence in the face of repeated aggressions and occupations, so that they can divert us from our basic task and duty of remaking our

unity, harnessing our resources and developing our capabilities. Because of this, and because our area has a vital and strategic commodity essential for their war machinery and imperative for their industrial growth and domination, the imperialists envisioned Israel and planned and nurtured its growth from a myth into a reality forced upon us. Because of this, imperialism has chosen to link its interest in our area and other neighbouring parts of the third world with that of Israel. Because of this the United States has been the main benefactor and champion of Israel. Unlimited funds, the most sophisticated weapons of destruction and unshakable diplomatic support have been marshalled to the support of Israel.

47. It is this blind support that has made Israel a garrison state in an area that was peaceful and tranquil. It is this firm commitment that has enabled a small community of transplanted aliens to create havoc and destruction in Palestine and other neighbouring States. It is that support that permits Israel to terrorize the innocent population, whether Palestinians in their camps in Syria and Lebanon or nationals in their towns and villages. It is this support that gives Israel the arrogance and impudence to challenge world public opinion and the will of the international community.

48. But the present situation will not last. As long as injustice continues and aggression remains it is the obligation of man to struggle against them. For not only do they prevent the harmonization of relations among peoples and States, but they also becloud the atmosphere of friendship and co-operation.

49. The time will undoubtedly come when the United Nations recognizes who has been responsible for the creation of tension and the perpetuation of injustice, and the time will come when it will chastise them. The Charter is not without adequate machinery to cope with such situations. Chapter VII was not embodied in our Charter for ornamental purposes, but to be applied. Is this too much to expect, bearing in mind a unique record of censures, rebukes and condemnations of Israel by every organ of this United Nations?

50. Only when the people of Palestine have regained their usurped rights and have been permitted to exercise their right to self-determination can we have a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. It is of some comfort to the Palestinians that the United Nations has been gradually realizing this basic problem and affirming their inalienable rights. Once these rights have been realized the conflict between the Arab States and Israel, a corollary of the Palestine question, can be tackled and dealt with successfully. Only then will the United Nations cease to be preoccupied with the situation in the Middle East. Only then can the United Nations be viewed as the hope of those who are on the side of justice, morality and equity. Only then can the United Nations undo the injustice it helped perpetrate against the people of Palestine.

51. The people of Palestine have no choice now, it seems, but to continue their struggle, and to endure and give more of themselves on the altar of freedom and liberty. Until they succeed it will be impossible for us to reach any concrete and meaningful result.

52. It is the right of every man to lead a normal life in his home and homeland. The people of Palestine are no exception. For what they want rightfully belongs to them. What every people in every land wants is the ability to lead a life free of foreign occupation, racism, colonial subjugation and alien exploitation. Only if this basic principle becomes the guide and the doctrine of the United Nations can we expect a real, just and lasting peace—not only in the Middle East but in the world at large.

53. Mr. VINCI (Italy): The wish earnestly expressed by the General Assembly last year [*resolution 2799 (XXVI)*] for the resumption and concrete progress of the mission of the Secretary-General's Special Representative has not been fulfilled. The situation in the Middle East is still one of uncertainty and unrest. As this debate invites us to take a close look at the situation, the first question that comes to our minds concerns, of course, the action our Organization can take at this stage in order to break the deadlock, which has lasted too long. A look at the past shows that the United Nations has done its utmost to perform its primary task of promoting agreement for a peaceful settlement. With Security Council resolution 242 (1967) it offered the parties a valid basis for the solution of the crisis.

54. As we look at recent developments in the region, we must recognize that they have not been affected by one single element of that resolution. It is the firm conviction of my country that resolution 242 (1967) continues to offer a complete and sufficient basis for a political settlement and a just and lasting peace. In fact, it is still today the only realistic basis for such a settlement. That is why Italy has consistently advocated the implementation of the resolution in all its parts, which are well balanced and contain all the elements for the establishment of peace.

55. That is confirmed by the stand taken by the General Assembly, which has constantly reaffirmed its support for the resolution and consistently shown the wise determination not to alter its delicate balance. The majority of the statements we heard at the beginning of the session in the general debate and many of the statements we have heard in this debate indicate clearly that the General Assembly has not changed its position in this regard.

56. What the General Assembly has tried to do in past years has been to persuade the parties to implement resolution 242 (1967), with the assistance of the Secretary-General's Special Representative. This is another firm point established by the United Nations that need not be altered: the Organization has played its role in providing the parties with a good basis for agreement, has succeeded in persuading the parties to accept that basis and is ready to help them along the difficult path of implementation; but it cannot take the place of the parties and fulfil their responsibilities. As is clearly provided for in paragraph 3 of resolution 242 (1967), they have to play their role in the effort "to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement".

57. Resolution 2799 (XXVI), adopted by the General Assembly last year, is well in conformity with that realistic line. It appealed once again to the parties for renewed efforts for the achievement of peace, and focused its main thrust on a substantial development that had taken place at

the beginning of the year when Egypt, in a bold and constructive move, declared itself ready to enter into a peace agreement with Israel. We welcomed that move, which was the first sign of a will to create that momentum to the search for peace that had been called for by the parties for many years.

58. We welcomed also the same forthcoming attitude on the part of Jordan, which declared itself ready to proceed on the same lines towards the achievement of peace with Israel.

59. Unfortunately, those moves did not receive a response capable of setting in motion the process for a negotiated solution. The Secretary-General in his report to the Security Council and the General Assembly⁴ indicated at the time why Mr. Jarring's efforts were again deadlocked. The General Assembly had therefore no other choice but to renew its appeal to the parties. That is what it is bound to do this year again, since a whole year has been lost without the slightest development in the right direction.

60. In fact the past year has been marked by a deterioration of the situation. While it is true that the guns remained silent along the Suez Canal, violence flared up in other sectors of the region. Acts of terrorism were committed out of a state of frustration and despair, and large and destructive military operations were unleashed as a reprisal, thus starting again the cruel and sterile spiral of acts of violence which has been plaguing that unfortunate region for too many years.

61. The recent events have been a cause of concern to my country. Speaking before the Senate on 6 October, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Italy, Mr. Medici, referring to the recent acts of violence in the Middle East, said:

"The Italian Government is fully aware of the necessity of pursuing untiringly the quest for a just and lasting solution of the problems of the Palestinians. The lack of any progress in the solution of this problem not only makes difficult the return of peace to the Middle East but also aggravates a situation which is humanly unbearable and which is at the origin of the chain of violence of recent months. In order to obviate this tragic state of affairs it is even more urgent, in addition to adopting measures for the protection of human lives, to search for effective means to remove the root causes of this situation."

62. The Italian Government has not failed to call upon the parties concerned to show restraint and to start a process of normalization by allowing a gradual return of the refugees of the 1967 war to their homes. We wish to renew that appeal. We wish also to voice our concern about another cause of unrest in the area, namely, the measures carried out in the occupied territories which are apparently aimed at creating *faits accomplis*. Those *faits accomplis* are contrary to the accepted principles of international law and of conventions, and are new obstacles on the road to a peaceful settlement.

63. Yet in spite of the many pending problems, in spite of the huge psychological obstacles produced by many years of confrontation and reckless propaganda, peace is not an impossible goal for men of goodwill in the Middle East. The experience of recent years has shown that war is not an alternative to a political solution of the crisis. The only way open to peace is a political settlement. I think no responsible politician or statesman in the Middle East has any doubt about that truth. The populations directly affected by the crisis are longing for peace. They need to dedicate their energies and resources to the improvement of their economic and social conditions and the reconstruction of their towns destroyed by war, and to put an end to the miseries and suffering of hundreds of thousands of refugees and displaced persons. We know that the peoples of the Middle East want peace in order to liberate themselves from the burden of an arms race that does not improve their security and that hampers their economic and social progress.

64. As far back as the summer of 1967 the Italian Government, aware of the many intricate and complex questions that constitute the core of the Middle Eastern crisis, suggested that the parties should proceed to a gradual settlement by stages on the basis of an established, agreed time-table. The suggestion did not meet with approval in some quarters at the time, but in recent years the idea of a gradual settlement by steps has been revived.

65. In 1970 the Secretary of State of the United States of America, Mr. Rogers, made certain proposals for an interim agreement concerning the Suez Canal. What is even more encouraging, President El-Sadat of Egypt made certain constructive suggestions at the beginning of last year for an interim agreement concerning the Suez Canal. Later Israel also showed a readiness to approach the problem of settlement in this gradual manner. We feel that that path should be explored further. A partial agreement which would be the first step towards the full implementation of resolution 242 (1967), to be completed by successive steps in a given period of time, and which could allow as a first measure the reopening of the Suez Canal, would be beneficial to all the parties. Such an agreement would start an irreversible process towards an over-all settlement. It would lessen tension in the area and allow the Mediterranean to recover its maritime and commercial functions, the prolonged paralysis of which has caused great damage to the economies of the coastal countries.

66. At this stage we think we should urge the governments concerned to put aside all sterile polemics and to proceed speedily, through all suitable avenues, towards the resumption of talks for a just and peaceful settlement. That, in our view, is the central point of our deliberations, on which the General Assembly must place the main thrust of its decision. It is on the basis of that main thrust that the Italian delegation will determine its position when the Assembly proceeds to the vote on the draft resolution submitted and any other documents which may be submitted for our consideration.

67. Mr. ESONO MICA (Equatorial Guinea) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Permit me first of all, on behalf of my delegation, which is taking the floor for the first time at

⁴ *Ibid.*, document S/10403.

this session, to convey to the President our warmest and heartiest congratulations on his election to preside over the General Assembly's twenty-seventh session. We are sure that his distinguished qualities as a diplomat and his great merit in international life provide sufficient guarantee that our debates will be conducted very ably.

68. The work of the previous session of the General Assembly was crowned with great success, owing to the great ability of its President, the Foreign Minister of Indonesia, Mr. Malik, and we wish here to convey to him our most sincere gratitude.

69. If we wish to meet the deep-rooted aspirations of our peoples, we must eliminate from our practices without delay those principles that are contrary to international ethics and at the same time we must strengthen the universal character of our Organization. The President of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea, His Excellency Don Francisco Macías Nguema, in one of his addresses to the peoples, said *inter alia*:

"The freedom of peoples is sacred and fundamental to all mankind without distinction as to race, sex, creed or social condition; every people has an undeniable right to enjoy peace and justice, which must prevail throughout the world, to exploit its own resources and to participate actively in its own development with its own dignity and personality. But the ambition of some men, combined with their malicious idea of superiority, makes the enjoyment of this freedom impossible because of their diabolical practice of domination and exploitation."

70. World justice, freedom for mankind and peace among peoples still seems to be very far off, because they presuppose equality in economic and social systems and therefore a legislative unity, which it will take some time to achieve. In an international community in which relationships of subordination and subjugation still prevail, the principles of solidarity among nations and brotherhood among men are only formal expressions devoid of any valuable content.

71. The principles on which the United Nations is founded, in particular the principles of the sovereign equality of States and the self-determination of peoples, require co-ordinated international relations and not the subjugation of the weak by the strong. Interdependence rules out every type of subordination. Our General Assembly, which last year was finally able to welcome to our midst the legitimate representatives of the great Chinese people, should devote its utmost attention to this problem. We could probably take another step of importance towards the strict observance of the provisions of the Charter if, with more success than in the past, the Organization brought about a cease-fire in the Middle East and the withdrawal of all Israeli forces from the occupied Arab territories.

72. The subterfuges of some States which put off from year to year the consideration of this item no longer deceive anyone. Nevertheless we venture to hope that this Assembly will not allow itself to be deceived. The continuing improvement in international relations requires that

no provisions of the Charter be violated with impunity. Violations, slowness in applying measures and half-way compromises at the time of their enforcement have created an area of tension in the world.

73. Thus we have aggression and invasion, as well as the illegal occupation of the territories of one Member State by another Member State, bypassing Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, on which all resolutions on this question have so far been based. For this reason, Mr. President, I have the honour to transmit on this occasion the opinion of my Government concerning a revision of the Charter, to the effect that the Government of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea, led by its President for life, does not support revision of the Charter; rather it suggests the strict observance of it.

74. The international community, the United Nations and all of us are confronted with a dilemma which is day by day becoming more acute. Are we to admit or not our own inability to discharge the tasks imposed on us by the situation, for which there are mutually agreed bases in resolutions adopted in previous years either by the Security Council or by the General Assembly?

75. All of this testifies to the impotence of the United Nations to enforce respect for the principles of the Charter, an impotence which means that the majority of our resolutions are mere documents which are more a reflection of our desires than of our true capacity to fight against the blind forces of the war of imperialism. This situation of stagnation offers nothing constructive to bind up the wounds that have been opened. Nevertheless, we cannot conceive that the Middle East should indefinitely remain bogged down in this mire of "no peace, no war".

76. Israel, which continues to freeze the process for a solution of the crisis, must understand that the United Nations, which it is defying with all arrogance, is not indefinitely going to remain indifferent to the illegal occupation by its troops of the Arab territories of the Golan heights, Sinai, Gaza and trans-Jordan, which it has practically annexed.

77. My delegation is in duty bound to congratulate those Arab States that have in desperation sought a solution for these acts of aggression and invasion within the framework of this Organization and in conformity with the principles of the Charter, instead of having recourse to violence, for violence has never done anything but destroy and is not constructive; it has served only to incite passions and not to assuage them, to pile hatred upon hatred and rubble upon rubble and not bring about brotherhood between the parties to the dispute.

78. In this way, the situation in the Middle East continues to be a constant source of worry and unease. The possibility of an over-all solution seems to be very remote. Five years have elapsed since the Security Council adopted resolution 242 (1967)—five years of tension and bloody incidents. The complete implementation of that resolution, which called upon Israel to abandon the occupied Egyptian territories, could lead us to a just and lasting peace in that part of the world.

79. The report of the Secretary-General⁵ makes no clear mention of a reply on the part of Israel with regard to the mission of Ambassador Jarring. Thus my delegation wishes to state clearly that the Secretary-General in his next report must include the clear reply of Israel on the task carried out by his Special Representative.

80. The question has been made abundantly clear: the conflict in the Middle East cannot be resolved if Israel fails to withdraw its armed forces from the territories it has occupied in various Arab countries and so long as the people of Palestine are not guaranteed the full exercise of their national rights. As long as the Zionist State continues to occupy Arab territories, as long as it denies the Palestinian people their inalienable right to self-determination, as long as Israel continues to trample under foot with complete contempt and impunity the numerous resolutions adopted by the United Nations and as long as Israel continues to occupy with all arrogance the territories of our brothers of Egypt, there will be no peace in the Middle East, and the Republic of Equatorial Guinea will not fail to support unreservedly the Arab Republic of Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Palestine in the struggle they are decisively waging for the territorial integrity of their countries. This is indeed what we are doing together with other peoples of the world who are fighting for their independence and human dignity.

81. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Senegal, who will introduce draft resolution A/L.686.

82. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): I take the floor at this stage of the debate on the situation in the Middle East to introduce to the Assembly, on behalf of the sponsors, draft resolution A/L.686. The honour that is thus accorded me by the sponsors of this draft resolution is indeed a great one, but it is also a perilous honour. For if there is one problem that has been so thoroughly debated that there remains nothing more to be said, it is the situation in the Middle East. Everything that can be said about this question has been said, so that it is now difficult indeed—if not impossible—to take up any aspect of the matter that has not been dealt with by someone else. I know that I am insufficiently equipped to avoid this pitfall. Nevertheless, I shall endeavour at least to avoid another which is to tax your patience with an over-long statement.

83. The sponsors of draft resolution A/L.686, the text of which I would briefly wish to explain, wish above all that their initiative should be seen against the background of previous efforts by our General Assembly to find a meaningful and just solution to this painful situation, whose consequences, already so disquieting for the present, are fraught with even more serious consequences for the future. This is why we have based our document on Security Council resolution 242 (1967) which, as we see it, represents the most adequate framework for the quest for a peaceful, just and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict.

84. As one representative has said:

“... we would do well always to bear in mind that this resolution”—namely, resolution 242 (1967)—“is the essential agreed basis for United Nations peace efforts and that this body and all its members should be mindful of the need to preserve the negotiating asset it represents.”
[2098th meeting, para. 37.]

That sentence was delivered from this rostrum yesterday morning by Mr. Bush, the Permanent Representative of the United States.

85. The preamble of draft resolution A/L.686 lists the considerations that underlie our initiative: first of all, our concern at the fact that Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 and General Assembly resolution 2799 (XXVI) of 13 December 1971, have never been implemented; next, our concern at the steps taken by Israel in the occupied territories in violation of the Geneva Conventions of 1949; and, finally, the need to admit that the grave situation in the Middle East constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security, and that our Organization has the responsibility to restore peace and security there in the immediate future.

86. The considerations have impelled us to single out some facts which are the subject of the 13 operative paragraphs of the draft resolution, which it is my honour to place before you for your approval. The first, second and third preambular paragraphs recapitulate the provisions of resolution 242 (1967) and emphasize what we regard as pivotal in that resolution—that is to say, Ambassador Jarring's mission.

87. The report of the Secretary-General which was published last year, as was recalled a while ago by the Ambassador of Italy from this rostrum, stated the Secretary-General's view of Israel's behaviour vis-à-vis the Jarring mission, which we regard as the crucial element in the implementation of resolution 242 (1967). In his report we read:

“Ambassador Jarring has been very active over the past month and some further progress has been made towards a peaceful solution of the Middle East question. The problems to be settled have been more clearly identified and on some there is general agreement. I wish moreover to note with satisfaction the positive reply given by the United Arab Republic to Ambassador Jarring's initiative. However, the Government of Israel has so far not responded to the request of Ambassador Jarring that it should give a commitment on withdrawal to the international boundary of the United Arab Republic.

“While I still consider that the situation has considerable elements of promise, it is a matter for increasing concern that Ambassador Jarring's attempt to break the deadlock has not so far been successful. I appeal, therefore, to the Government of Israel to give further consideration to this question and to respond favourably to Ambassador Jarring's initiative.”⁶

⁵ Ibid., Twenty-seventh Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1972, document S/10792.

⁶ Ibid., Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1971, document S/10070/Add.2, paras. 14 and 15.

88. In operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of our draft resolution, we recapitulate the provisions of resolution 242 (1967), but we also refer to resolution 2799 (XXVI) adopted last year by the General Assembly of the United Nations. We have particularly highlighted the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force—a principle which is the foundation of modern international law. The Charter also governs relations of peaceful coexistence among States. Our Organization cannot ignore those imperatives without betraying the very ethos of its Charter. Once it is recognized that conquest by force is inadmissible, then the only frontiers that can be recognized remain those that existed prior to the start of any belligerent action.

89. Of these three operative paragraphs, I should particularly like to draw the Assembly's attention to paragraph 5, which invites Israel to declare publicly its adherence to the principle of non-annexation of territories through the use of force. I emphasize that paragraph because it is African in essence. When, last year, after the meeting of Heads of State and Government of the OAU, the countries of the African continent entrusted to a number of their Heads of State the task of undertaking a mission to Egypt and Israel with a view to finding a solution in order to reactivate the Jarring mission, the African Heads of State sent to the Government of Israel four of their number. In the course of their meetings with the Israeli authorities, a statement was made by General Dayan. He said, "Israel has no intention of annexing an inch of any territory in the Sinai." He added, "Better yet, Israel indeed has no interest in doing so."

90. That aroused some hope among the African Heads of State, but when it came to drafting the memorandum that was to be submitted to the United Nations Secretary-General, Israel avoided replying to the specific question put to it concerning that statement by General Dayan. Nevertheless, the statement appeared in the records of the meetings—and records were prepared by the Israelis themselves.

91. When the delegation of foreign ministers appointed to submit the African memorandum to the Secretary-General deposited it, Mr. Jarring's reaction was immediate. The sentence immediately attracted his attention, and he stated that if Israel would through an official spokesman of its Government, declare that it had no intention of annexation in Sinai, he would once again take up his pilgrim's staff and resume his mission. Mr. Jarring, who I am sure is in this hall, may correct me if my memory is faulty, because I attended that meeting.

92. The Foreign Minister of Senegal, who led the delegation, immediately contacted the Foreign Minister of Israel, Mr. Eban, and asked him whether he was ready to make such a statement on behalf of his Government. The Foreign Minister of Israel replied positively to that request of Senegal. But how great was our surprise when, three days later, from this rostrum, in making his statement [2000th meeting], the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel said just the opposite of what he had promised the Foreign Minister of Senegal he would say.

93. At the end of the last session of our Assembly, the President of the Republic of Senegal invited Mr. Jarring to

visit Senegal. Following their talks, he finally became convinced that only the renunciation of any annexation of territory by Israel could defuse the Middle East crisis. Thus it was that he himself undertook personal representations with the Israeli authorities and asked them whether they would agree to reconsider their intransigent attitude and give a favourable response to the Jarring request—perhaps in the form not of a reply to the aide-mémoire, but of an official statement—a procedure which Mr. Jarring had accepted. The steps taken by the President of the Republic of Senegal were in vain.

94. That is why we insisted upon the inclusion in the present draft resolution of operative paragraph 5, which, in our opinion, represents a means of resuming a mission which we regard as the essential element for the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

95. Operative paragraphs 7 and 8 of our draft resolution record the geographical and demographic changes now being carried out by Israel in the occupied Arab territories. We consider those changes to be a violation of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and of the pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. That is why, in operative paragraph 8, we call upon all States not to recognize any such changes and measures carried out by Israel in the occupied Arab territories.

96. Operative paragraph 9 is also a paragraph which has been much discussed. It invites Member States to refrain from providing Israel with assistance which aims at enabling it to sustain its occupation of the Arab territories. I believe that this is reasonable. This, too, is drawn from the provisions of our Charter.

97. Resolution 242 (1967) is a Security Council resolution. Chapter VII of our Charter provides for implementation of Security Council resolutions, and these elements which we have included in operative paragraph 9 fall within the framework of that Chapter of the United Nations Charter.

98. What is more, resolution 242 (1967) stipulates:

"Emphasizing further that all Member States in their acceptance of the Charter of the United Nations have undertaken a commitment to act in accordance with Article 2 of the Charter".

It is, therefore, in virtue of Article 2 of the Charter that we also wished to include this paragraph in our draft resolution.

99. What does Article 2 say? It says in paragraph 5:

"All Members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present Charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any State against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action."

It is, therefore, on the basis of this Article 2 of our Charter that we thought it timely in operative paragraph 9 to request all Member States "to refrain from providing Israel with assistance which aims at enabling it to sustain its

occupation of those Arab territories." The Security Council resolution forbids Israel to continue its occupation of the Arab territories.

100. In operative paragraph 10 of our draft resolution, the Assembly: "Recognizes that respect for the rights of the Palestinians is an indispensable element in the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East". Who dares deny it? The events we witness every day show that any peace in the Middle East concluded without the agreement of the Palestinian people could not last very long. The Palestine problem is a difficult and complex one, but it exists and it must be resolved. We do not have the right to refrain from mentioning it in our draft resolution.

101. Yesterday, in a dispatch from Jerusalem, I read that the Israeli authorities considered this part of the draft resolution a violation of the provisions of resolution 242 (1967) because it mentions Palestinians rather than refugees. I think this is a mere semantic quibble. The refugees are Palestinians, quite simply.

102. The last three paragraphs of our draft resolution are procedural. We request the Security Council to do certain things and we refer our draft resolution to it for implementation because, while we do not forget that our Assembly has no means by which to implement its decisions, neither do we forget that the Security Council is an organ of the United Nations, whose highest organ always remains the General Assembly.

103. This, then, is the gist of our document which we are submitting to the Assembly for its approval, not to add a further polemical element to a situation which has already engendered so much violence and so much resentment, but, above all, to make a new contribution to the quest for peace—a peace in terms of weapons, first of all, but also a peace for our consciences and our hearts. We submit this document without any acrimony and without wishing to offer insult.

104. A few days ago the Foreign Minister of Israel, in a radio broadcast described our draft resolution as a total falsification of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), and he added that Israel would denounce that resolution if this draft resolution were to be adopted by this Assembly. I did not know that Israel had the right of veto in this Assembly. I had always thought that the countries with the right of veto were expressly named in our Charter. I also have the feeling that Mr. Eban had not yet read our document when he made this statement, for I believe it is now clear that our draft resolution remains true to resolution 242 (1967), which was adopted unanimously, we must recall, and which also at the time met with the agreement of those mainly concerned.

105. In preparing our draft resolution we contacted all groups and all schools of thought in our Organization. We

wanted to involve everyone in this undertaking because the stakes are worth it. The Middle East has become a powder keg, both literally and figuratively. We learn from a newspaper report recently that the State of Israel alone, over the past two years, has imported more weapons than the sum total of all other goods over the past 20 years. This is a matter of concern not only to our Assembly but also to other international organizations, particularly the OAU, and to the non-aligned countries.

106. On 30 November, a dispatch from Jerusalem informed us that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel had sent his Netherlands colleague a message requesting the countries of Europe not to support our draft resolution, for:

"While in terms of pure mathematics, Egypt can get a majority without the votes of the countries of Europe or Latin America, Israel feels that this vote would have no moral basis if it did not have the support of the countries of Europe."

The dispatch does not mention the countries of the Latin American continent in connexion with the moral basis. I do not believe that the countries of Europe, which are now making such great sacrifices to try to narrow the economic and technological gulf that separates them from the masses of the world's peoples, need this new attempt at division. Likewise, I do not believe there was any need to have made these insulting insinuations, especially at this time.

107. For our part, we sincerely think that it is in Israel's interest to put an end to its policy of intransigence and defiance.

"Injustice always provokes revolt, occupation and resistance. There is no momentary weakness that does not in the long run find the energy and the resources for revenge". [2012th meeting, para. 124.]

Those words were spoken from this rostrum last year by Mr. Kosciusko-Morizet, the Permanent Representative of France.

108. In the Middle East people like to use proverbs a great deal and in Africa too. There is a proverb in my country which says that "Whatever force gives you, force will take away". I trust that Israel will heed and draw the appropriate lessons from that thought, and our Assembly has the right, indeed the duty, to assist Israel in this. The best way to do this is to adopt, by a unanimous vote, the draft resolution I have just submitted for the Assembly's approval on behalf of the sponsoring delegations.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.