

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



**2095th
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 1 December 1972,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 21:

The situation in the Middle East (*continued*) 1

President: Mr. Stanisław TREPCZYŃSKI (Poland).

In the absence of the President, Mr. Gabre-Sellassie (Ethiopia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 21

The situation in the Middle East (*continued*)

1. Mr. OLCAY (Turkey): One of the characteristics of the United Nations era in international relations has been the universal acceptance of the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes. At long last, in words, if not always in deeds, mankind appears to concur as regards the necessity of solving its differences through peaceful means. Our deliberations on various issues indicate clearly that we all agree at least on one point: that war brings no lasting solution to our differences and that it only sows the seeds of hatred and injustice, thus leading to more tears and bloodshed.

2. The problem of the Middle East is no exception to this rule and no other region requires the application of mankind's common will for peace more urgently than the Middle East. During the course of this century the Middle East has become one of the most tormented parts of the world. Unfortunately, owing to unavoidable circumstances, its rich resources, which should be devoted to the welfare and progress of its people, who have lived in continued grief and hardship, remain largely allotted to military purposes, while the area itself is still one of the major hot-beds of tension, endangering international peace and thus constituting a source of permanent concern.

3. This summer marked the fifth anniversary of the tragic war of 1967, which shook the Middle East for the third time in two decades and resulted in the occupation of territories of Egypt, Jordan and Syria. Five years have elapsed since then and the situation remains far from normal in spite of the common desire for, and repeated attempts at, the establishment of peace. To our regret, we are even witnessing an increase in violence, sometimes taking the shape of full-scale military operations in the area.

4. The growing tension across the cease-fire lines, which from time to time becomes uncontrollable, provides ample proof, if proof were needed, of the necessity of making constant efforts in search of peace in the Middle East. It is therefore appropriate that the General Assembly should be

seized of the question in yet another effort to try to contribute to a settlement.

5. In addition to the general international interest in peace and justice in the Middle East, specific reasons increase my country's concern and interest. We are a country of the region and geographical proximity necessarily links Turkey's own sense of security and peace to the prevailing conditions in the area. We have been involved in the life of the peoples of the area for more than a millenium. Our historic, political, cultural, economic and religious ties with it underlie our deep concern. Therefore much that is common in our past, together with our sense of present political realities as well as geographical considerations, increase our interest in the establishment of peace and justice in the region.

6. The foreign policy of Turkey has traditionally been guided by sincere adherence to the principle of resolving international disputes through peaceful means. In our foreign relations we have always aimed at the promotion of good relations with all our neighbours and the countries of the region, relations based on mutual respect for political independence and territorial integrity and non-interference in internal affairs. Thus since the primary target of Turkish foreign policy is the reign of justice and peace in the world, the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East is and will be of particular importance for my country.

7. The establishment of such a peace should naturally safeguard the legitimate rights and interests of all concerned. On the other hand, consistent with the basic principle of our foreign policy, we cannot condone the acquisition of political or territorial advantages through the use of force. Neither do we approve the resort to faits accomplis or unilateral actions anywhere in the world, and certainly not in our region, as a basis for the elaboration of settlements. We believe that the imposition of unilateral solutions through such methods can bring no real and durable peace, since nothing lasting can be founded on injustice and hatred.

8. We have continuously advocated a just settlement of the problem of the million and a half Palestine refugees, who have undergone enormous sufferings for more than two decades. Until such time as a final political solution is found we have felt duty-bound to extend our active support to all international efforts aimed at alleviating this human grief.

9. Because of our opposition to the policy of fait accompli and unilateral actions we remain opposed to all measures and actions which would bring about any unilateral change in the status of Jerusalem, a city whose moral position as a focal point of convergence of so many faiths far transcends

its geographical and physical situation. The emotional elements of global interest raised by this problem should not and cannot be ignored in either the legal or the political consideration of the matter.

10. With these views in mind the Turkish Government has continuously supported, and when and where possible contributed to, all efforts aiming at a peaceful solution of the problem. The Turkish Government has from the start fully supported Security Council resolution 242 (1967). For more than five years now all international efforts have been based on that resolution, and rightly so. Within the purview of the basic principles of the United Nations Charter, that resolution encompasses all the elements of the conflict on which I have tried to express briefly my delegation's views. The very fact that despite five years of unsuccessful efforts there remains the widest consensus in favour of that resolution is indicative of its intrinsic merits and validity.

11. The Jarring mission was and continues to be the prescribed means for reaching a settlement through the implementation of that resolution. The mission received almost universal support, and we remain convinced that we have made a felicitous choice in the person of Ambassador Jarring, an experienced and gifted diplomat to whom we all owe a debt of gratitude for his dedication and wisdom. Our only source of regret is that, as I have already indicated, for five years we have failed to achieve the implementation of that important resolution despite its wide acceptance.

12. Having supported Ambassador Jarring's mission since its inception, we have reasons to be appreciative of the constructive attitude taken to his efforts to fulfil his mandate by some of the directly interested Arab States. As the Turkish Foreign Minister said some time ago from this same rostrum:

"We believe that this approach should not only be put to good use but should also be followed by the other parties to the conflict." [2053rd meeting, para. 49.]

13. It is incumbent upon all the members of the international community, and particularly the parties directly interested, to persist in the efforts to find a peaceful solution to this conflict as soon as possible. The opportunities for a peaceful settlement can in no way be considered as indefinitely available and at any moment time may prove itself to be not on our side any more. The recent sporadic developments in the area must have shown us how susceptible the situation is to military escalation.

14. We may not be in a position to afford the loss of any time or any opportunity to take a step forward in the direction of peace and conciliation in the Middle East. It is for that reason that, as I have stated earlier, we welcome the present debate in the General Assembly. We trust that the resolve of the Assembly, complemented by the good will and sincerity of the conflicting parties, could bring about some positive developments in the direction of breaking the present deadlock. We remain hopeful that a way will be found to contribute to the creation of the conditions required for a just and honourable peace in conformity with the principles of our Charter. To that end the Turkish Government will spare no efforts.

15. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): My predecessor on the rostrum, the representative of Turkey, and almost all the other speakers who have taken or will take part in this debate either have referred or will refer to their delegations' support for Security Council resolution 242 (1967). My delegation is no exception. The United Kingdom Government remains convinced that this resolution offers the best—indeed the only—realistic basis for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. We remain firmly committed to its provisions and to the proposition that it should be carried out in full. The views of my Government on the substances of the issues which it covers were set out in my statement before this Assembly two years ago.¹ Those views have not changed, and there is therefore no need for me to repeat them now.

16. Five years have passed, almost to the day, since the Security Council adopted that resolution following nearly six months of literally night-and-day effort. Speaking in the Council shortly before the final vote, Lord Caradon, my predecessor, concluded his brief statement by saying that by adopting the resolution the members of the Council could

"... put the maximum weight of this Council behind a new and determined effort to bring, at long last, peace and justice to all the peoples concerned".²

17. Looking back over the past five years one is tempted to conclude that the efforts not only of the members of the Security Council but of the international community have failed and that there has been no progress towards carrying out the resolution. Such an assessment would, I believe, be altogether too pessimistic. Given the complexities of the problem, it is scarcely surprising that no "instant implementation", as one might put it, of the resolution has materialized. A closer look at developments, however, over the past five years shows that some progress has been made.

18. For example, there has been the Egyptian Government's public acceptance of the commitment to enter into a peace agreement with Israel. This commitment included the idea of demilitarized zones and United Nations guarantees. This was a very considerable advance. Although it has, unfortunately, not been matched by any equally clear and positive statement by Israel on withdrawal, my delegation has noted with interest the recent restatement by the Israeli Prime Minister of Israel's willingness to negotiate a measure of withdrawal in advance of a peace settlement. We have not given up hope that the Israeli Government will be prepared to make a parallel undertaking of its own which goes further than that.

19. The experience of the past five years has, however, demonstrated that the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) is a long and difficult process. Anyone acquainted with the area would not have expected otherwise. For that reason, if no other, as my Secretary of State said in a recent speech in London, we—that is to say, the international community—must not listen to counsels

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1893rd meeting.

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year*, 1382nd meeting, para. 62.

of despair. Resolution 242 (1967) was the first serious attempt by the international community since 1947 to find a comprehensive solution to the Arab-Israel conflict. Neither at the time of its adoption nor subsequently has anyone—least of all my delegation—pretended that the resolution is perfect or that it says the last word on all the issues with which it deals. But the fact is that it represents the highest common factor of agreement obtainable, either then or now. Moreover, it enshrines the basic principles which must be honoured if a true settlement is to be achieved.

20. As I have said, my Government continues to believe that resolution 242 (1967) will have to be carried out in full before a real peace can be achieved in the area. In saying that, however, I do not mean to rule out the possibility that implementation may be achieved by stages. Clearly, any progress on the ground would be a stimulus and an encouragement to further advance. That is why, for example, we have in the past welcomed efforts to bring about arrangements between Egypt and Israel involving the reopening of the Suez Canal. This approach was originally suggested by the President of Egypt, as the Foreign Minister of Egypt in opening this debate [2092nd meeting] reminded us earlier this week. It was subsequently favoured by the Prime Minister of Israel. It may be worth further study. Such arrangements, if agreed upon, could conceivably unlock the door to an eventual settlement of the whole dispute. It is, however, self-evident that an interim arrangement, no less than a final settlement, will need to be agreed by the parties. It cannot be imposed.

21. Furthermore, it seems clear to my delegation that any such interim arrangements would have to include provisions for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the line they at present occupy along the Suez Canal and, most important of all, these arrangements would have to be recognized as no more than a stage in the continued search for a comprehensive settlement. They could not replace such a settlement.

22. Such arrangements are one way forward. They may be the best way. But there may be others. In a case such as this, where a solution has eluded us all for so long, no option which might lead to a settlement should be foreclosed, no possibility overlooked.

23. It is in this spirit that my delegation approaches the present debate. We hope that it will be used for constructive ends: to increase the options open, and not to reduce them. And we hope that the outcome 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.

24. In this connexion I pledge my delegation's full and continued support for all these efforts, and say that the United Kingdom Government remains ready to help in any way it can. We have helped in the past, for example, by our participation in the four-Power talks, and we remain ready to do so in the future. As we see it, methods and means are of lesser importance. What matters above all is the creation of a momentum towards peace, however it is established.

Once such a momentum is created, there is some chance that it will be self-perpetuating.

25. If such a momentum is to be established, however, those concerned must ensure that no steps are taken on the ground which might obstruct efforts to reach a settlement. That is why I cannot conceal my Government's concern that attempts, as one might put it, to change the facts in the territories occupied by Israel in June 1967 may hinder, if not destroy altogether, the prospects of achieving the goal on which we are all agreed. In the last analysis, the only fact that must be created is the fact of peace.

26. Our thoughts about the shape of a final settlement must also be focused on the fate of the refugees. The fate of those helpless and homeless people, who have suffered so much, lies at the heart of the Middle East problem—or the Palestine problem—as it could still, perhaps more meaningfully, be called.

27. We have witnessed recently a vivid demonstration of the dangers inherent in this sad human situation; I refer to the escalation in the pattern of violence and counter-violence which has marked the last few months. My delegation has made it clear elsewhere that we unreservedly condemn acts of terrorism, whatever their source, and are determined to co-operate with the international community in taking practical measures to end the cycle of violence and reprisal which threatens to undermine the authority of government and the rule of law.

28. While my Government cannot accept that terrorism is in any circumstances justified, we are not blind to the need to eradicate its root-cause and to deal with the problems underlying it. We must show the hundreds of thousands of refugees in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and elsewhere that the world has not forgotten them. We must take note of, and action on, their legitimate aspirations, which must not be overlooked in any final settlement. In short, we must once more give them a reason for living and hope for the future.

29. My Government's concern for the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinians is in no way inconsistent with our support for the integrity of the State of Israel, to which we are and will remain committed. This is a firm commitment of which we have given ample evidence in the past. But we should recognize that the future of the Palestinians must feature as a part of any final settlement.

30. I cannot help wondering, therefore, whether a first step towards a solution to the problem of the Palestinian refugees might be an agreement by the Israeli Government to allow back to the west bank of the Jordan the persons displaced in 1967. As well as being an important humanitarian gesture, such an agreement could prove a vital first step in providing the refugees a stake in the future, thus reducing the despair which breeds hatred and violence. It might also, like an interim arrangement on the Canal, help to give momentum to the search for an over-all solution and to create the confidence which is now so sadly lacking and which will have to be established if the parties to the dispute are to be convinced that there is more to be gained by a just and lasting peace than by a continuation of the present hazardous state of no peace and no war.

31. The international community cannot tacitly accept the continuation of the present situation in the Middle East, posing as it does the constant threat of a wider conflict. As my Secretary of State said in his recent speech in London to which I have already referred:

"We think it a sad and bitter thing that both sides to the dispute should have to devote to the means of military confrontation great human and material resources which ought to be contributing to the well-being of the area."

The present situation must eventually give way to peace, a just and lasting peace, in which all the peoples of the area, Arabs and Israelis, can live side by side in harmony, gradually restoring to this area, the cradle of our civilization, its former well-being and prosperity. It is the duty of all of us to hasten that time.

32. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): I am sure that this Assembly would have been very pleased if the Foreign Minister of Israel had agreed to participate in this debate. We consider that the resumption of the debate on the Middle East in the General Assembly, in view of the current situation nationally and internationally, would have warranted the Israeli Foreign Minister's showing his sense of the responsibilities involved and perhaps also a modicum of courtesy towards this Organization.

33. Questioned some time ago about the possibility of his participating in this debate, Mr. Abba Eban apparently replied that, having discerned no new elements in the situation, he considered that the debate was useless and that his presence would not be justified. It is no reflection on what may be said here by the Permanent Representative of Israel if I say that we would have liked to hear Mr. Eban in person, for the speech we heard the other day in the form of a reply completely disregarded the substance of the problem, dealt with matters which amounted to dilatory manoeuvres, departed from the objective analysis of the present situation and revolved around terrorism, as if the Munich events had occurred before the Balfour Declaration or before the occupation of Palestine in 1948. Henceforth, reference to the Munich events, divorced from any sound analytical basis, is to be taken as the point of departure for a new Israeli doctrine in order to get away from the facts of the situation.

34. It is even regrettable that in this connexion we should have heard the representative of Israel say in rather strong language that the essential focus of international action should be a continuing effort to root out this pestilence which is Arab terrorism [2092nd meeting]. If we had to evaluate the kind of virus that has been injected into the international community for the past 25 years we would see exactly what were the symptoms of the plague in the Middle East since Zionism established its headquarters there and found itself with a geographical springboard for the periodic extension of its occupation by means of typical acts of aggression successively affecting each country in the region. Thus today, 25 years after the recognition of Israel and the imposition of the United Nations decision on the Arab world, not only is the whole of the territory of Palestine fully occupied but a large part of Jordan, a part of

the territory of Syria and a large proportion of Egyptian territory was occupied as well; and, alas, we see the complete impotence of the international community to deal with repeated acts of aggression against Syrian and Lebanese territory.

35. Mr. Abba Eban feels that there are no new elements. The international community has had an opportunity this year, in various capitals, on different continents, at the head-of-State level and at the foreign minister level—at meetings which have brought together sometimes 67 or 70 and at other times 45 countries—to consider this problem, to see what developments have taken place in the situation and to conclude that there is a danger which manifests itself with increasing frequency. But Mr. Abba Eban, for his part, considers that that international activity, that concern, that anxiety, those repeated attacks against Arab territory, are not new elements which warrant his presence or this debate.

36. The representative of Israel told us at the beginning of this debate with some emotion—albeit artificial—and with a great deal of rhetoric that for five years Israel has been trying to find a solution and that it is the Arab side which obstinately refuses that offer and disregards those proposals. I would venture to remind members as briefly as possible of the steps and the various efforts undertaken at different levels of international responsibility, and the way the Arabs greeted them and how Israel reacted to them.

37. After the vote on Security Council resolution 242 (1967) everyone welcomed with a certain degree of hope the appointment of Ambassador Jarring and expected that his mission, which was conceived and prepared out of obvious political concern and took account of an apparently balanced political basis and text, would provide the occasion for the representative of the Secretary-General to remove the debate from the verbal constraints of an international forum and keep it within the confines of a dialogue within the manner of classical diplomacy so as to permit everyone to achieve the desired success.

38. The first journey undertaken by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General could strictly speaking be described as an exploratory visit during which it was possible to draw up an inventory of certain points which might win general approval. But no sooner had the Special Representative of the Secretary-General submitted his first report, known as the "aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971",³ when all the power of Israeli propaganda was mustered to reject that aide-mémoire, in discourteous terms, and to demand purely and simply that the Secretary-General's Special Representative should withdraw it because, in reporting the results of his contacts, it contained the definition of a possible policy. Since then, despite frequent meetings of the Security Council, the reminder of resolution 242 (1967), the continuation of Ambassador Jarring's mission, the assistance which the great Powers have tried to give to that mission both within and outside the United Nations, the attitude of Israel has been one of persistent refusal. Israel has not even made the slightest attempt to justify itself on the basis of a political objection to the

³ Ibid., Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971, document S/10403, annex I.

positions prepared by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General; instead, it has decided purely and simply that, since the aide-mémoire does not suit its political ambitions, it was going to disregard it. Undoubtedly it was no real surprise to most of us to see Israel adopt that attitude. In 25 years I do not recall the Tel Aviv Government once giving its agreement to a decision of the United Nations, apart from its support of the unjust decision which created Israel. Since then, it has invoked the authority of the United Nations only to consolidate what it calls the legitimacy of its own existence, while otherwise ignoring the United Nations as if it were not right that the Organization should accept its responsibilities.

39. Again last year the General Assembly considered this problem and we had thought that, because almost everyone thereafter accepted the idea that a political solution should be sought by setting aside the threat of a resumption of hostilities, that would make it possible for Israel—which is always professing its pacifism here—to heed the voice of the General Assembly and, adopting a serious and positive approach, to agree to begin a dialogue in which to seek peaceful solutions.

40. Egypt, which accepted the cease-fire although it was in a position to resume military operations to defend its territory and although support for a resumption of hostilities could still have been obtained from certain parts of the world, had chosen a courageous course which was in keeping with the understanding of the international Organization and had the unanimous support of the world community. A series of initiatives adopted by certain governments, which were at least aware of their responsibilities for the past and were ready to restore a greater measure of justice in a spirit of atonement for their mistakes, the initiatives taken by the great Powers, the suggestions of the Secretary-General and even a new approach by Ambassador Jarring to his mission unfortunately did not evoke the slightest favourable response from Israel. Of course, the continuing will to expand is not compatible with the idea of sitting around a table and seeking a solution which would put an end to Israel's expansionist aims.

41. Everyone has come here to denounce that negative attitude. Those who in the past did not believe that Israel followed an expansionist policy, have had the moral integrity to begin to recognize it and to talk about it publicly. Indeed, a glance at the map of the Middle East shows to what limits, thanks to the military aid supplied by the great Powers responsible for peace and thanks to the financial assistance which permits it to sustain its military effort, Israel is pushing its expeditions, which are now reaching peaceful villages which have not known war since 1948.

42. What justification is given for these acts of aggression? That some Palestinians are living in Syria or Lebanon. But it is not their fault that they are no longer living in Palestine. Does Israel intend henceforth to pursue these exiles, dispersed throughout the world and, wherever they are trying to build a new life and to regroup, to use Phantoms to bomb the villages where they are trying to make a new life—a miserable one, true enough, but one imbued with the spirit of their community?

43. The justification for the acts of aggression against Lebanon is the determination to attack a country whose stability represents a political success in that region, an example of community harmony and of ethnic and political cohesion. Undoubtedly this example is not reassuring to Israel, which does not wish it to be said that there are States which enjoy so much equilibrium, harmony, stability and cohesion in their national life and among their peoples. Undoubtedly the danger that this example might be contagious is part of the philosophical considerations of Zionism, which does not want Lebanon to be what it is in the Middle East. Israel knows full well that Lebanon, a peaceful country, does not have the means to resist its acts of aggression. For when it had the insolence to land, one morning, at an airport and set fire to 13 aircraft, and when the international community did not react, despite United Nations resolutions, despite the guarantees that had been given directly to the Lebanese Government with regard to the integrity of its territory, that impotence was unfortunately an encouragement to the aggressor, which drew from it the assurance that it could repeat its invasions, in whatever form, without the reaction of the international community going beyond a speech of a few hours' duration in the Security Council. That being so, Israel is now attacking Syria on a weekly basis, so to speak, as if these were manoeuvres that the Israeli air force deemed it essential to carry out constantly over peaceful territory.

44. It would appear that the international community, which unfortunately has become accustomed to this passivity, is now becoming more and more familiar with these forays of Israeli Phantoms over Syrian and Lebanese villages and feels that they are neither a new element nor a danger that might call into question the artificial peace, the artificial tranquillity, which it had been thought could be taken advantage of in order to seek a political solution.

45. Thus, for five years all the resolutions, all the journeys by certain foreign ministers from Europe and elsewhere—all motivated by goodwill—which were undertaken in an effort to try to persuade the Tel Aviv Government to revert to a political solution, and all the other efforts also made in that direction have been either treated with contempt or ignored. Israel has met them all with only hypocrisy and has even imputed to those who have undertaken these peaceful initiatives intentions that it has sometimes gone so far as to describe in inadmissible terms.

46. It is regrettable that after all those initiatives, at a time in this year of 1972 when we have the impression that we have succeeded to some extent in extinguishing the most serious hotbeds of war in certain regions of the world, at a time when the Moscow meeting seems, at last, to open up the vision of a peaceful world in the near future, no serious examination of the Middle East situation has been undertaken in direct and practical terms.

47. Do certain Powers, which seek to extinguish the seedbeds of complications and the danger of conflict in certain continents where confrontations between them were dangerous, feel that in other regions, where the people have become accustomed to living with war, where the occupier has become accustomed to living with his arrogance, the international community could accept that situation, merely taking note of a certain temporary

inability to go to war again and of a permanent attitude of aggression on the part of Israel?

48. We followed with much interest the statements recently made in Cairo, Lebanon, Jordan, and even Syria reiterating the will of the Arab countries to seek seriously, in dignity and with international legality and justice, a policy of peace that would restore peace to the Middle East. The reception given to all those initiatives is set forth in the records of the Security Council, in the various memoranda of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, in the statements of heads of State and in the communiqués published at the end of certain conferences. The Arabs have always given a positive reception to the attempts to find a political solution to the problem.

49. The representative of Israel tells us that the Arabs are laying down prior conditions, that the Arabs reject a peaceful solution. But I should like him to cite a single—I repeat: a single—positive response that any official speaking on behalf of the Government of Israel has communicated to a great Power, to the Secretary-General or to the President of the Security Council, or has made in a public statement from this rostrum. The most recent statement by the Israeli Government is the one we heard the other day and, alas, it does not contain a single positive element indicating that Israel, aware of developments both in the region and in the world, takes note of these good intentions and announces that it, too, is ready to engage in a dialogue. Israel's speech boiled down in fact to a half-hour on terrorism.

50. We have said, during discussions in the General Assembly, what our views are on the problem of terrorism. If it were necessary to explain any further our view of the problem of terrorism, I would say this. If you admit that the people of Palestine have a right to their country—and I was happy to hear the representative of the United Kingdom say at this meeting that the people of Palestine are a basic element in the search for a solution—you cannot but admit also that the people of Palestine, who are not fortunate enough to live in their own country but who live elsewhere, are in duty bound to defend themselves wherever they still have the means to do so in the world—since the international community feigns to be unaware of them and since they are given no other possibility of making themselves known. That is certainly regrettable, but when Israel uses Phantom jets and tanks against peaceful villages and people, all the while refusing to admit that these are acts of war, is it doing anything else but engaging in terrorism—and not individual, but State terrorism? Indeed, this is perhaps the only constant element to be noted in Israel's attitude in the Middle East: born of terrorism, it has been for 25 years a terrorist State itself. All that it has acquired it has acquired as a result of acts of aggression. And I would say that we can even speak of "moral terrorism" towards the United Nations, since a country that owes its existence to the United Nations arrogantly comes here and denies the Organization's right to concern itself with the existence of others.

51. The delegation of Morocco has on several occasions set forth its line of conduct here, either on behalf of its own country or on behalf of the Arab countries. If anyone wishes to examine in detail the attitude it has taken for five years, he will see that each time there has been a possibility

of dialogue the Arab world has accepted the emissary, has accepted the working document and has met with whatever individual had the necessary authority to engage in a dialogue.

52. At the present time, the Middle East remains as the world's most dangerous hotbed and most explosive situation. While we greet with satisfaction peaceful developments that are manifesting themselves elsewhere, at the same time, unfortunately, we can only note Israel's will to keep its war safe from any danger of contamination by peace. If that is what the Israeli representative wanted to tell us the other day, it would be regrettable to see this debate conclude without some appropriate reply being made to such an attitude and to the challenge thus offered to the international community.

53. Mr. GROZEV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): More than five years have gone by without any progress, not even the slightest, being made towards a solution of the conflict in the Middle East or towards the restoration of peace in that sensitive part of the world. No forward step has been made towards the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) or the various resolutions of the General Assembly.

54. We are all aware of the efforts made by both our Organization and public opinion throughout the world to put an end to the tension in the Middle East, to eliminate the after-effects of Israeli aggression and to restore peace and justice.

55. During the course of the past year, several special initiatives were undertaken to bring about a peaceful settlement of the conflict. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Jarring, worked out a concrete programme aimed at settling the dispute on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). Certain heads of State or government of African countries undertook a special mission to mediate between the parties concerned. The permanent representatives of the four great Powers devoted considerable efforts to ensure the implementation of the recommendations contained in resolution 242 (1967). To our great regret, their consultations have been interrupted, and we know who is responsible for this. We consider that the permanent representatives in the Security Council should resume their consultations in order to find ways and means of assisting Mr. Jarring's mission and facilitating an equitable political solution of the conflict within the framework of the United Nations.

56. At its twenty-sixth session the General Assembly launched a fresh appeal to the countries concerned, calling upon them to conform to the principle of the United Nations that the "acquisition of territories by force is inadmissible and that, consequently, territories thus occupied must be restored" [*resolution 2799 (XXVI)*]. For the third time following the Israeli aggression of 1967, the General Assembly in that resolution of its twenty-sixth session confirmed that

"... the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East should include the application of both the following principles:

(a) Withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict;

(b) Withdrawal of all claims or state of belligerency, and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area . . .”.

57. The Arab countries victims of Israeli aggression have stated that they accepted the Security Council resolution. Egypt and Jordan gave a positive response to Mr. Jarring's aide-mémoire and, declared themselves ready to apply the resolution in all of its parts, including the signing of a peace treaty. In addition, inspired by its desire to find a just solution to the dispute, the Egyptian Government proposed the reopening of the Suez Canal as a first step which must form part of the over-all settlement of the crisis. Egypt and other Arab countries are counting on the assistance of the United Nations in order to reach a solution of the problem of the Middle East. There can be no doubt whatsoever of their sincere desire to find a political solution to the crisis on the basis of total application of the Security Council resolution.

58. The Assembly of the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity [OAU] that took place last June at Rabat adopted a resolution on the Middle East in which they deplored “Israel's negative and obstructive attitude which prevents the resumption of the Jarring Mission” and invited “Israel to withdraw immediately from all the occupied Arab territories to pre-June 5 1967 lines in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967”⁴.

59. The Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Countries that was held at Georgetown last August also adopted a resolution on the Middle East⁵ reaffirming the necessity for a political solution to the conflict on the basis of a complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied Arab territories.

60. The efforts by the United Nations and world public opinion have thus far produced no result, thanks to the haughty and negative attitude of the Israeli Government, which has in effect “vetoed” all decisions and resolutions adopted by both the General Assembly and the Security Council.

61. Israel's rejection of all efforts aimed at a peaceful solution of the conflict is a shattering rebuttal of its claims that it had been forced into war in 1967 because of the threats of invasion from the Arab States, that it had been obliged to resort to self-defence, and so on.

62. All of Israel's brief history, from its creation to the present time; the political attitude of its Government with regard to the Arab countries, both before and after the aggression of 1967; its attitude to the decisions of the United Nations—all these make it impossible to entertain

the slightest doubt of the fact that its leaders do not desire the restoration and consolidation of peace in the Middle East. They do not want peace, for in conditions of peace and normal relations with the neighbouring Arab States it would be difficult to achieve the supreme aim of Zionism, namely the transformation of Israel into a powerful, purely Jewish State.

63. For more than two decades the Zionist Israeli Government has been following a consistent policy of expansion, and by aggression has expanded Israel's frontiers. The conquered Arab territories have been annexed, the Arab population has been forcibly removed and the cultural and ethnic Arab heritage in the territories has been destroyed. The Israeli leaders themselves tell us that the old city of Jerusalem had been “annexed irrevocably”. Israeli legislation is introduced and extended to the occupied Arab territories. Israeli military installations are set up there.

64. While pursuing its policy of military escalation, Israel uses military terrorism on the neighbouring Arab countries. The continuing incursions organized by the armed forces into the territories of Lebanon and Syria, the bombing in depth of civilian targets in Syria, the massacre of the civilian population—that is what is being done to spread fear and disarray among the Arab population. That is State terrorism, organized by Israel against the Arab peoples.

65. The statements made by the Israeli leaders serve to prove that by prolonging the occupation of the Arab territories that were invaded, and by violating the national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, Israel is pursuing a policy of faits accomplis. Their aim is to place the Arab countries in a desperate situation in order to force them to renounce their just and legitimate claims.

66. Israel is attempting to disguise its militarist and colonizing goals by the inconsistent theory that it is a weak ill-defended State and that it has to cope with “Arab terrorism”. Israel has put on the toga of an alleged “judge” in the Middle East and is dispensing “Zionist justice”. But that “justice” is dispensed with the aid of the bullets of invading armies and the bombs of Phantom jets spreading death among the defenceless civilian population. This “justice” tramples underfoot the legitimate and just interests of the Arab peoples. This “justice” confronts the Arab States with ultimatums by attempting to create a situation which will enable Israel with impunity to lay down the law in the Middle East.

67. At the same time, the Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs attempted this year once again to convince us [2045th meeting] from the rostrum of the General Assembly that Israel is ready to negotiate and that it is ready to enter into conversations on a bilateral basis. The only thing that the Minister failed to mention in his statement was whether or not Israel agrees to apply the Security Council resolution and Mr. Jarring's aide-mémoire. Within the United Nations, Israel talks about negotiations—without, however, proposing an equitable basis for the solution of the problem. It talks about negotiations which would ensure that it would be able to dictate its conditions to the other party from a position of force, negotiations which would legitimize the right of the aggressor to appropriate territories conquered by the use of force.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Twenty-seventh Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1972, document S/10741, AHG/Res.67 (IX).

⁵ See *The Georgetown Declaration, the Action Programme for Economic Co-operation and Related Documents* (Georgetown, Guyana, 1972), p. 39.

68. The Israeli leaders openly state that the United Nations should no longer cling to documents which, apparently, are outmoded. It is clear that reference is being made to the Security Council resolution, to resolutions of the General Assembly concerning all matters linked to the Middle East, and to Ambassador Jarring's aide-mémoire.

69. Israel's repeated acts of aggression prove in a striking way that it has no intention whatsoever of conforming to the collective will of the Organization, which insists on the need for a peaceful settlement of the dispute. It is no secret to anyone that Israel is intensifying its military preparations. Israel's modern military equipment and its military expenditure on a *per capita* basis rank among the highest in the world.

70. Israel's military expenditures are increasing from year to year. For the fiscal year 1972/1973 they accounted for 40 per cent of the total budget, which is the equivalent of tens of millions of dollars per day. For equipment for the air force alone, including the latest purchase of United States Phantom jets—which was the subject of a recent visit to the United States by the Israeli Minister of War—funds have been allocated which are five times greater than the amount spent in 1967.

71. The developments during the past few decades show that Israel is a factor dangerous to peace not only in the Middle East but throughout the world. Because of the Zionist ideology of its ruling circles, Israel is intimately linked to contemporary imperialism and, more particularly, to the great military and industrial monopolies of the United States.

72. It is to Israel that special tasks are assigned by the imperialist States in their plans for world domination aimed at the despoliation of the national resources of other countries, and in particular of the areas which are rich in natural resources, such as the Middle East. Israel is to play the role of *gendarme* to stifle the national liberation struggle of the Arab peoples. It is through Israel that the military and industrial imperialist monopolies hope to ensure to themselves free access to the rich sources of black gold and domination of the vital artery linking the trans-Atlantic world with the East by the shortest land and sea route, and also to obtain strategic positions that would facilitate the execution of their aggressive plans.

73. It is no secret to anyone that the dispute in the Middle East, with its serious implications for millions of Arabs, would have been equitably solved long ago if Israel did not enjoy the vast political, military, financial and economic assistance of the imperialist forces and of world Zionism. It is those forces which encourage Israel to show contempt for the will of the United Nations and world public opinion, and to defy the general clamour for peace and justice.

74. Guided by its Zionist ideology, the Tel Aviv régime is carrying out, both in the occupied Arab territories and in its own country, a policy of mass repression against the indigenous Arab population. The Israeli Government has transformed an entire people, the people of Palestine, into exiles, refugees without house or home. The rhetoric of the Israeli leaders is not sufficient to erase the large black stain on their conscience. If the Israeli leaders really aspired to

peace and took to heart the vital interests and destiny of their people, they would easily achieve peace by withdrawing their forces from all the occupied Arab territories and by recognizing the national rights of the Arab peoples, including the people of Palestine.

75. In speaking of the crisis in the Middle East and in pressing for its solution, we have in mind the destiny and the future of the Palestinian and other refugees who have been expelled from their homes and lands. But at the same time we are thinking of the good people in Israel who do not share the intentions and the aggressive acts of the Tel Aviv leaders.

76. The Zionists and the Semite racists are wrong in accusing all those who are against their policy of aggression of being anti-Semitic. The Communists in particular are free of any form of racism or anti-Semitism. All this has been confirmed by the realities of life and continues to be so confirmed. Who could deny the great merit of the Soviet Union, which saved the lives of millions of Jews from the danger of Hitler during the Second World War?

77. Everyone knows that the Bulgarian people did not allow the Jews living in Bulgaria to be sent to the concentration camps and gas chambers of Nazi Germany. The former head of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church and other Bulgarians stopped a train loaded with Jews by lying on the railway tracks, and thus saved their lives. I personally had Jewish colleagues during the years of the Bulgarian resistance and the clandestine struggle. I was thrown into Fascist prisons together with anti-Fascist Jews. I am convinced that everywhere, including the United States, there are many Jews who are far from supporting the policy and the acts of the Israeli Government.

78. It is understandable that world public opinion has been aroused and condemns Israel's dangerous policy of playing with fire, confronting the world with faits accomplis and flouting the decisions of our Organization. It is with good reason that we insist that the United Nations should take more decisive measures in conformity with the provisions of the Charter dealing with such cases in order to compel Israel to answer for its flagrant violation of the principles and purposes of the United Nations. It is with good reason that the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries at Georgetown:

"Declares that it will intensify its assistance in all international forums, and in particular the United Nations General Assembly and the Security Council, to take all necessary initiatives for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from the Arab Territories including a recommendation to the United Nations to take adequate measures against Israel should it persist in disregarding United Nations efforts".⁶

79. The People's Republic of Bulgaria shares the view expressed by those countries and organizations which consider that the United Nations should apply all the sanctions provided in the Charter.

80. Bulgaria, like the other socialist countries and all peace-loving peoples, has from the very outset defended the

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

just cause of the Arabs and has defended the Arab peoples victims of Israeli aggression. We firmly believe that a political solution of the crisis in the Middle East could be found within the framework of the United Nations on the basis of the strict and total application of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). Our position is clearly restated in the joint communiqué published on the occasion of the recent visit to the Soviet Union of the delegation of the Bulgarian Communist Party and the Bulgarian Government, headed by the President of the Council of State. Todor Zhivkov:

"The Bulgarian and Soviet delegations have expressed their concern at the tense situation which continues to exist in the Middle East. They resolutely condemn Israel's

military provocations against the Arab States, which constitute premeditated acts of aggression organized in advance. The People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Soviet Union have once again expressed their firm support for the just cause of the Arab peoples and their struggle for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, the elimination of the after-effects of Israeli aggression, supported by American imperialism, and the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East on the basis of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 and the relevant decisions of the United Nations."

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.