

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



**2101st  
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 6 December 1972,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

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

**President:** Mr. Stanisław TREPCZYŃSKI (Poland).

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Kröyer (Iceland), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

## AGENDA ITEM 21

### The situation in the Middle East (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT: As representatives are aware, a draft resolution is before the Assembly in document A/L.686. I would request delegations which intend to submit draft proposals or amendments to do so as soon as possible.

2. Mr. NUR ELMI (Somalia): In the past 25 years the events which have created the situation in the Middle East have been exhaustively examined, debated and written about, and as each new chapter has been added to his unfolding drama it has been placed in the perspective of the tragedy as a whole. There have now been sufficient time and effort devoted to this question to allow its essential elements to be sifted so that they may be clearly seen.

3. First of all, there is the conflict itself, which is essentially a product of the history of the area in the present century, and secondly there is the question of the authority of the United Nations in this matter, a question of prime importance since all Member States have accepted, as a condition of membership, the role of the United Nations as the guardian of international peace and security.

4. In the view of my delegation—and this is a view based on objective historical accounts of the Middle East question and on the consensus of world opinion expressed through the United Nations—one of the most fundamental issues of the Middle East problem has always been that of the rights of the Palestinian refugees.

5. Paragraph 2 (b) of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) rightly affirms the necessity “for achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem”. For 25 years the unfortunate Arab people of Palestine have suffered a bitter and painful exile from their homes and from their land.

6. The Jewish people, who preserved the hopes and longings for a return to what they believed was their land—the Israel of the Old Testament—during a Diaspora of 2,000 years, refuse to recognize the rights, hopes and longings of the Palestinian people whom they displaced and

dispossessed. Indeed, it is the height of the irony of fate that the Jewish people, who perhaps more than any other people have known the meaning and the anguish of exile and who have themselves experienced the bitter taste of humiliation and hatred, today inflict on the Palestinian people the greatest injustice ever done to man. Such injustice constitutes a tragedy of incredible dimensions which cannot leave any people of conscience indifferent to the grave violations of the most fundamental human rights in the annals of history. Yet the claims of the Palestinian people are not, like those of the Jews, founded on ancient history alone, on events that have long since lost their political validity, or on a tradition handed down over the centuries about a people lost in the mists of antiquity. Their claims are based on the direct experience of a generation which is still living; their hopes and longings are founded on a legitimate claim that has been given validity by the system of international law, which all Member States of the United Nations claim to uphold.

7. The record clearly shows that when the United Nations admitted the State of Israel, after the partition plan for Palestine, it did so on the understanding that the displaced Palestinian people would be allowed to return to their homes and lands or would be compensated for their property. This was implied in the resolution that admitted Israel [resolution 273 (III)] and was clearly spelled out in resolution 394 (V) when it became clear that Israel was finalizing the imposition of an exclusive Zionist State in Palestine and had no intention of living up to its responsibilities as a State Member of the United Nations. Every attempt by the United Nations over the past 25 years to implement resolutions concerning the Palestine refugees has been strenuously opposed by Israel.

8. The importance of according justice to the Palestinian refugees has to be seen against the background of the betrayals of the just aspirations of the Arab people of Palestine in this century. Offered independence in return for fighting side by side with Britain in the First World War, they found themselves instead under a mandate which was no different, in effect, from any other type of British colonial rule. To add insult to injury, the Balfour Declaration imposed on the Palestinians, in principle and in practice, the establishment of a national home for the Jews in the land that the Arabs had inhabited for 700 years, at a time when they had begun to articulate and work for their own self-determination and independence. In spite of the clear understanding of the Balfour Declaration “that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine”,<sup>1</sup> the administering Power failed to prevent the

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Supplement No. 11*, vol. II, annex 19.

chain of events that led to the setting up of the exclusively Jewish State of Israel in Palestine.

9. The world has witnessed the apportioning of half of Palestine—and the best part at that—to the Jewish immigrants, whom the Palestinians were prepared to welcome as friends and partners, but not as usurpers.

10. Much has been written and said about the reasons for the flight of the Palestinians who became the refugees of the war of 1948. It is important to note, however, that the process of dispossession of the Palestine Arabs had begun before the end of the British Mandate in May 1948. By that time the armed forces of the Zionists had already set about clearing the Arab inhabitants from the land that had been designated for the State of Israel under the partition plan of November 1947 [*resolution 181 (II)*]. According to the memoirs of Yigal Allon and David Ben-Gurion, this process was also carried out in areas allotted to the Arab State, so that prior to the war of 1948 hundreds of thousands of Palestinian Arabs had been reduced to the status of refugees within their own homeland. The published writings and public statements of Israelis such as Menachem Begin are too clear for anyone to doubt that the Zionists' deliberate policy of terrorizing the Arab population was an important factor in the flight of the refugees out of Palestine. A natural fear of the hazards of war was another factor. Strangely enough, the hope of the Palestinians that the Arab forces would be successful and enable them to return home is often cited by the Zionists in their attempts to justify their continued dispossession of the Palestinian people. But it is difficult to see how the latter could have hoped for anything else but to be saved from terror, displacement and subjugation.

11. Of course, the 1957 hostilities have added to the number of the Arab people dispossessed by Zionist aggression. It is against the background of this historical record that one must view the bitterness and frustration of the Palestinian refugees; it is against this background that one must understand their valiant resistance to being swept under the carpet as though they were the dust of history. Even while the world strongly deplores the world-wide outbreak of acts of terrorism that have been attributed to the Palestinian liberation movements, it must recognize the hard school in which they learned the profession of terrorism. Their teachers were the hordes of Zionist terrorists who today express pious horror over such acts of terrorism but who at other times indiscriminately massacred hundreds of innocent Arabs at Deir Yasin in April 1948 and assassinated the United Nations mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte—to cite only a few of their wicked activities. But when the Palestinians resort, in their bewilderment and anger, to desperate acts of violence in self-defence, those who used ruthless terrorism will denounce it before the conscience of the world, now that their purposes have been achieved at the expense of the Palestinian people. It is part of human nature that violence will be met with violence, for, when despair and hatred set in, peoples will seek revenge in order to vindicate their dignity and freedom and will ultimately resort to violence.

12. These facts of history must be repeated now even though they have been often emphasized in this and other world forums. The Zionists never cease to tell us of their

2,000-year-old claim to Palestine based on their religious beliefs and traditions. In this secular and oecumenical age, when the international community respects all religions equally, we cannot make as the basis for internationally guaranteed agreements the particular religious beliefs of any given faith.

13. In the view of my delegation Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and General Assembly resolution 2799 (XXVI) are a clear presentation of the essential elements of the Middle East situation. Resolution 242 (1967) was unanimously accepted then as, and it still remains today, a just and reasonable basis for a settlement, because it takes into account the many political problems inherent in the conflict in the Middle East. It also lays down the actions that should be taken by all parties within the framework of the world Organization's mandate to preserve peace.

14. Since 1967 a new cause for the anger of the Arab people has been added to the old causes. Israel continues to refuse to return to the boundaries that existed before its aggression of June 1967 and to return the large regions of Arab territories which it seized at that time. This is an intolerable situation which cannot be accepted by those States which have co-operated with the peace-making efforts set in motion by the Security Council.

15. The representative of Israel has exhorted this Assembly, in his statement at the 2092nd meeting, not to adopt what he called another one-sided or unbalanced resolution. But let us examine what the balance is that he would have us maintain. The United Nations is committed to the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. This principle, which Israel refuses to accept, is founded in the Charter and reaffirmed by the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*]. It is reaffirmed in Security Council resolution 242 (1967). To produce a balanced resolution in accord with Israel's wish, the United Nations would have to go back on its own decision, made in its most authoritative forum, and would have to ignore one of the most fundamental bases for peace that has been developed by the world Organization. The United Nations cannot go back on this principle and, therefore, it must call upon Israel to withdraw from the Arab territories occupied during the June 1967 hostilities, for this situation cannot and must not continue. It must insist that this is a matter of principle not open for negotiation.

16. If one studies last year's resolution on the Middle East it is easy to see the provisions which made that resolution unbalanced from the Israeli point of view. The General Assembly expressed in resolution 2799 (XXVI) its full support for the efforts of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to implement Security Council resolution 242 (1967), and while noting with appreciation Egypt's positive reply to the initiative of Ambassador Jarring, it called upon Israel to respond favourably to the Special Representative's peace proposals.

17. It is a matter of record that almost every point which Israel had hitherto insisted was an obstacle to peace has been conceded by Egypt and Jordan. But at every stage of the negotiations Israel raised the stakes in an effort to

frustrate the purposes of the mission of the Special Representative. These are the facts of the situation, and if their reflection in a General Assembly resolution produces what, in the view of Israel, is a one-sided resolution, then it is a simple matter for Israel to rectify this situation. Israel has only to abide by a fundamental principle of the United Nations; it has only to co-operate, as behoves a Member State, with the peace-making initiatives of the United Nations; it has only to open the door to peace, which it closed when it rejected Mr. Jarring's aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971,<sup>2</sup> and chose to ignore his further proposals for simultaneous commitments on basic principles.

18. From whatever side we approach this situation, we reach the same conclusion: that Israel must abide by the decision of the United Nations and show its willingness to enter into serious negotiations with the Arab States, through Ambassador Jarring, in accordance with the principles laid down in resolution 242 (1967).

19. It seems to my delegation that a fundamental point at issue in the Middle East impasse is Israel's refusal to negotiate an agreement within the framework of a United Nations initiative, and its insistence on what it calls "face-to-face" negotiations with Arab States. The unwillingness of Egypt and Jordan to accept any basis for agreement other than the principles laid down by the Security Council in resolution 242 (1967) is understandable, in view of the gap that exists between Israeli pronouncements and Israeli policy towards the occupied territories. The Israeli representative said at the 2092nd meeting that the Government of Israel is ready to negotiate peace without any pre-conditions. But Israel has already laid down unacceptable conditions in its proclamations on the status of Jerusalem, which it says will never be returned and whose present disposition it claims as non-negotiable. Israel has already laid down its conditions in its officially stated position that Sharm el Sheikh, the Golan heights and parts of the west bank of the Jordan River must remain in Israeli hands. Israel has laid down its conditions in the statement of the Prime Minister in the Knesset on 13 November this year that Israel intends to continue setting up Jewish settlements in the occupied Arab territories; that 44 settlements have been set up since the 1967 war, and that more are planned. In spite of the reality of this admitted policy of changing the physical character and demographic composition of the occupied lands, in contravention of international conventions to which Israel is a signatory State, the Israeli representative stated before this Assembly only a week ago that he was authorized to reiterate that Israel does not seek to freeze the existing situation. We are told that Israel has no ultimative maps delineating the peace boundaries. Presumably this means that Israel is prepared to throw back to the Arabs whatever crumbs are left, after it has satisfied its own expansionist designs. And this is the approach to the problem that the Arab States are asked to accept: to negotiate on Israel's terms.

20. In the view of the Somali delegation, Israel's continued intransigence in the face of just and reasonable proposals for peace demands from this session of the

General Assembly an expression of international concern stronger than that of last year. My delegation believes that the General Assembly should follow the lead given by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity [OAU] held in Rabat, Morocco, last June and by the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Georgetown, Guyana, in August 1972, and call on all States to refrain from supplying Israel with weapons, military equipment or any other assistance that would enable it to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Arab territories and continue its defiance of the authority of the United Nations.

21. No one welcomes a deteriorating situation. It is surely the hope of all Member States that in any conflict reason and moderation will prevail. But the world community cannot ignore, and would be failing in its duty if it did not take positive measures against, the actions of a State which deliberately undermines the system of international law on which mankind's hope for peace depends. For our part, there is no ambiguity in our position with regard to this question. Our position has been explicitly stated and reaffirmed consistently in the past. We condemn Israel not merely because it is Israel but for its aggressive policy against its neighbouring States, for its policy of territorial expansion, for its annexation of Jerusalem, for its refusal to return the territories it acquired by force, for its persistent refusal to allow the Arab Palestinians to return to their homes, for its total disregard of the authority of the Charter of the United Nations and for its violation of the norms of international law and conventions.

22. The United Nations has a grave responsibility in this matter. This Organization must face squarely the challenge to its authority and to world peace presented by Israel's defiant attitude and actions. The Somali delegation said at the twenty-sixth session [1999th meeting] and reiterates now that the General Assembly must be prepared to recommend, and the Security Council must be prepared to carry out, enforcement measures under the Charter if Israel continues on its present arrogant course. The issue being debated is an issue not only between Israelis and Arabs but also between Israel and the United Nations.

23. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Jarring, has not been able to make progress on substantive matters because of the unresponsive and unco-operative attitude of the Government of Israel. The services of Ambassador Jarring, which I am sure are still available, can facilitate the consultations and agreements necessary for the peoples of the Middle East to move closer to peace. The General Assembly must now go further and try to develop a framework for peace, based on the principles of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which the Special Representative might use in renewed talks with the parties concerned.

24. But the onus is on Israel to accept the opportunity presented for a just and lasting peace. If Israel should continue to reject this opportunity, as it has in the past, it will bear the responsibility for the continuation of the conflict in the Middle East, with all its tragic consequences.

25. Mr. ABDULLA (Sudan): Those members here who are familiar with the history of Israel will recall that this very

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10403, annex I.

Assembly on 29 November 1947 voted the division of Arab Palestine into almost two equal parts between the Palestinian Arabs and the Jews [*resolution 181 (II)*]. Some members may even remember the devious and vicious methods used by certain Powers to make that portion of Arab Palestine available to the Jews, when the Jewish population formed only 7 per cent of the total population and owned only 2 per cent of the land. On 10 April 1949 the terrorists of the Zionist Irgun group committed an abhorrent crime at Deir Yasin, where 254 Palestinian men, women and children were slaughtered in cold blood. The leader of the terrorists, Mr. Begin, the commander of the Irgun group at that time and one of the founders of Israel, in a book he wrote boasted that subsequent to this massacre "Arabs throughout the country . . . were seized with limitless panic and started to flee for their lives."<sup>3</sup> And now they are what we call refugees.

26. Ever since, Israel has adopted terrorist methods as a policy. It follows that policy today. Following that policy to its logical end, Israel wantonly attacks the Palestinians in their camps in neighbouring countries and everywhere in the world, as the Prime Minister of Israel herself declared hardly three months ago. The Deir Yasin massacre became the norm, and it was followed by massacres like that of Kafr Kassim in 1956 in Jordan and the massacres of Bahr el Bakr and the Halwan factory in Egypt two years ago.

27. I am giving these examples without referring to their horrid results, of which members are aware, in order to demonstrate the very nature of Israel, whose representative a few days ago spoke of Arab terrorism causing insecurity for its people. While terrorism forms the basis of Israel's policy, insecurity has ever been used as a pretext and a policy in order to empty the whole of Palestine of its original inhabitants and to subject them to all the inhuman plight inflicted on them by the Zionists. As a result, 1.5 million Palestinian Arabs have become destitute. Indeed, after the June war of 1967 Israel undertook to expropriate Arab lands by force and made radical ethnic, demographic, economic and political transformations even in the Holy Land of Jerusalem, a land divine to millions of people all over the world, Moslems, Christians and Jews alike. In short, Israel has flouted articles 33, 34 and 54 of the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War<sup>4</sup>, of which it is a signatory. Throughout the 25 years of Israel's existence, naked force and organized terrorism have been Israeli policy towards the Palestinian Arabs. Thanks to that policy, the struggle for the legitimate right to self-determination and independence of the Palestinian Arabs has been augmented and generally recognized. It is no wonder that that right has been repeatedly acknowledged by the relevant bodies of this Organization and elsewhere.

28. Despite the plight and all the terror the Zionists have inflicted on the Palestinian Arabs, the national movement of the Palestinian Arabs, as represented by the Palestinian Liberation Organization, has adopted a policy for all Palestine whereby all the citizens of that State will have

equal rights whether they are Arabs, Moslems or Christians or are of the Jewish faith. It will be a democratic State for all.

29. But we all know that Israel is the last country to admit such a democratic, secular State. Its very nature of being exclusively racial and religious is contrary to such a free society. Indeed, there has been no change from this dogmatic philosophy of racism and religion which its founders, Theodor Herzl and Weizmann, had propounded at the beginning of the century. Both Herzl and Weizmann advocated a policy of not permitting any Palestine Arab to return to his homeland.

30. Under the persistent pretext of the security of Israel, or the protection of the interest of Israel, as Mr. Tekoah described it for a change, Israel has occupied all of Palestine and the territories of three Member States and has continued to occupy those territories for the last five years.

31. This is the problem which Israel has created and with which the United Nations has been seized for the last five years. In its simple context it is the acquisition by force of arms of the lands of other Member States. In its wide context it is a situation charged with all the elements that constantly threaten peace and security in that large area. In both contexts this is a situation which is not permissible under the principles of the United Nations, and hence it is the duty and the responsibility of the United Nations to resolve this situation by all means available to it. All modalities for a peaceful political solution have been thwarted by the constant intransigence of Israel and its defiance of all the decisions adopted by the United Nations. At one time the mission of Mr. Jarring gave some ray of hope, but Israel has refused to declare itself ready to vacate its illegal occupation of the Arab territories.

32. It is now sufficiently clear that Israel, under the pretext of security, is pursuing a policy of permanent occupation by acquiring land from its inhabitants, building military villages and radically changing the demography of those Arab territories.

33. This Assembly also has to consider the very extensive military, economic and financial assistance which Israel is receiving from outside the area, and particularly from the United States, in perpetuating its occupation of Arab lands. Furthermore, it will be noted that this assistance is being vigorously and energetically exploited by Israel to terrorize the Palestinian Arabs with a view to liquidating that whole people, as if what Israel has already done—making over 1.5 million Palestinian Arabs destitute and imprisoning the rest of them within their own territory—is not enough.

34. This Assembly cannot overlook or ignore the fact that Israel's policy of expansion is based not only on the acquisition by force of the lands of sovereign Member States, but also on the criminal and savage annihilation of the very people whose land has been divided to accommodate what turned out to be largely immigrants from abroad.

35. The fact that the United Nations has so far failed to apply its decisions or to take the measures available to it

<sup>3</sup> Menachem Begin, *The Revolt: Story of the Irgun* (New York, Henry Schuman, n.d.), p. 164.

<sup>4</sup> See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973, p. 287.



under the Charter has encouraged Israel to proceed unheeding, indeed defiantly, with its policy of expansion designed to occupy more lands. The process by which Israel acquired by force a land three times its own size is a proof of its intention to conquer more Arab lands in order to create what it calls "Greater Israel", stretching from the Nile to the Euphrates. This attitude explains why Israel has always thwarted United Nations efforts for a genuine political solution, and has finally shifted its tactics to calling for direct negotiations, knowing that negotiations under occupation and duress are tantamount to surrender. All declarations by responsible Israeli authorities point to the fact that Israel is not ready for negotiations without prior conditions, contrary to some declarations that we hear from time to time. Indeed, all the declarations made by responsible Israelis, including the Prime Minister herself, affirm that large tracts of Arab lands, including Arab Jerusalem, are not a subject for negotiations. A few days ago Mrs. Golda Meir made a statement to *Time* magazine in which she said: "We can come to an agreement with our Arab neighbours if the principle is accepted that the 1967 borders will not be restored."

36. On the initiative for negotiations to open the Suez Canal, she declared: "Israel is prepared to pull back a bit"—and I stress "a bit"—"to a certain line, which naturally"—I stress "naturally"—"will be the final line."

37. It is no secret that there exists in Israel a plan by Yigal Allon, the Deputy Prime Minister, which is actually being executed in the occupied area through the creation of military settlements and military belts along the River Jordan. Moshe Dayan, more candid than Yigal Allon, is for the outright continuation of the *status quo* or occupation until the time when the acquisition becomes *de facto* annexation.

38. These statements and many others give clear evidence that Israel has decided to reap the fruits of its aggression, always under the pretext of Israel's security. This is what peace means to the Zionist Israelis. The words "peace and security" have been so much repeated by the military establishment in Israel that a national conviction has become reduced to a popular joke.

39. Permit me to relate this joke, at once amusing and depressing yet revealing of the Zionist intent in the region. The joke goes like this. One Israeli asks another: "Do you want peace with the Arabs?" The other answers: "Yes, I want peace—a piece of Syria, a piece of Jordan and a piece of Egypt." This is the context of peace in which the Israeli population has been educated by its leaders and especially by the military establishment.

40. Had Israel wanted peace it would have heeded the decision of the United Nations which assured all parties concerned of peace with security guarantees. Had Israel wanted peace it would have listened to the decisions taken by the Assembly of the OAU at its last meeting in Rabat, the decisions of the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries in Georgetown last August, and international public opinion, which began to see the militarist and aggressive nature of Israel, which Zionist propaganda had presented as a small, peaceful country threatened by its Arab neighbours.

41. The failure of all those genuine efforts for a just and durable peace in the area during the last five years, and the dangerous situation created by this illegal acquisition of the lands of others by force, as well as the denial of the right of a whole people to self-determination and independence, make it incumbent on the United Nations to adopt more effective measures against Israel aggression.

42. Since this state of affairs is created and aggravated by the continuous flow of arms and financial assistance from certain countries—and, I repeat, in particular the United States—it is the duty of this Assembly to call on all those Member States to assist in the removal of this perpetuated aggression by stopping forthwith the delivery of arms and all sorts of assistance to Israel. Such action by the General Assembly cannot be described in any way as one-sided or as not conducive to any genuine move for peace, for nobody could justifiably deny this Assembly its right and duty with respect to the establishment of peace in any part of the world.

43. It is also the duty and the right of this Assembly to vindicate the legitimate and inalienable right of the Arab people of Palestine to human rights and dignity, self-determination and independence. It would be immoral and a dereliction of duty if the United Nations were to allow a people of 2.5 million souls to be chased out of their homes and terrorized wherever they are by Israel, which follows a policy of systematic genocide.

44. Even the question of terrorism against those people has been mentioned repeatedly of late in connexion with the discussion of the item on terrorism in this place [item 92].

45. The General Assembly will be in duty bound to play a prominent role in the removal of aggression and the establishment of peace, a basic condition for the promotion of "social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom"—to quote from the opening words of the Charter.

46. Mr. CORADIN (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): For six years now the General Assembly has been dealing with the crisis in the Middle East without being able to change any of the essential elements of the problem. Today, when practically all the other hotbeds of tension are being reduced throughout the world, the Middle East remains the only nerve centre where peace is still threatened.

47. However, the problems which have constituted a threat to peace have been considered and taken up by the Powers concerned and by the United Nations with the obvious and praiseworthy desire to find a solution to them. The easing of tension which can at present be observed in Europe and the talks which have been undertaken by the parties to put an end to the Viet-Nam war are a demonstration of the fact that the peaceful settlement of disputes by means of negotiation, whether they be direct or indirect, bilateral or multilateral, has these days become the universally acceptable method of diplomacy. All those are reasons which would prompt us to believe that the crisis of the Middle East can and should be settled in accordance with the same method, at a time when the quest for peace

is becoming a major preoccupation for the international community.

48. It is obvious that the situation in the Middle East is extremely complex because of the problems which are involved and because of the inevitable circumstances in which they evolve. It is also certain that the parties concerned in this conflict have rights and interests which at first glance would appear to be difficult to adjust, but which in reality can be reconciled.

49. The Arab countries are struggling to make Israel withdraw from the occupied territories so that the fate of the refugees can be solved once and for all, and so that the refugees can freely aspire to self-determination and to independence. Israel is struggling to ensure that the frontiers established between its territory and the Arab world are secure, that is to say, likely to guarantee its internal security. Thus it claims that it is pleading for its survival, for its self-determination, its independence and its sovereignty.

50. This is really an extremely complex situation in which the claims on both sides appear to be justified. Doubtless it is difficult to settle any dispute if neither of the parties is willing to make concessions. But it is not impossible to arrive at some adjustment of this problem, which in view of its international impact is of concern not only to the peoples of that region but also to those who are not directly involved.

51. As far as Haiti is concerned, the historic, economic, political and cultural ties to the peoples of that region, whether it be Israel or the Arab States, explain the interest which the Government of my country has in the restoration of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. In this connexion, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Haiti asked the following question during his statement on 26 September last in the general debate:

"Is there no other way but war, between the resolve of the Arab countries to force the Israelis to abandon the occupied territories and Israel's determination to seek safety within secure frontiers?" [2041st meeting, para. 159.]

52. The position of my Government on the question of the Middle East has not changed. It is based on the historic traditions of the Haitian people and on respect for principles which are universally recognized: the right of peoples to self-determination and to territorial integrity, mutual respect for political independence, free development and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

53. That is why my delegation is convinced that the implementation of these fundamental principles by the parties to the dispute can only help to establish a just and equitable peace whereby the interests and rights of each and every State will be guaranteed. But that peace can be brought about only to the extent that a willingness to make mutual concessions constitutes the basis of negotiations which might be undertaken between the parties.

54. An analysis of the present situation indicates certain prospects which are far from giving grounds for pessimism.

It gives us reason to hope that there will be some settlement of this dispute, a settlement that will not be imposed upon the parties concerned, but be freely accepted by them. My delegation would like to stress particularly the danger represented by proposals of a binding nature in the search for a reasonable solution to the conflict. These would be more likely to delay the process of negotiation rather than to encourage it. The adoption of any coercive attitudes towards either of these parties to the dispute can only further complicate the political climate in the Middle East.

55. My delegation has good reason to believe that a calm and objective approach to the problem, together with a desire by the parties to make mutual concessions, must necessarily lead to an over-all or stage-by-stage settlement of the conflict.

56. During the last five years considerable efforts have been made to bring about a stage-by-stage settlement. A peace agreement proposed by Egypt, involving the demilitarization of the occupied areas under the guarantee of the United Nations; the proposal made by Israel, on the other hand, to negotiate the withdrawal of its troops prior to the conclusion of a peace—all these are for my delegation evident signs of the desire of the parties to the dispute to undertake commitments in order to find a solution to the problem.

57. In the same spirit, Security Council resolution 242 (1967) has seemed to be perhaps the most essential document of the General Assembly on the matter, a document which should underlie any over-all settlement of the dispute. Since it embraces the basic elements of the conflict, it makes it possible for the General Assembly to continue its efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement of the situation in the Middle East. The Jarring mission, which was generated by this resolution, is and remains the only tool available to the Secretary-General for usefully intervening in the process of looking for a peaceful solution. If the results already obtained are not absolutely decisive in registering a certain progress in the situation, nevertheless they should not be underestimated. Mr. Jarring, whose devotion, tact and experience cannot be praised too highly, will undoubtedly continue to look for the appropriate ways to take advantage of the present relaxation of tension to intensify his contacts with the States concerned in order to make it possible for the Secretary-General to bring about a peaceful solution which will be accepted by both parties to the dispute.

58. On the basis of the clearly discernible good intentions of each camp, the Jarring mission will undoubtedly be able in the near future to apply resolution 242 (1967), either by means of interim arrangements or totally, by implementing its essential elements.

59. Undoubtedly, this will not be an easy task to fulfil, but with the goodwill of men and the spirit of mutual concession, peace will return to this sorely tried Middle East—a just and equitable peace which will leave behind it no seeds of discord.

60. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Once again the General Assembly is considering the situation in the Middle East. It is doing so now after more

than five years have elapsed since the State of Israel, with the support of international imperialism and, above all, with that of the United States, attacked three neighbouring Arab countries.

61. After five years the situation remains the same and in some aspects it has deteriorated even further. Israeli troops continue to occupy the territories of Egypt, Syria and Jordan which fell under their control as a result of the aggression carried out in 1967. The tragic drama of the people of Palestine, brutally despoiled of its territory a quarter of a century ago, continues without solution and is worsening with the emergence of new Arab displaced populations which have fled from the territories occupied by Israel in 1967.

62. The appeals of the General Assembly, repeated year after year, have fallen on the deaf ears of the aggressors, their supporters and accomplices. The larger imperialist Powers, mainly the United States, offer to Israel the necessary military and financial resources to perpetuate its aggression against the Arab peoples. At the diplomatic level imperialism provides the necessary support to paralyse the action of international organizations in favour of obtaining an equitable solution to this dispute.

63. Bolstered by imperialism, Israel refuses to abide by the decisions of the international community and in practice it is undertaking the colonization and annexation of the territories occupied by force in 1967. To these ends it has been applying a series of illegal measures which violate the rights of the peoples concerned; this is obvious evidence of its intention to evade any peaceful solution in accordance with law. These measures constitute a certain source of continuing intensification of the tensions in the area and they are an open challenge to the opinion repeated on many occasions by the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations.

64. On more than one occasion the Revolutionary Government of Cuba has expressed its opinion on this problem. We confirm our view to the effect that the indispensable prerequisite for the establishment of a just and lasting peace is the unconditional withdrawal of the invaders from all of the occupied territories and the recognition of the national rights of the Palestine people. There will be no peaceful solution to this dispute so long as this condition is not properly complied with. We consider that the Assembly should reaffirm this principle as a necessary prerequisite for any solution.

65. We also consider that the Assembly should call upon all Member States to refrain from providing Israel with any type of assistance that might strengthen its military power and continue the illegal occupation of Arab territories and any other measure which might be interpreted as recognition, overt or covert, of the changes that the aggressors are making in these territories.

66. My delegation wishes to take advantage of this opportunity to give evidence of its solidarity with the Palestine people and with the peoples of the Arab countries victims of imperialist Israel aggression. We consider it an international duty to offer our co-operation, solidarity and support to the Arab cause.

67. The struggle of the Arab peoples, including the people of Palestine, against imperialist aggression and for the defence of their national rights is an inseparable part of the general process of the emancipation of the so-called third world and deserves the support of all progressive forces.

68. That is why my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.686, which was introduced at the previous meeting by the representative of Senegal.

69. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translation from Russian*): During the year which has elapsed since the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, there has been a general relaxation of international tension and an improvement in relations between States in various regions of the world, but unfortunately, through the fault of Israel, there have been no positive changes concerning the question of a political settlement in the Middle East. Security Council resolution 242 (1967), General Assembly resolution 2799 (XXVI) and other United Nations decisions on the Middle East have not been implemented. The situation in that region continues to be tense, fraught with the dangers of a new outbreak of war, whose consequences not only could be dire for the peoples of the Middle East but could spread beyond the confines of the region.

70. The blame for the lack of progress in finding a solution to the Middle East conflict must be placed firmly and squarely on Israel. At a time when the Arab countries, various United Nations bodies and world public opinion are making every effort to eliminate the consequences of the Israeli aggression against the Arab peoples and to establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, Israel is continuing to block all paths leading towards any peaceful political settlement in that part of the world, stubbornly refusing to withdraw its troops from the territories it seized and openly following a policy of annexing the occupied Arab territories.

71. Encouraged by its impunity and by the support of Zionist and imperialist circles, Israel is pursuing a policy of banditry, terrorism and violence against the Arab peoples. A blatant example of this is the continuing Israeli provocation against neighbouring Arab countries, as are also the recent barbaric bombings and open acts of terrorism against the civilian populations of Lebanon and Syria and against the Palestinian refugee camps in those countries.

*Mr. Coradin (Haiti), Vice-President, took the chair.*

72. This strongly underlines once again the need for this discussion and for the adoption of further and more resolute measures to force Israel to comply with the will of the overwhelming majority in the United Nations and put an end to its aggression in the Middle East. Taking the most decisive steps to that end is even more clearly necessary in the light of the statement by the representative of Israel at the beginning of this debate [2092nd meeting] in which he once again attempted, by distorting the facts, by invention and by false arguments, to depict Israel as the innocent victim of aggression, and the Arab countries, large areas of whose territory have been occupied by Israeli troops, as the aggressors. In an attempt to justify Israel's territorial conquests, he tried to prove that the views and the position

of the United Nations on a Middle East settlement were wrong, while everything that he, the representative of Israel, said was right. But it is naïve to suppose that anyone could have believed such a brazen lie. The Israeli representative's statement is simply further proof that Israel is not seeking any peaceful political settlement in the Middle East but intends to continue disregarding United Nations decisions and the demands of world public opinion that it should bring to an end its aggression against the Arab countries.

73. Israel is a State which was established by a decision of the United Nations. In taking the decision to establish the State of Israel, and later in deciding to accept it as a Member of the United Nations, the Member States proceeded on the assumption that Israel would act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and would respect its provisions. But what is actually happening? The whole history of Israel's existence, filled with constant aggressive wars against neighbouring Arab States, runs directly counter to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. No other State Member of the United Nations has such a list of crimes to its discredit as Israel.

74. During the period from the 1967 aggression to January 1972 alone—as General Bar-Lev, formerly chief of staff of the Israeli army and currently Minister of Commerce and Industry, has himself acknowledged—the Israeli armed forces violated the provisions of the cease-fire agreement and invaded the territory of Arab States 5,270 times. Over the last five years the Security Council has condemned Israel outright eight times and censured it 10 times for acts of aggression against the Arab peoples.

75. Israel's territorial expansionism is becoming more blatant year by year. Whereas formerly Israel's leaders spoke of self-defence and the right to exist, declaring that Israel wanted no territorial conquests and did not need an inch of anyone else's land, those slogans are now long forgotten. Today representatives of Israel brazenly and openly reject any measures envisaging the return of the occupied Arab territories or a peaceful political settlement in the Middle East. The statement by Israel's Defence Minister Moshe Dayan that "Israel's boundaries are where the Israeli army positions now are" has become the slogan of the Israeli Government in its policy of territorial expansion.

76. In an interview on Israeli television in early August 1972, General Rabin, the Israeli Ambassador to the United States, called for open sabotage of any political settlement in the Middle East. He declared that the Government of Israel "should block any political option providing for a general settlement on the basis of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, which had the Jarring mission as the main instrument for its implementation". Rabin's interview simply confirmed once again that the ruling circles in Israel are not interested in attaining a just and lasting political settlement, that the main concern of the Israeli expansionists, who are relying on the constant support of Zionist and imperialist circles in the Western countries, is to annex traditionally Arab lands and to subvert anti-imperialist régimes in the Arab countries.

77. The Israeli leaders try to justify their policy of annexation by talking about the necessity of guaranteeing the security of Israel's frontiers. But it has long ceased to be a secret that the annexationist plans of Tel Aviv, based on the Zionist doctrine of creating a "Greater Israel" stretching from the Nile to the Euphrates, include not only the incorporation of territories occupied during the 1967 war but further expansion as well.

78. In its attempt to "legalize" the annexation of the occupied Arab territories, the Israeli Government is resorting to the classic method of Zionism, namely, trying to achieve each of its goals through a succession of faits accomplis.

79. One conspicuous illustration of such a policy is the expulsion of Arab inhabitants from their own land and the establishment of Jewish settlements in their place. The Israeli aggressors' take-over of the occupied lands is accompanied by atrocities against the local population. The methods and practices used by the Israeli aggressors against the Arab inhabitants are similar to those of the Fascists in occupied territories during the Second World War.

80. In his statement of 29 November [2092nd meeting] the representative of Israel used all sorts of examples and quotations about the "paradise" in which the people of the occupied territories were supposedly living. But if that is so, why do the leaders of Israel refuse to admit representatives of the United Nations into those territories, in particular the members of the Commission on Human Rights and the members of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories? They are afraid that world opinion might be informed of even more monstrous crimes being committed by Israel in the occupied Arab lands.

81. Israel is deriving substantial economic benefits from its continuing occupation of the Arab lands. In the Sinai peninsula, with the help of Western companies, the exploitation of Egyptian oil is steadily expanding and providing the Israeli leaders with more millions to finance their war machine.

82. The expansionist plans of the Israeli military can also be judged by the rapidly growing militarization of the country. The militarization of the Israeli economy became even more pronounced after the 1967 war. According to a statement by Israel's Finance Minister Pinhas Sapir, Israel has spent approximately \$6,000 million on "defence" during the past six years, and for the next six years that amount will increase almost to \$10,000 million. Moreover, Mr. Sapir declared that Israel intends to increase its military expenditure by more than 60 per cent even if a Middle East peace treaty is signed.

83. With the help of foreign capital, a huge military industry has been established in Israel, producing up to 600 different kinds of weapons and ammunition, including jet aircraft, rockets, artillery and mortars. For the 1972/1973 financial year, Israeli leaders are earmarking approximately 40 per cent of their budget for military purposes. That is one of the largest military budgets in the world.



84. The most modern military equipment is being imported into Israel from abroad in large quantities—aircraft, tanks, helicopters, rockets, artillery, the latest electronic gear, radar and submarines.

85. If this flow is not stemmed, Israel will be receiving more and more modern means for strengthening its military machine and will continue its aggression against the Arab States with a view to satisfying its new expansionist ambitions.

86. The continuing comprehensive military, economic, political and moral support given to Tel Aviv by Zionist and imperialist circles in Western countries is building in the minds of the Israeli military a conviction that they can act with impunity. This support makes Israeli propagandists more and more persistent in forcing on world public opinion, especially in the Arab countries, the idea that Israel's demands must be met, that is, that the aggressor must be rewarded. They see as one means to that end the so-called direct Arab-Israeli talks on the possibility of reaching some kind of temporary or partial agreement.

87. But it is obvious that no agreement is possible so long as Israel refuses to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories and the Israeli troops continue to trespass on Arab soil. The campaign to exert political pressure on the Arab countries is doomed to failure. As was stressed in the statement entitled "For a just and lasting peace in the Middle East", issued by the Twenty-Fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union,

"The struggle of the peace-loving forces against the Israeli aggression has now entered a phase in which the expansionist aspirations of Israel's ruling group and Zionist circles have been fully exposed. The international isolation of the Israeli aggressors and their patrons—the United States imperialist circles who hypocritically declare their wish for peace but who, in effect, encourage the Israeli extremists—is becoming greater."<sup>5</sup>

88. It is self-evident that no Israeli manoeuvres can force the Arab countries to change their position or to renounce the support given them by the United Nations. The way to a solution of the Middle East conflict has been indicated in United Nations decisions, particularly in Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which is based on the affirmation of the principle that the use or threat of force for purposes of territorial acquisition is inadmissible and that any territory so acquired must be returned.

89. As everyone knows, the principle of the non-use of force in relations between States has been reaffirmed in many United Nations decisions, including resolution 2936 (XXVII), adopted at this session, as one of the basic principles of international relations. It is becoming more widely accepted among States, and its implementation requires, *inter alia*, the elimination of the consequences of Israeli aggression against the Arab peoples. After all, it was not by chance that the United Nations General Assembly recalled in that resolution the principle of the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by force and the inherent

right of States to recover such territories by all the means at their disposal.

90. A settlement of the Middle East conflict requires, first and foremost, the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied territories and the return of those territories to the Arab countries; it also requires the renunciation of all claims, the cessation of any state of war, and respect for, and recognition of, the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all peoples in the area, including the people of Palestine, and of their right to live in peace without being subjected to the threat or use of force. That is the only way to eliminate the hotbed of war in the Middle East and to establish a lasting and stable peace in that part of the world.

91. The achievement of that goal is being brought nearer by the position taken in support of the just struggle of the Arab peoples by a growing number of States, which now constitute an overwhelming majority in the United Nations. The ranks of those who openly or covertly support Israel are inexorably thinning. But other events are taking place as well.

92. Last year, when the question of the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China at the United Nations was resolved, there were many who hoped that the People's Republic of China would join the forces effectively combating Israeli aggression and that the Israeli aggressors would find it more difficult to resist the implementation of United Nations decisions aimed at putting an end to their aggression against the Arab peoples. But that did not happen. At the last session of the United Nations General Assembly, the delegation of the People's Republic of China did not support the resolution on the Middle East conflict. And at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly, on this burning question the People's Republic of China has confined itself to the statement that—and I quote from the English text distributed by the delegation of the People's Republic of China—"... by relying on their own strength, the 100 million Arab people will certainly frustrate the aggression ...". [2099th meeting, para. 57.]<sup>6</sup>

93. This means that China will not participate in a Middle East settlement but will merely watch from the sidelines to see how matters turn out. Such an attitude plays into the hands of the Israeli aggressors but certainly does not serve the interests of the Arab peoples. Meanwhile the Chinese delegation will be inventing stories at the United Nations about super-Powers. In that connexion I should like to point out that, even before the appearance of the delegation of the People's Republic of China at the United Nations, the Members of the United Nations had already heard fabrications and slanders about super-Powers, consisting mainly of anti-Soviet propaganda spoken by the representative of a certain other country. At that time everyone agreed that such talk was gibberish. Now, when we hear the same sort of thing from the Chinese representative, it can only be called super-gibberish which does not even need to be refuted, particularly when we note that yesterday, speaking in exercise of the right of reply [2099th meeting], the representative of Israel replied to all the representatives who had spoken except the delegation

<sup>5</sup> *Materialy XXIV Sezda KPSS* (Moscow, Izdatelstvo Politicheskoy Literatury, 1971).

<sup>6</sup> Quoted in English by the speaker.

of the People's Republic of China. Moreover, the Israeli representative began, in this sixth year of the Israeli aggression, to quote Chinese proverbs in order to disguise and justify Israeli aggression. That is both symptomatic and significant. It seems to be a covert expression of Israel's gratitude that, instead of actively helping the Arab States to eliminate the consequences of Israeli aggression, China is in fact, through the position it has adopted, helping Israel to continue that aggression.

94. The Byelorussian SSR, like the other socialist States and all peace-loving peoples, has from the very beginning, consistently and as a matter of principle, supported the just struggle of the Arab peoples against the Israeli aggressors. We have actively supported and continue to support the activities of the United Nations to eliminate the consequences of Israeli aggression in the Middle East and to bring about a political settlement in that region. We have supported and continue to support Ambassador Jarring's mission. We are firmly convinced that a political solution of the Middle East conflict can be achieved within the United Nations on the basis of the implementation of its decisions relating to that problem, especially Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which provides for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories. To that end, collective action must be taken by all States, taking advantage of all possible options under the Charter of the United Nations, among them the measures provided for in Chapter VII, including, if necessary, the use of sanctions against the aggressor.

95. In order to foster positive trends in the world and bring about a relaxation of tensions in various regions, the United Nations must take decisive and prompt action to eliminate the hotbed of war in the Middle East and to ensure a just and lasting peace there, which the peoples are so anxiously awaiting.

96. Mr. NUÑEZ (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Once again in this international forum we are coming to grips with the discussion of the item euphemistically entitled "The situation in the Middle East" which we might more appropriately call "The drama of the peoples in the Middle East".

97. My delegation, which represents a small Central American country, considers it its duty to join with large and small countries of other parts of the world in an effort to offer a solution to the situation in the Middle East which would be honourably acceptable to the nations involved and which would ensure that their peoples have an opportunity to live in peace and freedom within a broad framework of mutual understanding, mutual respect and constructive co-operation.

98. My delegation has listened attentively to, and seriously weighed, the statements that have been made from this rostrum by representatives both of the Governments and peoples directly concerned and of other Powers that are following with concern the tragic drama that is being played out in the Middle East. We have found in these statements a common yearning for peace. These statements indicate that the speakers are tired of the tension produced by a conflict which the peoples concerned should not bear

any longer and which the nations of the world should not contemplate with indifference or encourage.

99. We were told by the representative of the United Kingdom that, as is shown by the experience of five years, "the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) is a long and difficult process" [2095th meeting, para. 19]. But then he encouraged us by quoting the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of his country, who had said that we "must not listen to counsels of despair" [*ibid.*]. The representative of Romania offered us counsel of hope which should emerge during the long course of negotiations on a "basis which is acceptable to both sides" [2098th meeting, para. 114], and encouraged us to strengthen "the political will to reach agreement" [*ibid.*, para. 116]. These highly qualified spokesmen were joined by a no less qualified and sincere statesman, the representative of the United States [2098th meeting], calling upon all of us, but in particular the parties to the dispute, to find in a dialogue the only instrument capable of bringing about in the Middle East the miracle which has been achieved for other areas of the world where conflicts have existed.

100. Last year we found ourselves in this same Assembly hall, engaged in a debate fraught with acrimony and bitterness, with a display of numerical superiority and unyielding attitudes. Our delegation then had the honour of joining the delegations of El Salvador, Haiti and Uruguay<sup>7</sup> in a noble effort to ensure that the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly would adopt a resolution for peace by reducing to the minimum the prerequisites for dialogue within the strictest adherence to resolution 242 (1967), which—to use the well-chosen turn of phrase of the representative of the United Kingdom—"represents the highest common factor of agreement obtainable, either then or now" [2095th meeting, para. 19].

101. Unfortunately, our efforts failed. A resolution was adopted [2799 (XXVI)] which, as many had feared, proved to be more a declaration of war than a milestone along the path—which of course, as we all know, is long and laborious—towards peace. The result has been a lost year so far as our task is concerned. The resolution held up the process for peace because it paralysed the hands of the person who was supposed to pursue his mission as the representative of the Secretary-General by including as a prerequisite for his action something that had already proved to be an insuperable obstacle. Instead of progress, we have had to witness with sorrow acts of violence which have caused suffering to many human beings, including some who have no direct relationship to the dispute.

102. My delegation would like to remain within the spirit that prevailed in most of the very valuable statements made by other delegations urging us to utilize this debate for constructive purposes in order to increase the options instead of reducing them. In this spirit, we appeal to all delegations to adopt a resolution which would constitute not an obstacle but, rather, an effective solution taking into account the political realities, the very understandable suspicions, and the legitimate human feelings of the parties to the dispute. We endorse the hope expressed by the

<sup>7</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 22, document A/L.652/Rev.1.

representative of the United Kingdom that the resolution that was adopted "will permit the Secretary-General and his Special Representative in due time to resume the quest for ways and means of breaking the present deadlock, using whatever procedures they judge to be appropriate" [2095th meeting, para. 23].

103. Instead of consolidating it, we should break the mythology of hatred. With prudent action we must show the leaders of peoples, and the peoples themselves, that the foul winds of hate, the blanketing fog of rancour can and should give way to a strong ray of sunshine over the horizon, which will bring with it what was called by the Romanian representative "the political will to reach agreement"—a political will which will be all the more effective to the degree that it is based on faith, hope and love.

104. Although I am a catholic priest, I do not say this as one of my Sunday sermons. But from this very rostrum one of the most lofty spiritual authorities of the world—and I am referring to Pope Paul VI—has already said: "Never again war, war never again!"<sup>8</sup>

105. Politicians and diplomats should also be reminded of the effectiveness of faith, hope and love in producing peace. Then they would understand the wisdom of the words "*summum jus, summa injuria*"—"extreme law is the greatest injury"—and understand that a resolution may perhaps for one party constitute a legal victory based on numerical force in terms of parliamentary numbers but may be regarded by the other party as a danger to its survival—particularly when that party has experienced that danger through its centuries of existence and still considers itself to be living under the threatening cloud of extermination.

106. To win in votes on resolutions for the mere sake of winning is not a sign of the art of prudent government. Any resolution that does not reflect the extremely wise balance of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) but that, on the contrary, would disrupt it in tragic fashion may, even without the authors so intending, become a force which would sooner or later result in violent action by one side or the other.

107. It is the duty of the United Nations to create frameworks of law within which it can demand that its Members comply with their duties and it can guarantee them the enjoyment of their rights. By virtue of complicated historical phenomena there has been created in the Middle East a fluid situation, a legal no-man's-land as far as borders are concerned. But these, instead of resulting from determinations of law—and we do not wish now to dwell on who is to blame—were acts of force and those frontiers became military lines at the moment of a cease-fire. What is regrettable is that each act of force has been met with another, and this has resulted in the creation of the complex situation that now confronts us. But that situation did not arise out of a vacuum. It has resulted from a historic process characterized at various points in time by a constant process of action and reaction, war, blockages of shipping lanes, sabotage, the destruction of villages, up-

heavals of populations, the unexpected withdrawal of United Nations forces, terrorism, military operations on a considerable scale in the midst of a seeming cease-fire. Those facts are interpreted differently, depending on the sympathies of those interpreting them. As a result, as has been said by the representative of the United States of America, everyone believes he is right.

108. In view of those situations, we are left with the following alternative: we can look back and become engulfed in sterile discussions in order to shed light on historic processes and determine who was guilty of such-and-such an operation and who said what at a particular time, or, leaving behind that sterile field which has resulted only in frustration, we can turn our eyes to the future and dedicate ourselves to building the world of tomorrow; we can explode the mythology of hatred and demonstrate to history that it is possible for brother peoples that were able to live together under conditions of exploitation by foreign imperial forces and empires in their last stages to live again in peace as sovereign, free and prosperous nations.

109. The year before us must be one of dialogue. I urge representatives not to obstruct this dialogue through unrealistic resolutions and Pyrrhic legal victories. It is dialogue and not resolutions—and much less armed confrontations—that is reducing tensions in other parts of the world. A very wise example of that attitude was given us by the President of Chile, Mr. Allende, in the vigorous statement [2096th meeting] in which he expressed the tormented soul of Latin America in affirming that, despite differences of opinion with certain countries, there was no country with which Chile was not prepared to enter into discussions concerning its affairs. No one loses anything by trying to enter into talks opening the doors to dialogue; on the contrary, everything is to be lost by closing them. Of course, no one claims that the commencement of dialogue means that basic questions separating nations or peoples will be settled in advance.

110. None the less, peace makes progress throughout the world on the wings of dialogue. In that fashion, the two Germanys have found broader areas of understanding between them; India and Pakistan have reduced the divergencies that had set them diametrically against each other; the United States of America and the People's Republic of China have opened up windows in walls that had seemed impenetrable. The two Koreas are through dialogue seeking the road to progress and well-being for their peoples; the two Viet-Nams are in the process of confronting the world with a happy surprise—the best possible announcement that could be made at Christmas-time—achieved through discreet and patient conversations. The painful tensions of the two peoples of Cyprus are being eased because their leaders have decided to converse.

111. I refuse to believe that peoples from whom a large portion of mankind has received spiritual, cultural, scientific and artistic values cannot put an end to this mythology of hatred and commit themselves to a dialogue that will heal wounds, redress injustices, reaffirm the right of peoples to self-determination, end the suffering of subjugated and displaced peoples and open up for the Middle East that Messianic era foretold by the Prophets who flourished there in the past.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, Twentieth Session, Plenary Meetings, 1347th meeting, para. 33.

112. Mr. LONGERSTAEY (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): It is with some trepidation that we participate in the General Assembly's debate on the serious problem of the Middle East. The interests of peace—the only goal that should guide our actions—prompt us to speak in restrained and measured language and to avoid any escalation of mutual recriminations which would be likely to compromise the patient and discreet quest for a peaceful settlement of this conflict.

113. Experience has shown that, unless we work methodically towards negotiation, the forces of disorder are capable of bringing about unacceptable confrontations. Therefore, we must set in motion procedures leading to a settlement of the conflict. As Mr. Harmel, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belgium, stated from this rostrum on 5 October,

“For us the basis of a negotiated solution remains in Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which the great Powers and the principal States concerned supported. I know it is five years old, but it is not obsolete; it contains the principles of an agreement. It would be otiose, in our view, to interpret it or to try to improve on it. Its practical implementation is principally the responsibility of the parties, aided by those designated by the United Nations to assist them.” [2054th meeting, para. 103.]

114. We do not wish to discount any of the efforts that have been made so far to create concrete prospects for the practical implementation of that resolution, but at the same time it must be noted that the so-called global approach initiated by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, in which we had vested such great hopes, has so far not created the context that would make it possible for significant progress to be accomplished. Another specific overture to which we should now turn our main attention is the proposal made on 4 February 1971 by President El-Sadat, and also the interest shown equally by Israel in seeking an interim solution which would be accompanied by the reopening of the Suez Canal. By bringing about such agreement, as Mr. Harmel said, we would be giving proof that mutually beneficial undertakings can be concluded between two States that are still balanced between war and peace.

115. What is important, in our eyes, is at least some beginnings of a positive movement which would put an end to a dangerous state of immobility. Then it would be possible to take up with more assurance the other problems which are connected with an over-all solution.

116. In our delegation we believe that setting a negotiating process in motion would be greatly facilitated if the parties to the conflict would see their way to repeating formally their adherence to the principles already explicitly expressed in resolution 242 (1967), which also stresses both the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by war and, equally, the need to work for a just and lasting peace, enabling each State in the region to live in security. As it is enshrined in the preamble to resolution 242 (1967), this dual commitment implies the main point that Israel would make no final territorial claims and that Egypt would not seek to wipe Israel from the map of the Middle East.

117. It will remain thereafter, by methodical negotiations, to arrive at concrete agreements which, step by step, will

resolve one of the most thorny conflicts of our age. If our Assembly can firmly advocate such a process of negotiation, it will thereby make a signal contribution to the accomplishment of the work begun by the Security Council in November 1967.

118. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Our position on this item is consistent with our basic approach to all international problems in the United Nations. We stand for the peaceful settlement of disputes free from the threat or use of force as an instrument of policy in international relations. We equally stand for respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State and its right to exist in security and peace. We stand for faithful adherence to the Charter and for compliance with the resolutions of the United Nations. In considering this item, therefore, we are governed, as previously, by these basic considerations.

119. One more year has been added to the years in which the problem of the Middle East has remained unsolved, and the situation, most regrettably, appears even more removed from solution than before.

120. This is particularly regrettable in view of the hopes that have been, not unreasonably, pinned on the relevant resolution of the Security Council, resolution 242 (1967). This is an eminently balanced and constructive resolution that takes account of the intrinsic justice of the case, and of existing realities that cannot be ignored. It constitutes the most realistic approach to the problem of the Middle East, and treats that problem in a manner satisfactory to the claims and positions of all sides, and to the goal of ensuring peace in the area.

121. The whole tenor of the resolution is clear and unambiguous, and its merits are obvious. The resolution provides for conditions that can produce a lasting peace by dealing with fundamental principles and basic realities in a just and even-handed way.

122. While emphasizing the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and while calling for the withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict, the resolution also calls for the

“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”.

123. Thus, parallel to the requirement of Israeli military withdrawal, the resolution requires equally that the basic and difficult problem resulting from the non-recognition of Israel as a State by its Arab neighbours—a matter of vital importance to Israel that has all along been its central complaint over the years—be disposed of.

124. This resolution, furthermore, was unanimously adopted by the Security Council and accepted by both sides. No sounder basis or more appropriate premise for the settlement of this problem could ever be devised and no circumstances could be found that would be more auspicious



cious. We hope that the still existing opportunity for concerted effort towards a long overdue settlement of this grave international problem will not be wasted. The general consensus in support of the resolution, manifested in the statements of previous speakers in this Assembly, is proof of its objectivity and its great merit.

125. We therefore consider it our duty as Member States to reaffirm emphatically the validity of that resolution and the need for its earnest and effective implementation. The objective, skilful and wise mediation of Ambassador Jarring must not be left idling, but must be utilized towards productive results. A positive spirit of understanding and an imaginative approach to agreement between the parties should be forthcoming for the implementation of the resolution in accordance with its tenets and purport and within the principles of the Charter.

126. The question of secure and recognized boundaries, as provided for in the resolution, is one of considerable significance. As far as the recognition of Israel is concerned, the good faith which has been genuinely forthcoming from the Arab side is a most hopeful sign of a new approach and certainly merits a comparable response.

127. The aspect of secure boundaries requires special attention and negotiation in devising the right formula, consistent with the other provisions of the resolution. One appropriate—perhaps the best—means of ensuring secure boundaries could be the establishment of demilitarized or neutral, or even international, zones with a United Nations presence and with the additional guarantee of the Security Council—and more particularly and effectively of its permanent members. Having regard to the big Power involvement in the whole Middle East problem, the joint guarantee of those Powers would be a significant factor in providing adequate assurance of the safety of the boundaries. The present period of East-West détente could perhaps afford an eminently auspicious opportunity for such an initiative in this respect, an initiative designed to bring about agreement between the parties within the framework of Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

128. Other aspects of the resolution concerning the freedom of navigation and the refugee situation should also be tackled with determination and in an all-out effort to reach agreement.

129. The Middle East problem by its very nature is a problem profoundly affected by deeply ingrained psychological factors. At the root of the problem lies the plight of the Palestinian people as refugees in camps, frustrated and despairing for decades.

130. Any flicker of hope for some restitution or alleviation of their sad lot has become dimmer and dimmer with the passage of every year. The refugee problem is tragically sensitive and is loaded with emotional and political dynamite. A deep-rooted and growing psychosis over the injustice of their plight has been increasingly gaining control of the minds and spirits of the refugees. In their

eyes the international community appears as somewhat apathetic to their plight.

131. Yet, apart from the humanitarian aspect, the international community has a direct stake in the just solution of this long festering and perennial problem of the Palestinian people who are being kept as refugees—not only in its potential threat of escalation to nuclear conflagration, having regard to the big-Power involvement, but also in its wider repercussions as a generator of acts of desperation through individual forms of violence which in our present technological times have become a real danger to the international community, and a problem on the agenda of this session [item 92].

132. We are on record as fully condemning all acts of violence and terrorism; we cannot, however, overlook the root-causes of these threatening international developments which call for urgent redress. By reason of sophisticated means of destruction in an advanced technological age, such explosive situations threaten the very structure of an existing international legal order, security in the world, and the life of everyone. This is perhaps one more manifestation of the basic need, in international and human relations, to conform to the ethical imperatives of a technological era that is now with us.

133. We have reached a juncture in history when international problems simply have to be solved by peaceful means, not through the threat or use of force. Any territorial or other advantage that might in one case or another be thought to accrue from continuing strife and war is wholly illusory and unreal. For real security lies only in a peaceful and agreed settlement, such as that envisaged in the Security Council resolution on the present item. Whatever the existing difficulties in solving this problem on the basis of the resolution, they are but minimal when compared to the magnitude of the calamities involved in any further continuance on the perilous road, which is mutually destructive, of conflict and war.

134. A start towards solving the refugee problem can be made by early arrangements for the return to the west bank of the Jordan of its people displaced in 1967. A positive gesture in that direction would produce new hope for all the refugees and would be an important factor in generating a more auspicious atmosphere and a better spirit of understanding concerning an agreed and peaceful settlement of the whole problem within the framework of the resolution.

135. My delegation joins in the general appeal made from this rostrum for the resumption of negotiations through the mediation of Ambassador Jarring and on the basis of the fair implementation by both sides of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). The Middle East, as an area surcharged with conflicting and explosive emotions, is pre-eminently the region in which the international community, through the United Nations, has a compelling duty and responsibility to restore and preserve peace in the paramount interest of world peace and security.

*The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.*