



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 8: Adoption of the agenda and organization of work (continued) Fifth report of the General Committee .....	1463
Agenda item 24: Question of Palestine: report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (continued) .....	1468

**President: Mr. Salim Ahmed SALIM**  
(United Republic of Tanzania)

**AGENDA ITEM 8**

**Adoption of the agenda and organization  
of work (continued)\***

**FIFTH REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE  
(A/34/250/ADD.4)**

1. The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 3 of its fifth report, submitted in document A/34/250/Add.4, the General Committee recommends the inclusion in the agenda of an additional item entitled "Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council".
2. Before we proceed to the vote on that recommendation, I shall call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote.
3. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to state briefly the reasons for our position. Yesterday, at the 6th meeting of the General Committee, the French delegation spoke in favour of a United States amendment [A/BUR/34/L.1] which would have made it possible to associate the proposal submitted in document A/34/246 with agenda item 114 relating to the report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization. That amendment having been rejected by the General Committee, we opposed the inscription of an additional question on the agenda of the current session.
4. The reasons for our position, which we reiterate formally this morning, are as follows: it seems neither timely nor urgently necessary to seize the General Assembly of a matter of such importance without at least having carried out the necessary consultations. To what could the inscription of this new item lead? A possible vote on a draft resolution based on the text in document A/34/246 would inexorably lead to a deadlock. Article 108 of the Charter provides that an amendment to the Charter shall come into force when it

has been adopted by two thirds of the Member States, including all the permanent members of the Security Council.

5. Several permanent members of the Security Council are opposed to the proposed amendment. This being so, the confrontation to which this question could give rise within the Organization would only weaken the Organization, whereas we do not doubt that the purpose of the authors of document A/34/246 is to strengthen it.

6. This is neither the place nor the time to explain in detail the reasons of substance for our opposition to the proposal contained in this document. At this stage, I should simply like to point out that it proposes a modification not only of the membership but also of the functioning of the Security Council, and, therefore, of the balance established by the Charter between the principal organs of the United Nations, for the reasons that I shall explain.

7. What is the objective pursued by the authors of document A/34/246? If their objective is to ensure that they get a better hearing in the Council, I would point out in reply that, by virtue of Article 31 of the Charter and the very liberal interpretation of it by the Council, all States can be heard by the Council. If what they want is to prevent the Security Council taking decisions that are contrary to the interests of certain geographical groups, I would comment that no decision can be taken by the Council, with its present membership, if the countries of Africa, Latin America and Asia are opposed to it. If their purpose is to facilitate the decision-making process within the Council, I should like to state that to my delegation this viewpoint seems somewhat lacking in realism. The Council is the only body empowered to take binding decisions concerning all States Members of the United Nations in the sphere of international peace and security. Because of this, it must respect—and at the present time it does—the balance that exists in the world, in particular the economic and military balance.

8. If the decisions taken in the Council are to be applied and are not to endanger peace, they must be accepted by the States which, according to the Charter, have special responsibilities.

9. It would be an illusion to imagine that it would be possible to impose those decisions on the States against their will. It is impossible to imagine that the Council could continue to take decisions that were not subsequently implemented and that the Security Council and the United Nations as a whole would not be weakened thereby.

10. In conclusion, I would emphasize that, by virtue of its specific functions, the Security Council is based on a philosophy different from that of the General As-

\* Resumed from the 70th meeting.

sembly; it is in no sense the managing organ of the United Nations. The proposal before us would alter the nature of the Council, by making it a reproduction, as regards membership, of the General Assembly, by virtue of the distribution of Member States of the Organization into geographical groups. This is certainly not what the authors of the Charter intended.

11. We shall therefore oppose the inscription on the agenda of the proposed new item. Far from leading to a useful and helpful discussion, the addition of this item might lead to a confrontation and, in any event, could not have any useful result.

12. Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): In connexion with the fifth report of the General Committee [A/34/250/Add.4], submitted for the consideration of the General Assembly, the Soviet delegation deems it necessary, once again, to give the substantive and practical reasons for which it objects to the inclusion on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly of an item entitled "Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council".

13. First of all, the Soviet delegation cannot fail to voice its regret at the fact that the proposal for the inclusion of this item on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly is clearly unacceptable to many States, and runs counter to the spirit of co-operation which is necessary for the adoption of decisions on important international problems discussed in the United Nations.

14. Consideration of this proposal in the General Committee, even in its procedural aspect, brought to light serious differences among the Member States of the United Nations. It goes without saying that a discussion on the substance of this proposal would lead to even more profound differences of view and could have only negative consequences.

15. The Soviet delegation opposes the inclusion on the agenda of the General Assembly of the question of the enlargement of the membership of the Security Council for the following reasons.

16. First of all, that proposal is designed to revise one of the most important provisions of the United Nations Charter. The position of principle of the Soviet Union on this question is well known and remains unchanged: the Soviet Union consistently and firmly opposes any attempt to revise the Charter. We proceed from the premise that the Charter, which has withstood the most severe test—that of time—is fully adequate for the fulfilment of the principal task of the United Nations, the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security, and therefore does not need to be amended.

17. Secondly, the Soviet delegation cannot agree with the statement that revision of the membership of the Security Council is supposedly necessary to strengthen the main role of the Council in connexion with the maintenance of international peace and security.

18. My delegation is convinced that it is not in those provisions of the Charter of the United Nations that

determine the membership of the Security Council that are to be found the reasons for the Council's not always being in a position to adopt the necessary effective decisions or for the fact that a number of regions of the world remain focal points of tension and that the vestiges of colonial and racist rule have not to this day been eliminated.

19. To ensure the effectiveness of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security, it is above all essential that the Member States of the United Nations should strictly comply in their policies with the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and carry out the decisions of the Security Council.

20. In the Charter itself there are considerable possibilities and provisions for action which have not been used. It is important to concentrate efforts and attention now not on the revision of the Charter, but on the need for this fundamental instrument of the United Nations to be strictly and consistently complied with by all Member States.

21. Thirdly, we cannot agree that an increase in the membership of the Council is necessary, as is claimed; to ensure a more equitable and balanced representation that would reflect the growth of membership in the United Nations. As is well known, according to the Charter membership of the non-permanent members of the Security Council is determined, not by arithmetical proportions, but, as Article 23 of the Charter itself provides, "due regard [is] specially paid, in the first instance to the contribution of Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security". It is obvious, therefore, that purely quantitative arithmetical calculations are unacceptable for the determination of the membership of the Security Council and are not in keeping with the requirements of the Charter.

22. Fourthly, the Soviet delegation cannot agree with the argument that the non-aligned and developing countries are not adequately represented in the Security Council. It is well known that the representation of those countries in the Council at the present time is such that, without the agreement of that group of non-permanent members of the Security Council, the Council is unable to take any decision at all. At the same time, inordinate enlargement of the membership of the Security Council would have a negative influence on the effectiveness of this most important organ of the United Nations, of which the Charter requires rapid and effective action to maintain international peace and security.

23. Proceeding from our position of principle on the need to maintain the integrity of the Charter, and bearing in mind the points which we have just made, the Soviet delegation cannot agree with the recommendation of the General Committee for the inclusion on the agenda of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly of an additional item on the enlargement of the membership of the Security Council, and will vote against that recommendation.

24. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): It is very rare for my delegation to oppose the inscription of an item; it is just as rare for us to oppose the adoption by the plenary Assembly of a report of the General Com-

mittee. I do not intend at this time to set out the views of my delegation on the substance of the item proposed by India and other delegations, although I am sure that our views, which are strongly and firmly held, are no secret to many delegations.

25. Our opposition to the inscription of this item is based on the fact that it cannot by any stretch of the imagination be described as urgent. We believe that only genuinely urgent items should be inscribed at this very late stage of the session. The plenary Assembly has many important items left on its agenda and there are only about 10 working days to go.

26. The item proposed by India touches on a very important subject and could lead to a proposal to amend the Charter, a problem controversial in the highest degree. It is simply not right that a question like this one should be rushed through, in contravention of rule 15 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, in the dying days of the session.

27. Mr. PETREE (United States of America): As we made clear in the General Committee, we support the right of delegations to have matters of concern to them discussed. What we cannot support is unnecessary duplication of effort. There is already an item under which this matter is being examined, and even an intersessional committee.<sup>1</sup> The fact that the item is raised in the closing days of an already burdened session, in violation of the requirements of rule 15 of the rules of procedure, is, in our opinion, no basis for inscribing it on the agenda when it duplicates an existing item.

28. It seems to us most unfortunate that an Assembly that has made a commendable effort to rationalize its work should be taxed with a proposal of this character in the closing days of the session. Even if the matter were not being dealt with under another agenda item, it would hardly seem reasonable to expect a matter of this importance to receive the necessary serious consideration among the crowded concerns of the last couple of weeks of the session. This is not the appropriate time to comment on the merits of the item or the views contained in the explanatory memorandum. Suffice it to say that the extraordinary and irregular manner in which the item was raised, to say the least, does little to engender a positive approach on our part.

29. In sum, in the light of the fact that this item duplicates what is already before this Assembly and in view of the manner in which it has been raised, we shall take what is for us the extraordinary step of voting against its inscription.

30. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The position of principle of the Byelorussian SSR with regard to the attempts to revise the Charter of the United Nations is well known. It is contained in the replies of the Byelorussian SSR to the relevant questionnaires of the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has been frequently stated at sessions of the General Assembly—three times, indeed, at this session.

31. Inasmuch as the Charter has stood the test of time and is fully adequate for the performance of the central

task of the United Nations in the maintenance and strengthening of peace, there is no need to change it. Revision of the provisions of the Charter could lead to an undermining of the United Nations, sow distrust or provide justification for the failure of certain Member States to comply with the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

32. The consideration of this proposal to enlarge the membership of the Council will not strengthen the Council's primary role of maintaining international peace and security. Instead it will weaken it. Only strict compliance on the part of each State with the provisions of the United Nations Charter and with the mandatory decisions of the Security Council can strengthen the role of the Organization and of its Security Council, not attempts to call those bodies in question on the pretext of supposed underrepresentation of some region on the Council.

33. The Security Council acts, as is well known, on behalf of all Member States of the Organization, and under the Charter full opportunity is given for participation in the Council's work by those countries that are not members. We wish to recall also that, by virtue of the Charter, no decision of the Security Council may be taken without the agreement not merely of the permanent members on it but also of the non-permanent members, the majority of which are non-aligned countries.

34. As previous discussions have shown, the proposal for a revision of the Charter is unacceptable to quite a number of States. The consideration of a proposal for altering or enlarging the membership of the Security Council cannot then yield constructive results.

35. For all these reasons, the Byelorussian delegation will vote against the proposal for the inclusion on the agenda of the question of the enlargement of the membership of the Security Council and calls upon other delegations that cherish the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter to reject this rash and unsound proposal.

36. Mr. BARTON (Canada): This Assembly has, over the years, given a rather elastic interpretation of the word "urgent", and I must say that raising this item at this stage is stretching that elasticity to the utmost. Nevertheless, in accordance with the tradition that we have observed, it is the intention of my delegation to vote in favour of the adoption of this item. But, in doing so, I would urge the sponsors of the item to remember also that the word "important" is operative, and that an item as important as this should not be settled in the dying weeks of the Assembly. It is one thing to introduce the item to provoke an initial discussion and then carry it on to the next session, but I would hope that the sponsors of the item will not be pushing any draft resolutions to a vote at this time.

37. Mr. B. C. MISHRA (India): There have been some questions raised this morning about the appropriateness, urgency and importance of bringing a new item before the Assembly in the closing stages of its deliberations. The charge has been levelled that we are misusing the rules of procedure and that it is only for that reason that some States will vote against inscription of this item.

<sup>1</sup> Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization.

38. That is clearly not the case. There have been informal discussions on this item, in particular with certain permanent members of the Security Council. These discussions took place before the request to inscribe a new item was placed before the Assembly, and even at that stage we were told that there was strong opposition to any discussion on enlarging the membership of the Security Council. So I must reject all these insinuations that have been flung at the delegations that have asked for the inscription of this item.

39. We can well understand the argument that the Charter should not be amended to increase the membership of the Security Council. That is an argument that should be put forward at this stage of the discussion of this item. That is an argument that might influence a number of delegations both in their voting and in their statements.

40. But to say that we are burdening the agenda of the Assembly with an unimportant item is to close one's eyes to reality. A close look at the explanatory memorandum would make it clear to all that we are not asking for something which is unbalanced, which is more than our due, or which is going to upset the Charter of the United Nations so much as to make the work of this Organization, and particularly that of the Security Council, impossible.

41. What do we say in our explanatory memorandum? We say: "in order to strengthen the primary role of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security . . ." [A/34/246, annex, para. 3]—this is the purpose of our endeavour—and we go on to say:

"...it is necessary that the composition of the Security Council be reviewed with a view to providing for a more equitable and balanced representation that would reflect the increase in the membership of the United Nations". [*Ibid.*]

42. Now, if the argument is that a more balanced and equitable representation in the Security Council would destabilize the Council, I must say that that is a most undemocratic argument to be expounded on the floor of this house. There are questions about the manageability of the Council, should its membership be increased. I do not understand what is meant by "manageability". If it is a question of the manageability of international peace and security, the maintenance of which is the primary role of the Security Council, then I assert that international peace and security could be much more beneficially "manageable" after the increase in membership than it is now. If it is a question of managing the members of the Council, then we certainly reject that argument.

43. One can have an honest difference of opinion as to whether or not the Security Council's membership should be expanded. But I do not think tactical arguments about the delay in putting forward this item and the claims that it is not important, that it is not urgent, should be used in order to oppose our request.

44. On behalf of those delegations which have undertaken this task of inscribing the new item, I should like to appeal to this Assembly to reject such tactical arguments and to vote in favour of the inscription of the item.

45. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): There have been many arguments of substance advanced this morning in connexion with the proposal we are now discussing. My delegation will refrain from addressing itself to these arguments of substance until such time as the matter comes up, as we expect, for substantive discussion in this Assembly.

46. As a rule, my delegation is not opposed to the inscription of an item at the request of a delegation. But in this particular case, not only were we not opposed, but we were happy to support the proposal and to sponsor it, because we are convinced of the usefulness of this proposal. It is a proposal that is not submitted lightly or unthinkingly by us, but that was the subject of very careful consideration and consultation and that, we feel, has the purpose of ensuring for small and medium-sized countries a representation in the Security Council that is more consistent with their actual representation in the General Assembly.

47. We do admit that the proposal is not a panacea for all the ills plaguing the Security Council. We have never pretended that it was so. One major problem with regard to the functioning of the Security Council is, for example, the use of the veto. This proposal does not address itself to that. As my colleague from India said yesterday, at the 6th meeting of the General Committee, this proposal is very limited in its objective, in what it seeks to attain. As we have already said, it has to do with ensuring for small and medium-sized States a more adequate and consistent representation in the Security Council.

48. It has been said that this proposal is being submitted in the dying days of this present Assembly session. We do again admit that this is so. But the fact of its submission at this late stage seems to my delegation to be no reason to reject its inclusion. The Assembly is perfectly competent to decide, once this matter is included, how it should be handled. I do not think that that is a decision which should be preoccupying delegations at this stage. We are merely asked to vote for or against the inclusion of the item. My delegation will be happy to vote again in favour of its inclusion, as we did yesterday in the General Committee, and I should like to appeal to members of the Assembly to give this proposal their whole-hearted support.

49. Mr. ESPECHE GIL (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Committee has decided, after a serious and thoughtful debate, to recommend to the Assembly, as indicated in document A/34/250/Add.4, the inclusion in the agenda of an additional item on the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council.

50. This proposal, in contrast to what has been maintained by another delegation, is thoroughly realistic and responds to the fact of the presence of 152 Members in this Organization, which cannot but be adequately reflected in its various organs.

51. This and other substantive questions, in the belief of my delegation and of other sponsors of the initiative, must be discussed with due seriousness and the interchange of debate required to lead to the achievement of an agreement at the plenary meeting.

52. Our purpose is to strengthen this Organization by means of appropriate representation, not to weaken it. Weakness can never come from an enlarged membership; it can come only from a renunciation of responsibility on the part of those endowed with a larger measure of it.

53. None of the procedural arguments are of sufficient weight to impede progress on the substantive issues at stake.

54. Accordingly, my delegation will vote in favour of the recommendation of the General Committee to have this item included in the agenda of the present session.

55. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the recommendation of the General Committee contained in paragraph 3 of document A/34/250/Add.4. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

*Against:* Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Israel, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:* Belgium, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Italy, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Saudi Arabia.

*The recommendation was adopted by 83 votes to 14, with 9 abstentions (see decision 34/402).<sup>2</sup>*

56. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their vote after the voting.

57. Mr. KEATING (Ireland): It is my delegation's usual practice to accept the recommendations of the General Committee, and we have done so in this in-

stance in supporting the inscription of the item on the proposed enlargement of the Security Council. We have done so, however, reluctantly. We would have wished that an item of this importance might be submitted at a much earlier stage. The proposal raises important issues which require careful examination. Its introduction at this stage of the Assembly's programme will obviously not facilitate such an examination.

58. We are concerned, furthermore, at the difficulties which the addition of a new item in the concluding weeks of the General Assembly session creates for the proper conduct of business already at hand.

59. Finally, we are not convinced that the item, although of the highest importance, is so urgent as to justify a departure from the normal procedure for the inscription of such matters.

60. Mr. JAMES (Australia): My delegation voted in favour of the adoption of the fifth report of the General Committee, contained in document A/34/250/Add.4, on the introduction of an additional item in our agenda. However, my delegation must reserve its position on the appropriateness of raising a subject of such importance at this late stage in this General Assembly session.

61. This is a matter which Australia would wish to see put to detailed and effective study, and we would hope that there would be no attempt by the sponsors to have us reach a precipitate decision. We very much doubt that we should attempt to reach a decision on the matter at this session of the General Assembly.

62. Mr. SCHELTEMA (Netherlands): My Government has always adhered to the principle and the practice of supporting the recommendations of the General Committee in the plenary Assembly. However, that policy is based on a set of conditions and assumptions that in this particular case are not present; and if those assumptions and conditions are not present, the application of that principle and that policy becomes, in our view, a matter of doubt.

63. For one thing, the request for inclusion of this item at this late stage in our deliberations could be justified only on the basis of urgency. This urgency has not, in our view, been demonstrated. In addition, the very important question now submitted to the General Assembly has far-reaching implications and therefore proper reflection and consultation and adequate preparation are needed. That has not been possible in the present circumstances.

64. For those reasons, my delegation felt that it could not support the recommendation of the General Committee, and we therefore abstained. I want to repeat that our general policy of favouring the adoption of the recommendations of the General Committee, under the proper conditions, remains unaffected.

65. Mr. FRANCIS (New Zealand): This issue is clearly of critical importance to the Organization, affecting as it does the body charged with the maintenance of international peace and security. We believe that it requires careful consideration by Governments and by regional groups.

66. In our view, however, the question does not lend

<sup>2</sup> The delegations of Algeria, Cyprus, Nepal and Rwanda subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their vote recorded as having been in favour of the recommendation. The delegation of Gabon subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as an abstention.



itself to a decision within the remaining few weeks of this Assembly session. Although we certainly believe in upholding the right of delegations to request the inclusion of items in the agenda, we were not convinced that in this instance the urgency requirement of rule 15 had been satisfied.

67. For those reasons my delegation abstained in the vote.

68. The PRESIDENT: In paragraph 4 of its report, the General Committee recommends that this item should be considered directly in the plenary Assembly. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts that recommendation?

*It was so decided (see decision 34/402).*

#### AGENDA ITEM 24

##### Question of Palestine: report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (*continued*)

69. The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that four draft resolutions have been circulated, as documents A/34/L.41 to A/34/L.44, inclusive.

70. In connexion with draft resolution A/34/L.41, I wish to call the General Assembly's attention to operative paragraph 6, whereby the Assembly would authorize the provision of summary records for the meetings of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. Such a decision would be in clear contradiction with the decision just adopted by the General Assembly, at its 76th plenary meeting, held on 23 November, according to which no summary records of subsidiary organs would be provided during an experimental period of one year, except with regard to the International Law Commission and the Committee Established under General Assembly Resolution 32/174.

71. I have accordingly drawn this matter to the attention of the sponsors of the draft resolution, who have explained that they attach great importance to the retention of summary records for the Committee.

72. As presiding officer, I consider it my obligation and duty to state that the adoption of the part of operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/34/L.41 calling for the provision of summary records would constitute a reversal of the decision already adopted by the General Assembly at its 76th plenary meeting.

73. Mr. PIZA ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Again this year the question of Palestine is at the centre of many of the items on the agendas of the Committees and of the plenary General Assembly, for it is in fact the core of one of the most critical problems of mankind at present, the problem of the Middle East.

74. The question of Palestine is not the only problem of the Middle East; but, of all the problems of the Middle East, it is the one that demands a large measure of humanity and inspires more resistance and, at the same time, a greater appeal for justice.

75. For that reason, my delegation, representing a country which makes and wishes to make of principles its only rule of political conduct, cannot allow the opportunity offered by this debate to pass without clearly affirming its impartial and principled position on the totality of this problem, in the hope that our affirmation will simultaneously serve as a clarification and a justification of our positions on the question of Palestine.

76. I have said that my country has made and wishes to make its devotion to principles its only rule of conduct. Hence, we cannot play a part nor take sides in the political confrontation which is heating up and confusing the question of Palestine, nor in the major political confrontation taking place in relation to that question. On the contrary, for us the problem is and must be fundamentally one of justice, respect for international law and responsible compliance with the principles which inspire our Organization.

77. Costa Rica has always supported, precisely for reasons of humanity and justice, the centuries-old struggle of the people of Israel to have its own national home in the land of its ancestors, above all at a time when that people had just been the victim of the greatest massacre in history, simply because they were Jews. The circumstance of Palestine being a Mandate of the League of Nations, inherited as such by the United Nations, made it easier for the latter, without violating established sovereignties, to give the people of Israel their own sovereign home, as the home of a people must be, in a part of the Palestine Mandate. Whether the solution was the most just, or whether there was a better one, is not a matter for debate 32 years later. The fact remains that the partition decided upon by the General Assembly in its resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947, was the only viable way to fulfil that objective, bearing in mind the fact that there lived in Palestine another people with equal rights and equal merits.

78. Costa Rica has consistently defended the legitimate rights of the people of Israel to exist in dignity and respect and continues to defend them with the firmness derived, after the creation of the State of Israel, from the fact that this is the first State in history born not of conquest nor force but as the result of a legal act by the organized international community, to which all the Member States have sworn compliance and support.

79. But these same reasons and this same commitment to justice and law lead us to affirm now with equal force the sacred right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, to its own national and sovereign home, as the home of a people must be, in the part of the old Palestine Mandate which the General Assembly of the United Nations itself allocated to it. In this respect, I should like to repeat here what the Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country said in the general debate of this session of the Assembly:

“We believe that it is Israel's right that its existence as a State be respected and guaranteed; and we believe that the Palestinian people also have the right to be allowed to organize themselves with all the attributes proper to sovereign parties in an international order”. [19th meeting, para. 334.]

80. Given this legal reality, there can be neither subterfuges nor pretexts, nor alleged lack of compliance by

one or the other of the parties with respect to resolutions which, being binding and supreme, as those of the United Nations are, remain in force quite apart from the conduct of those to whom they are addressed; nor can there be rights of conquest, which in other times were legitimate means to acquire territory but today, mercifully, thanks to our organized international community, are obsolete.

81. That is exactly what the United Nations has reaffirmed innumerable times; that is exactly what has been recognized repeatedly in General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, such as resolution 242 (1967) of the Council, inspired by a more complete and comprehensive proposal of 20 Latin American countries—among them Costa Rica—which the representative of Argentina recalled yesterday [79th meeting, para. 11], and complemented by others, such as Security Council resolution 298 (1971) on the status of Jerusalem, all of which we must comply with and support.

82. That being the situation, the specific conclusions of my delegation on the main aspects of the problem are the following.

83. First, we defend the existence of the State of Israel and its right to security within the boundaries assigned to it by the partition resolution.

84. Secondly, with equal conviction, we defend the right of the Palestinian people to its own sovereign State and security within the boundaries assigned to it under the same partition resolution, without any fiction of being integrated into or represented by any other State, whether Arab or Jewish.

85. Thirdly, we defend the right of the displaced Palestinians to return to their homes and receive compensation, and their right to live in peace and equality, just as we would defend those same rights for any displaced Jew.

86. Fourthly, we call for the return by Israel of all the territories occupied after the 1967 war, with the concurrent right of Israel to its legitimate, secure and guaranteed boundaries.

87. Fifthly, with regard to the Holy City of Jerusalem, which, as His Holiness Pope John Paul II said recently in this very hall, is "a heritage sacred to the veneration of millions of believers of the three great monotheistic religions, Judaism, Christianity and Islam", [17th meeting, para. 24], we fully agree with the appeal of our Holy Father and with the spirit both of the partition resolution, General Assembly resolution 181 (II), and of Security Council resolution 298 (1971), and call for and defend its status as an international city.

88. Sixthly, we acknowledge the right of the Palestinian people to be represented as such in international negotiations and forums and the legitimacy of this representation headed by the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO], which is recognized by the United Nations, until the Palestinian people itself, once in full exercise of its sovereignty, is able to decide democratically on the constitution of its national government.

89. No one has asked us to give advice, but, with the Assembly's leave, we would venture to suggest to the

two parties involved in the conflict—the Government of Israel and the PLO—that they come together and discuss in a civilized manner, within the framework of the Charter and the relevant United Nations resolutions, a solution which in our modest view would be more viable, simple and just than that of force or of negotiations directed by third States, however respected they might be. For that to be possible, all that is required is something that, with good faith, respect and tolerance, and, above all, with sincere adherence to the principles of the Charter, does not seem to be absurd or difficult: that, on the one hand, the PLO accept the existence of the State of Israel and its rights, and, on the other hand, that the State of Israel accept the existence of the Palestinian people and its rights and recognize the legitimacy of the PLO, which has already been granted by the international community through its highest body, the United Nations.

90. All the rest, as the Bible says, "shall be added unto you". [St. Matthew. 6:33; St. Luke, 12:31.]

91. Mr. KHAN (Bangladesh): My delegation at the outset wishes to pay a tribute to the Chairman and members of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People who have over the past three years consistently focused on the content and direction—the essential parameters—of an equitable settlement of the Palestine question, as crystallized in the views of the overwhelming majority of the world community. Bangladesh has consistently held that the Committee's recommendations represent indeed a balanced prescription for peace. We are particularly struck by the guiding motivation of the members of the Committee that the implementation of their recommendations would constitute a contribution within the framework of the United Nations and would complement efforts towards the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the region.

92. It is not our intention to recall the genesis and evolution of the Palestine problem or trace the international community's efforts to seek remedial action. Suffice it to say that after a quarter of a century of diffused and piecemeal deliberations, the General Assembly in 1974 finally dealt with this question in its totality, encompassing all aspects—historical, political and juridical. Thus, for the first time, the international community abandoned the fictional approach which it had taken for 25 years by treating the problem not in its political context but on a humanitarian plane, thereby ignoring the Palestinians' existence as an entity, denying their status as a people and treating them with indignity as hapless refugees.

93. While the General Assembly in the past six years has cumulatively and unambiguously spelled out the framework for a solution, it is now up to the Security Council to pursue this problem to its logical end. It has now become obvious that an equitable solution cannot remain confined within the hidebound perimeter of the Council's resolution 242 (1967). There has been substantive progress forward in the dozen years that have intervened. There have been qualitative changes universally recognized by our global society. Four million Palestinians cannot be simply wished away as non-people. They are a reality recognized by the great majority of mankind. Nor can resolution 242 (1967) itself be stretched to justify illegality and expansionism, or cloud through sophistry the cardinal principles of the

Charter, principles which enjoin that no country can be permitted to embark on a policy of conquest and aggrandizement, that no country can be allowed to enjoy the fruits of aggression and that no people can be denied its inalienable right to a homeland.

94. Independent moves towards a so-called comprehensive settlement which circumvent the central issue of the Middle East conflict—the implementation of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people—are tantamount to inviting violence and condoning illegality.

95. Bangladesh particularly notes that, notwithstanding the pursuit of its own dependent prescription for peace, Israel follows a policy which is the very antithesis of peace. In violation of the Charter and the decisions of the United Nations, Israel continues illegally to occupy the Arab lands and to engage in repeated and wanton acts of aggression in Lebanon. It has continued to build new settlements on land which clearly belongs to the Palestinian people. It has continued to engage in flagrant violation of the fundamental human rights of the Palestinian people and deny them their inalienable right to statehood. Israel has embarked on a deliberate programme to alter the Islamic and Arab character of Jerusalem. We cannot but denounce Israel for its actions. We note that both Egypt and the United States have voiced their disapproval of Israeli actions on all these questions. It is evident that Israel's aim is not a comprehensive peace in the Middle East. Its aim is clearly to pursue a policy outside the ambit of the United Nations and thereby to render United Nations resolutions and decisions on the Middle East problem infructuous.

96. Bangladesh's position on what constitutes a just, equitable and durable solution of the Middle East problem has been repeatedly enunciated in the Security Council and the General Assembly. Bangladesh is firmly convinced that a fair and lasting solution demands the complete and immediate withdrawal of Israel from all occupied territories, the restoration of the rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to their own independent State, and the acceptance of the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

97. Peace cannot be imposed by fiat, by political expediency or by might. To endure, peace must be based on justice, equity and reason. We are now presented with a crucial opportunity to chart a realistic path to a durable and just peace through timely and concerted action or, if we fail to do so, to open the door to further conflict and global conflagration. Bangladesh is confident that the choice for peace can and must prevail.

98. Mr. FILLIE-FABOE (Sierra Leone): Once again, this Assembly is addressing itself to the question of Palestine, and it is our sincere hope that the burning question of the Palestinian problem will not suffer the fate of other items by coming up for discussion year after year with little or no results.

99. The Palestinian question is a unique one in that it is a combination of decolonization, a gross violation of human rights, occupation, the displacement of persons and a huge refugee problem. It is the question of Cyprus, Kampuchea, Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa, all rolled into one. Those separate questions

have been discussed in different forums of this Organization and the concern that we express for Palestine must be the same as, or even greater, than the concern that we have expressed in dealing with those items.

100. Every Member State of this Organization knows that the Palestinian problem is at the core of the Middle East issue and, unless it is solved, there will never be peace in the Middle East. It is important also to stress that the PLO is the sole and authentic representative of the Palestinian people. As no other movement or group has ever challenged the PLO, it is indeed foolish that certain parties negotiating on or discussing the Middle East issue should consistently exclude the PLO. We can only remind them of similar attitudes adopted by the Portuguese in the case of FRELIMO,<sup>3</sup> the PAIGC,<sup>4</sup> the MPLA<sup>5</sup> and so forth. This was also the attitude at Salisbury and in London with respect to the liberation movements in Zimbabwe until recently. The PLO's undisputed position in Palestine is widely recognized by a majority of the Members of our Organization and by many other organizations, including the non-aligned movement, the Islamic Conference and the Organization of African Unity [OAU]. We have noted with satisfaction that there is some positive change in certain quarters in the attitude towards the PLO's role as the sole representative of the Palestinian people. We do hope this trend will catch on so that the question of the future Palestinians, who number several millions, will not continue to be discussed in their absence, an approach which we consider unrealistic and one which will always be doomed to failure.

101. My delegation, like many others, is gravely concerned at the Security Council's inaction vis-à-vis paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 33/28 A, requesting it to consider and take as soon as possible a decision on the recommendations of the Committee endorsed by the General Assembly. We would like to state that ignoring the issue will not make it go away. Rather, inaction by the Security Council on this very important issue can only lead to the perpetuation of the explosive situation in the Middle East, which clearly poses a threat to international peace and security. On the other hand, positive action by the Security Council on the recommendations endorsed by the General Assembly could create the conditions necessary for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, especially since the recommendations referred to concern the basic principles relating to the problem of Palestine within the Middle East situation. We call on the Security Council, therefore, to consider taking up this all-important question as soon as possible.

102. We are also gravely concerned that despite resolutions and decisions concerning Palestine, Israel, in utter defiance, continues to violate these decisions. From the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, we note with grave concern that Israel has continued deliberately to follow a policy of annexation of occupied territories, implementing this by the expropriation of property, the establishment of settlements and the implantation of Israeli Jewish civilians [see A/34/631, chap. IV, sect. A]. What is most disturbing is the fact that this practice

<sup>3</sup> Frente de Libertação de Moçambique.

<sup>4</sup> Partido Africano de Independência de Guiné e Cabo Verde.

<sup>5</sup> Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola.



appears to have been escalated in spite of the Camp David accords, thereby giving the lie to the assertion that the interest of the Palestinians was taken care of in the negotiations. The most recent of Israel's acts, which was condemned by nearly all Members of this Assembly in resolution 34/29, was the plan to expel from the occupied territories the Mayor of Nablus, leading to the resignation of the mayors of cities and towns in occupied Palestinian territory.

103. Israel, in violation of United Nations decisions, has continued its brutal treatment of Palestinians, including torture by severe beating, by refrigeration, by hanging by hands and feet and by enforced sleeplessness, sexual tortures, and so on.

104. This inhuman state of affairs must not be condoned, and must be severely condemned by the civilized world. Every effort must therefore be exerted by this Organization to bring these sadistic practices of Israel to an end.

105. We would like to reiterate our full support for the Palestinian people's just struggle to return to their homeland, for self-determination and for the establishment of their independent State on the land of their fathers and forefathers, under the leadership of the PLO, their sole legitimate representative. We would also reiterate our belief that the solution to the Middle East problem rests on allowing the Palestinian people to exercise their inalienable rights and on Israel's withdrawal from all occupied territories.

106. As before, we again appeal for a show of political will—I repeat, political will—by the international community with respect to this heart-rending plight of the people of Palestine. If we all decide that this problem must be solved, it certainly will be solved. Recently, we had a Pledging Conference for Emergency Humanitarian Relief to the people of Kampuchea, held on 5 November last,<sup>6</sup> and the results of that Conference were most encouraging. It was a clear demonstration of positive political will. Why can we not display this same political will in the case of Palestine, the case of people who have suffered long enough, the case of people yearning for a land of their own, a land which once was theirs but today is no more?

107. We would like to conclude by reminding those concerned that it is impossible to break the will of a people determined to be free, to return to its homeland and to exercise its right to self-determination and independence. The task becomes even more difficult when that people has the sympathy and support of the majority of the international community.

108. Mr. KAMIL (Indonesia): As the Assembly will shortly be discussing agenda item 25, "The Situation in the Middle East", my delegation will restrict itself in this debate to discussing the report now before us.

109. A captain is the most important component of a team, and it is he who guides the team in fulfilling its mission and achieving its aims, or otherwise. In the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Ambassador Médoune Fall of Senegal, with his wisdom, tenacity, statesmanship and diligence, has guided the work of the Committee with

such success that we can truly say here that we are satisfied with its work. My delegation therefore gladly joins previous speakers in paying a tribute to Ambassador Fall for his chairmanship of the Committee since its inception four years ago. I would like also to express my appreciation to other officers of the Committee and to Ambassador Gauci, its Rapporteur, for his statement at the 77th meeting in introducing the Committee's report [A/34/35 and Corr.1].

110. The report has demonstrated the objectivity of the Committee in its work, as well as its diligence and steadfastness in promoting the implementation of its recommendations, which were first endorsed by the General Assembly in 1976. The Committee has made a significant contribution in promoting international awareness of the question of Palestine and in focusing world attention on the right of the Palestinian people to return to their homes and to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty. There is now world-wide recognition of their rights and of the urgent need to restore them as pre-conditions of any over-all settlement of the Middle East conflict.

111. The recommendations of the Committee, which this Assembly has consistently endorsed in its last three annual sessions, stress, *inter alia*, the following points: first, that the question of Palestine is at the heart of the Middle East problem and, consequently, no solution in the Middle East can be envisaged which does not recognize and give full content to the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people; secondly, that the full exercise of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to return to their land and to achieve self-determination, national independence and sovereignty will contribute decisively to a comprehensive and final settlement of the Middle East conflict; thirdly, that the participation of the PLO, on an equal footing with other parties concerned, is indispensable to all efforts to seek a lasting solution to the Middle East crisis under the auspices of the United Nations; fourthly, that the occupying force should dismantle already established settlements in the occupied areas and desist from establishing new ones, and should speedily and completely evacuate Arab territories.

112. The validity of these conditions of a settlement remains undiminished with the passage of time. Indeed, they have become more relevant than ever and their implementation has become more urgent, in order to redress the injustice that has been done to the Palestinian people for the past three decades and to save the world from the possibility of another major catastrophe.

*Mr. Eralp (Turkey), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

113. Indeed, as the Committee has indicated and as has been confirmed by the General Assembly, Palestine remains the core of the Middle East problem. It is significant to note that there is virtual unanimity in world opinion that the Palestine issue is the fundamental element in the search for a settlement of the conflict. It is consequently recognized that no effort to seek a solution to the Middle East problem that does not involve the PLO, and no agreement that excludes the upholding of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians, can be viable. In view of the fact that, on the basis of General Assembly resolutions 3236 (XXIX) and 3375 (XXX), the PLO has been recognized by the United

<sup>6</sup> See SG/CONF.1/SR.1 and 2.

Nations as the sole representative of the Palestinian people, it is only logical that the PLO, which is gaining ever-increasing recognition throughout the world as a political entity, be represented on an equal footing with other parties concerned in any negotiation on the question. However, Israel, in defiance of world opinion, is not yet prepared to accept this.

114. As also stated by the Committee and endorsed by the General Assembly at its current session, the full exercise of the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people would contribute decisively to a comprehensive final settlement of the Middle East problem. Israel's current policy demonstrates, however, that it is not prepared to recognize these legitimate rights of the Palestinians. An illustration of this is that the Israeli Government has recently taken the step of sanctioning the purchase by its citizens of Arab-owned lands in the occupied Arab territories. By lifting the ban on the purchase of such lands in these areas by Israeli citizens, the Israeli Government has reinforced the growing suspicion that it intends to retain permanent control of these occupied Arab territories with a view to annexing them, thereby making a mockery of the legitimate and inalienable rights of the people of Palestine.

115. The inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and the consequent obligation of complete and speedy evacuation of such occupied territory by any occupying Power are fundamental and sacrosanct principles recognized by the international community. It is therefore the consistent position of my delegation that Israel, being the occupying Power in the case of the occupied Arab territories, should withdraw therefrom completely and irrevocably.

116. The General Assembly last year, in its resolution 33/28 A, urged the Security Council to take the necessary action. In paragraph 8 of that resolution it:

*"Once again urges the Security Council to consider and take as soon as possible a decision on the recommendations endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolutions 31/20 and 32/40 A and in the present resolution"*.

117. My delegation regrets that, despite this and earlier requests by the General Assembly, the Security Council has yet to act on the Committee's recommendations. My delegation is more than ever convinced that determined action by the Council would lead to tangible progress towards the solution of the problem of Palestine. The need for such action has become increasingly urgent in view of the illegal measures still being adopted by Israel for the establishment of additional settlements in the Arab territories and the disastrous consequences that such a policy is bound to have for any effort to reach a peaceful and lasting settlement of the Middle East crisis. If the Security Council fails to take positive action and a positive decision concerning the implementation of the Committee's recommendations, my delegation would consider favourably the convening of an emergency special session of the General Assembly at the appropriate time with a view to achieving further progress in the search for a comprehensive solution to the Palestine problem. Such a solution, of course, should include the complete withdrawal of foreign forces from Arab lands, the return of the Holy City of Jerusalem to Arab custody and the

exercise of the legitimate and inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, that is, to independence.

118. In conclusion, in view of the past performance of the Committee and the necessity for the continuance of its noble work, as specified in the mandate given it in General Assembly resolution 33/28 A, my delegation strongly supports the extension of that mandate and the continuance of the good work of the Committee.

119. Mr. WAPENYI (Uganda): My delegation would like to begin by paying a tribute to Ambassador Médoune Fall, Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, and to his team for the excellent report that they have produced, despite difficulties.

120. I should like to associate myself with the recommendations of the Committee that were endorsed by the General Assembly at its thirty-first session [*resolution 31/20*]. The passage of time, far from making them outdated and redundant, has only emphasized that they are fundamental to the search for a peaceful solution to the problem in question.

121. Unlike such bodies as UNRWA, the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People was established only four years ago. However, both bodies are important in that they both deal with a problem which has resulted from Israeli aggression and intransigence and which is a typical example of man's inhumanity to man.

122. In his address at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, my President said:

*"The people of Uganda are very concerned over the situation in the Middle East. It is obvious that at the heart of the Middle East problem is the Palestinian question. Any serious proposal for peace must begin with recognition of this reality. We recognize the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and national independence in a homeland of their own."* [*14th meeting, para. 27.*]

123. Uganda, as most representatives here are aware, suffered for eight years under the Fascist dictatorship of Amin, and for those eight years we lived in constant fear, without a chance to exercise some of the fundamental rights which we lost because of the oppressive régime. After such an experience, my delegation is in a better position to know how the displaced Palestinian people feel and what they are going through, without a homeland and without those rights. They live under constant threats to life and property, institutionalized torture and detention, the exploitation of Palestinian resources and manpower and, more recently, threats of deportation and banishment. Banishment belongs to the Middle Ages. Are we going to see its reappearance in the twentieth century in Israeli-held Palestine? My delegation has joined those that demand that something be done by this Organization, and the international community demands that the deportation order be revoked. Otherwise the Israeli authorities will be turning back the clock of history.

124. My delegation wishes to express its concern at the lack of progress in the Security Council with regard

to the implementation of the Committee's recommendations concerning the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. The recommendations of the Committee established by the General Assembly in its resolution 3376 (XXX) of 10 November 1975 are no different from those submitted by the Commission of three members recently established by the Security Council.<sup>7</sup> Both reports refer to the lack of co-operation from the Israeli authorities. The two reports have identical evidence of Israeli systematic and large-scale settlement in occupied territories. Both refer to Israeli disregard for basic human rights, including and in particular the right of the refugees to return to their homeland. My delegation shares the view that concrete action by the Security Council on the basis of the Committee's recommendations could produce the required results, leading to a solution of the problem of Palestine.

125. We are, however, still baffled by the unwillingness of the Security Council to tackle this problem in its proper perspective. A draft resolution presented to the Security Council on 23 January 1976 was vetoed by the United States. Yet that draft resolution simply:

“Affirms:

“(a) That the Palestinian people should be enabled to exercise its inalienable national right of self-determination, including the right to establish an independent state in Palestine in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations;

“(b) The right of Palestinian refugees wishing to return to their homes . . .”<sup>8</sup>

126. Any dilatory tactics or hesitation on our part, any lack of political will can only serve to strengthen the hold of Israel on the occupied territories.

127. At Lusaka, during the Meeting of Heads of Government of Commonwealth Countries, held at the beginning of August this year, as well as at Havana during the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at the beginning of September, my Government participated in talks which were, *inter alia*, aimed at achieving a peaceful and permanent solution to the Palestinian problem. It has become more urgent to find a solution to this problem in view of the increasing number of illegal measures being undertaken by Israel in establishing more settlements in the occupied territories. That is why my Government supported a resolution:

“To call for the convening of an emergency special session on the basis of [General Assembly] resolution 377 (V), in case the Security Council fails to exercise its primary responsibility as a result of lack of unanimity of the permanent members”. [A/34/542, annex, sect. VI A, resolution No. 2, para. 11.]

128. Yesterday, at the 78th meeting, we heard the representatives of Israel state that the problem of the Palestinians could be solved if their Arab brothers

<sup>7</sup> Commission of the Security Council established by resolution 446 (1979). For the report of the Commission, see *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fourth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1979*, documents S/13450 and Add.1.

<sup>8</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-first Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1976*, document S/11940.

would absorb them and that, since Jordan was created out of the Mandate of Palestine, it is the responsibility of Jordan and other Arab States to absorb the displaced Palestinians. He went on to state that it is an Arab problem and deserves an Arab solution. If we are to believe that, can we now revive history and state the argument that, because the displaced Jewish people were a European problem, they should be resettled in Germany? We cannot.

129. Despite the gravity of the matter, Ambassador Jacob Doron of Israel stated recently that the Arab population of the occupied territories has increased by 20 per cent. He went on to state further that unemployment had been practically eliminated and that the gross national product had grown at an average annual rate of 14 per cent. As if that were not enough, Ambassador Doron added insult to injury by saying in the Special Political Committee on 26 November 1979 that<sup>9</sup>

“the number of automobiles licensed in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza district rose from about 5,000 in 1967 to over 25,000 in 1976. Only 2 to 5 per cent of the population of the territories in question had television sets or electric refrigerators in 1967. The figure today is well over 30 per cent.”

130. The problem at hand is not and never has been a problem of cars; it has never been a problem of television sets, let alone refrigerators. It is quite evident that Israel has either refused to address itself to the real issue or is holding the United Nations and the international community in total contempt. The issues in question are the annexation of Palestinian land, the establishment of settlements in occupied territory, the displacement of local inhabitants and the denial of basic human rights. There will be no permanent solution to this problem unless and until the State of Israel agrees to address itself to these issues and to concede to the Palestinians their inalienable rights.

131. Mr. VELASCO (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to refer to the activities of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People throughout this year, as summarized in document A/34/35 and Corr.1. The Committee, under the prudent and active leadership of Mr. Médoune Fall, has wisely discharged its mandate and at the same time brilliantly realized the principles of the United Nations, which are the foundation of its work and concerns.

132. It can well be said that this year, 1979, will be considered by history as the most fruitful on the hard road of the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people towards the attainment of their self-determination, the establishment of their national home and the achievement of their own historical destiny. In this period, within the United Nations as well as outside it, the cause of the Palestinian people, above and beyond biased influences in the international mass media, is beginning to be espoused by many States, which understand the inexorable justice of their claims. It is all the more significant to see that States which have in the past avoided their diplomatic responsibility to seek stability in the Middle East have finally come to

<sup>9</sup> This statement was made at the 36th meeting of the Special Political Committee, the official records of which are published in summary form.

recognize that, without the active participation of the Palestinians in the peace processes, the peaceful co-existence of the peoples of that stormy region will never be achieved.

133. The Palestinian people most certainly deserve that international recognition. They have shown heroic persistence in avoiding their dispersion throughout the earth, unlike what has befallen, in this very century, other nations which did not demonstrate the same determination to survive. As I have said, they have heroically resisted and endured life in refugee camps, the exploitation of their peoples as cheap labour, the denial of their rights and the barriers erected to prevent their accession to human dignity. Yet, despite these painful circumstances, although they must live as exiles in their own country, although they are denied that mysterious union between man and motherland which has been at the source of every civilization, as we have heard in this very hall from their true representatives, their leaders, in accordance with the will of the people, have made a tremendous effort, in conditions of abject poverty, to secure, by means of education, hard work and social discipline, and the realization of a communal life, in dignity, without illiteracy and with imposing cultural achievements, under the banner of blind faith in the realization of their destiny. The Palestinians have refused to lose their national identity and they know that, after the long night of occupation and subjection, the hour of redemption is at hand. To such a people, as to all the peoples of the earth that are struggling to live as human beings and with social justice, the United Nations must give its support. In the midst of the twentieth century the Palestinians have embarked on an epic task, such as other peoples have performed in previous eras and which are today recalled by mankind as evidence of heroic endurance.

134. The support of my Government for the just cause of the Palestinian people is nothing new. With great foresight, the most illustrious Colombian of this century, Mr. López Pumarejo, warned the international community, coincidentally on 28 November 1947, of the enormous risk involved in the introduction of an alien political body against the will of the inhabitants of that specific region—and this has since been the basis of Colombian policy in the matter. President López Pumarejo said in this hall, at the 127th plenary meeting:

“From another angle, we cannot overlook or underestimate the fact that among the thirteen votes counted against the partition of Palestine, every one of the Moslem countries is included. If the Jewish problem is both religious and racial, we find that it does not forebode well for the execution of the plan that it should have been unanimously rejected by the whole Moslem world; not quietly rejected, but under strong protest; not by a small portion of mankind, but by the representatives of four hundred million people of one religious creed. No wonder that the plan has had to come across the Atlantic in search of the supporters that it has failed to find in the countries adjoining Palestine, in the eastern Mediterranean, in western Europe, or in the distant Asiatic mainland.”<sup>10</sup>

135. These wise and far-sighted words of the greatest

<sup>10</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Plenary Meetings* (vol. II), p. 1397.

civilian leader in our history showed that he knew that nothing that is imposed against the will of peoples, within nations or internationally can subsist because nations cannot be subjugated forever. The Palestinians have again demonstrated this fact. They are a people which, having been denied its very existence and having seen its rights ignored, now begins to discern on the horizon the dawn of its freedom, after a vigorous collective struggle marked by extreme hardship.

136. Nor can my delegation accept the conquest of territory by force of arms. This is a concept that runs counter to the diplomatic tradition of Colombia, a nation which has not conquered a single square metre of its territory by such violent means. Nor can we accept the unilateral invocation of concepts of religious history to claim rights to political sovereignty.

137. Finally, my delegation once again insists on the imperative need for the Palestinians to be summoned to the negotiation table to discuss their national destiny. This is not only because the recognition of the right of peoples to self-determination is a precept of international law, but also, and to a greater degree, because the Palestinians have won that right to discuss the nature of the organization of their future community life, the laws that will govern their everyday life, the boundaries of their homeland and, above all, the identity of their leaders, their chiefs, their governors. It is a sign of blind arrogance to believe that peoples will allow foreigners to appoint their representatives. This simple social law has been known to man since the dawn of history. The Jews elected their leaders when they were wandering in the desert; the Greeks elected their leader when they found their way back to their maritime country through Asia; and in America, we followed Bolívar when he travelled the continent urging peoples to accept their destiny and exercise self-determination. Leaving to the Palestinians the right to choose their own leaders is merely letting universal history follow its course.

138. Mr. HRČKA (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): The discussion by the plenary Assembly of the question of Palestine as a separate item of the Assembly's agenda is in itself evidence of the widespread international recognition that this question is of cardinal importance to the settlement of the Middle East conflict.

139. Before proceeding to set forth the Czechoslovak position, we wish to express our gratitude to the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People for the work it has done. The positive estimate of the Committee's efforts is best demonstrated by the fact that the Committee's recommendations for a solution of the Palestinian question have not only long enjoyed the approval of the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations, but have also become a valuable instrument for the ever-increasing understanding of ways of bringing about a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. In this connexion, we associate ourselves with those Members of the United Nations who have expressed regret that the Security Council has proved unable, because of the obstructions engaged in, as we all know, by one of the permanent members of the Council, to adopt a decision on the Committee's recommendations, which had been approved by the General Assembly.

140. Both at sessions of the General Assembly and in the Security Council, the Czechoslovak delegation has had frequent opportunities to take an active part in the discussion of the question of Palestine and to state its position on various aspects of that question. The path to the solution of this question lies only through the exercise of the inalienable national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to self-determination and to establish their own independent State, and through the exercise by the Palestinians of their right to return to their homes. It is also essential that Israeli forces should be withdrawn from all the Arab territories occupied by them, including Palestinian territories.

141. The events in the Middle East, what has been happening in the occupied territories and Israel's gross interference in Lebanon's internal affairs, all confirm the correctness of our position that the road to a solution does not lie through separate deals. The separate agreement has merely aggravated the complexity of the question of Palestine. It is already possible to see clearly that attempts to "solve" this question through what is known as limited autonomy, and behind the backs of the Palestinian people, have failed. The Palestinian people and their sole legitimate representative, the PLO, have rejected these attempts, which take no account at all of their rights and do not satisfy their legitimate aspirations. Rather, the aim of those attempts is simply, in fact, to consolidate and perpetuate the Israeli presence in the Arab territory and to circumvent historical justice, which, as is confirmed by the relevant United Nations resolutions, is inexorably on the side of the Palestinian people.

142. By rejecting the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, the Camp David framework of 17 September 1978 and the separate agreement itself of 26 March 1979 have, as Mr. Terzi, the representative of the PLO, said at a meeting of the Security Council,<sup>11</sup> proved to be simply a violation of the international consensus. The discussion at this session and the developments in the Palestinian question, particularly during the last year, with which we are all familiar, fully confirm that conclusion.

143. Today we witness an ever-increasing international recognition of the PLO. At the same time, we see an increasing awareness that the separate agreement is not bringing peace any closer and does not provide a framework for the solution of the Palestinian question and, hence, of the whole Middle East conflict itself. Far from it: the "international consensus" is being corroborated, together with the firm belief that the road to a just and lasting peace lies only through the rejection of the policy of separate deals; through a comprehensive settlement on the basis of the collective efforts of all the parties concerned, including the PLO; through the complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967; through the exercise of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to establish their own independent State; and through guaranteeing the peace and security of all the countries of the region. In this respect, my delegation is convinced that sooner or later all the parties concerned will have to revert to that very position.

144. In conclusion, we wish to assure the representa-

tives of the PLO that the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic will continue to strengthen its friendly relations with the Palestinian people and its representative, the PLO, and will provide that people with support in its just struggle for its inalienable rights.

145. Mr. FARAH (Djibouti): Once again this year, as at previous sessions, this Assembly is debating yet another report, the sole concern of which is to pave the way towards a just and equitable settlement of the question of Palestine. The report in question is that of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People [A/34/35 and Corr.1]. This report and what is reflected from it in the statements of the representatives who have spoken before me depict the grave situation described in the mandate of the aforesaid Committee and warns us of the impact this situation may have on the peace-keeping efforts in the Middle East.

146. My delegation, which has been following the debate on the subject in question with keen interest, is very happy to express, from this rostrum, its firm support with regard to the question of Palestine. We commend the untiring efforts of Mr. Médoune Fall of Senegal and his able team in presenting this factual report to the General Assembly. We are gratified that their efforts have contributed to the gathering forces that are bent on stimulating the world conscience to react against the injustice inflicted on the Palestinian people by Israel.

147. Each year the debate takes place against a background of new outrages. While the whole world is tenaciously searching for new solutions to the Middle East problem, we continually hear about new Israeli methods of repression designed to destroy the will and determination of the Palestinian people by cold-blooded murder, by destruction of their properties, by displacement from their homeland, by deportation and dispersal to the harsh experience of alien lands, where they have always endured the indignity of the refugee status. The only crime of the Palestinians is that they insist on demanding their inalienable rights, of which they have been robbed since the illegitimate birth of Israel 32 years ago.

148. Israel continues its illegal measures to change the legal status, the geographical nature and the demographic composition of the occupied Arab territories. This persistent action is carried out with a premeditated design of annexing the Arab lands. It is an act of manoeuvring, the sole aim of which is to create confusion around the core issue in that region, to divert international attention and place obstacles in the way of the continued efforts of the international community to promote a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

149. The Zionist Government of Israel must abandon its imposition of Israeli regulations on the Arab population in the occupied Arab territories. The inhuman treatment inflicted on the Arab people by the Israeli forces in the occupied Arab territories, the Israeli denial of the basic right of the Palestinian people to return to their homeland and the continued misuse by Israel of the holy shrines in the occupied Arab territories and its sacrilegious acts are but a few examples of the vicious acts which are unacceptable and must be rejected by all able statesmen in the peace-loving international community.

<sup>11</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fourth Year*, 2161st meeting.



150. Through the reports of the competent organs, including the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, rightfully assigned by the General Assembly the task of contributing to the search for an equitable solution to the Palestinian problems, we find that, contrary to the internationally accepted moral code of conduct, Israel has become inhumanly insensitive and arrogantly deaf to all international pressures and appeals. Israel has continued its belligerent behaviour against the Palestinian people and has categorically denied them their inalienable right to return to their homeland. Such behaviour on the part of Israel contravenes the principles of the United Nations Charter and calls for serious action by the competent organs of the United Nations and all agencies and institutions of the peace-loving international community to unite their efforts in bringing sanity to Israel.

151. One cannot but realize that Israel is insane when it believes that it can struggle and continue to struggle in building a Zionist expansionist State at the expense of the Palestinians and other Arab peoples at a time when the international conscience and world public opinion—even in the most reluctant pro-Israeli circles—have realized that support, both moral and material, must be provided for the protection of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to return to their homeland and have a State of their own.

152. It is unfortunate that an ominous stagnation on the Palestinian problem still prevails in spite of the past and present efforts in the search for an equitable solution. Unless a final solution to the Palestinian problem—which is the core of the Arab-Israeli conflict—is arrived at, it will be impossible to bring about a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

153. The Palestinian people have passed through 32 years of tragic experiences. They have known the bitter memories of four ravaging wars. They have suffered brutal miscarriage of justice in being evicted from their homeland to endure the indignities of exile. They have known the horrors of cold-blooded murder and the brutal experience of homelessness. Yet the Palestinian people, though frustrated to the point of exasperation, are very patient in demanding their inalienable rights by the most peaceful means open to people that have been in a state of homelessness for 32 years. They are really patient and for that they have rightfully deserved our utmost respect. Even more, the whole world owes them a debt which can only be repaid by providing moral and material support for their just cause.

154. We believe it is high time the United Nations—the General Assembly and especially the Security Council—made radical changes in its efforts to obtain more tangible results on the question of Palestine. We believe that there cannot be a durable settlement of the problem of the Middle East if the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people are denied. We also believe that no peaceful settlement in that region can be negotiated without the participation of the PLO, the sole representative of the Palestinian people, on an equal footing, and that only the total withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the Arab territories occupied since June 1967, including Jerusalem, can lead to the establishment of lasting peace in that region.

155. Israel must know that the peace and security of a

Jewish State will in the final analysis depend on the fair treatment of the Palestinians and on recognition of their right to return to their homeland, which would lead to the establishment of the Arab State of Palestine under the indisputable leadership of the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

156. In conclusion, my delegation supports all the resolutions of the United Nations calling for the return of the Palestinian refugees to their homeland. We also support all the efforts made in recognition of the destiny of the Palestinian people for self-determination, under the leadership of the PLO and under the banner of the struggle for the establishment of the Palestinian Arab State within recognized and secure boundaries.

157. Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): We do not intend to dwell at length on all the ups and downs of the painful history of the people of Palestine. Others more qualified have already done so in terms as eloquent as they were moving.

158. We have carefully studied the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People [A/34/35 and Corr.1] and listened just as carefully to the speakers who have participated in this debate.

159. From the report submitted and the statement made in the course of the debate so far, it appears that the question of Palestine, of which the United Nations has been seized since February 1947, has always been dealt with, particularly at the beginning, with a certain scorn for the Palestinian national identity. That fact is at the origin of the infernal cycle of violence and conflicts which we today deplore in that region.

160. It was only starting in 1969 that the General Assembly began officially to recognize the national identity of the Palestinian people. Since that time, it has unceasingly been reaffirmed in the course of our sessions. The PLO has been recognized as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People has been established within the United Nations. But it appears that it has become difficult in the United Nations to go beyond the peak of affirming or reaffirming the identity of the Palestinian people. It is justifiable to ask why this is so.

161. The Committee has submitted to the General Assembly wise recommendations capable of going beyond the peak of the proclamation of the identity of the Palestinian people and leading to appropriate solutions. The General Assembly has, on several occasions, approved these recommendations, but the Security Council has not followed them up in the way we had expected. On the one hand, there are the General Assembly resolutions, which since 1974 have elaborated on the idea that the question of Palestine is at the heart of the Middle East crisis and, on the other hand, there are the Security Council resolutions, in particular resolution 242 (1967), which do not seem to have developed and do not take account of the dimension of the Palestinian National identity. In the opinion of the delegation of Zaire, in order to be able to find a way out of the deadlock, the Security Council, and above all certain of its members, must include in its

concept of the problem this new dimension, which is becoming increasingly important as time passes.

162. That is why the implementation of the relevant General Assembly resolutions and recommendations is blocked both at the Security Council level and among certain Members of our Organization.

163. General Assembly resolutions 31/20 and 32/40, for example, have not been dealt with appropriately by the Security Council. Security Council resolutions 237 (1967) and 242 (1967) have not been implemented by Israel as required.

164. It seems to us that it is with this as its starting point that the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session must examine the problem in all its aspects to try to get away from the well-trodden paths, reassess the situation objectively and map out the paths for the future in a positive and constructive spirit.

165. The delegation of the Republic of Zaire wishes to congratulate most sincerely Mr. Médoune Fall, the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, and the members of the Committee on their report which is at once brilliant, complete and wise. We reaffirm our support for the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable and sovereign rights.

166. The Republic of Zaire has at all times insisted and continues to insist that the question of the Middle East and Palestine must be solved within the United Nations, which in this respect provides the most appropriate framework.

167. All States Members of the Organization must accordingly make their contribution to the search for a just and lasting settlement of the Middle East crisis so as to assist in bringing the efforts of the Organization to a successful conclusion and, more particularly, in ensuring the implementation and application of the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, in particular Security Council resolution 242 (1967). However, as I have already said and wish to reiterate, that resolution does not take account of the dimension of the national identity of the Palestinian people, which, since the recognition of the PLO as the sole authentic representative of the Palestinian people, is being daily reaffirmed.

168. In considering that the problem of the Middle East and Palestine must be solved within the United Nations, our approach is based on the fact that it is the United Nations which, 31 years ago, assumed responsibility for the creation of the State of Israel as a solution to the problem raised by the wandering Jewish people, deprived of land and home. However, the solution found by the United Nations, at the request of certain Powers moved, when all is said and done, by extremely noble sentiments, has had the effect of depriving of land and home and of plunging into poverty, misery and the vicissitudes and uncertainties of forced and perpetual exile, another people, that of Palestine.

169. We have said that one injustice cannot be corrected by another, and the head of the delegation of Zaire recalled that at this rostrum [*19th meeting*] in specific terms. If the Palestinian people today finds

itself in conditions identical to those of the Jewish people in the past, it is assuredly because the Israelis, by occupying its lands, have expelled it, deprived it of a homeland and forced it to live in the uncertainty of exile.

170. Therefore the United Nations has the moral duty and the responsibility of redressing this injustice of history and giving the people of Palestine, like other peoples of the world, a State of their own.

171. The Republic of Zaire, because of the persistence of the negative attitude of Israel, its refusal to implement the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, its constant and flagrant violation of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, broke diplomatic relations with that State in 1973 and, at this very rostrum of the Assembly, recognizes the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. The Republic of Zaire supports the right of the Palestinian people to return to its homeland, and to recover all its inalienable and sovereign rights, including the right to create a Palestinian State. The question of Palestine is at the core of the Middle East crisis and, as long as the main elements of the problem of the Middle East are not resolved, as long as genuine progress is not made towards a just and lasting settlement of all the aspects of the problem, including the question of Palestine, the situation in the region will remain unstable and dangerous. All States and peoples of the region have the right to live within secure and internationally recognized boundaries.

172. Like the other members of the OAU and the non-aligned movement, the Republic of Zaire condemns the establishment of Jewish settlements on Palestinian lands, the unilateral appropriation of the Holy City of Jerusalem and the profound geographic and demographic changes in those territories, which are contrary to the provisions of the Geneva Conventions of 1949.

173. In the view of the delegation of Zaire, the search for a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement of a Middle East and Palestine crisis must be carried out with the participation of the PLO in all the important and decisive stages of the process leading to the return of peace in that region.

174. That being said, the Republic of Zaire considers that the peace efforts of Egypt, which led to the signing of the Camp David agreements, have unleashed a dynamic peace process in the Middle East, and that this should be acknowledged by the international community as a positive step in the search for a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Middle East crisis. Those peace efforts have the merit of allowing for the inclusion of recognition of the PLO and the Palestinian identity in the concept of the problem embodied in Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

175. The Republic of Zaire does not believe that there is any contradiction between the position which states that the Middle East crisis and the question of Palestine must be solved within the framework of the United Nations and the efforts undertaken by certain Members of the United Nations precisely to accomplish the mission pursued by the United Nations. On the contrary, it is the duty of all Member States, individually and collectively, to make every necessary effort to unblock the

situation, to break the impasse and to make it possible to arrive at a solution in conformity with the spirit and letter of the relevant resolutions of the Organization.

176. When one bears in mind the number of the resolutions adopted by the United Nations on the question of the Middle East and on the question of Palestine, and when we recall, at the same time, the constant contempt shown by Israel regarding the implementation of those resolutions, any honest observer cannot fail to welcome, with a glimmer of hope and satisfaction, the fact that the peace efforts of President El-Sadat at least had the merit of beginning the process of implementing the United Nations resolutions and, in particular, Security Council resolution 242 (1967) with respect to the return—partial, no doubt, but nevertheless the return—by Israel of the Arab territories occupied and usurped by force, even though in the initial phase it is only the return of Egyptian territory.

177. This proves that a spirit of negotiation and peace has made it possible to begin the process of implementing United Nations resolutions, whereas those resolutions, adopted in indifference by some and in anger by others, had not by themselves offered any way out of the deadlock.

178. It is one thing to adopt resolutions and another to implement them, to have them implemented or to contribute to their effective implementation. The two things often require so much determination, reaching beyond political courage. Perhaps the problem does not present itself in the same terms for those who have grown used to adopting resolutions without concern for their implementation.

179. The peace efforts of Egypt which led to the Camp David agreements further prove that Israel, in adhering to those agreements, has automatically recognized the illegality and illegitimacy of the acquisition of territories by force, and therefore the illegality and illegitimacy of its presence on Arab and Palestinian lands which do not belong to it. This fact, recorded by the international community, is extremely important with respect to the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). The arbitrary and unilateral nature of the actions undertaken by Israel in that region thus appears more clearly since Israel also has recognized, by agreeing to return the Arab lands to Egypt, that those lands were taken illegally. Since the Camp David agreements come within the framework of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and since that resolution does not include the fact that the Palestinian question is at the heart of the Middle East crisis, how can one complain about Egypt's negotiations with regard to Palestine or about its having deliberately kept the PLO away from the negotiations? We believe, for our part, that now each Member State of the United Nations must exert the utmost efforts to convince certain permanent members of the Security Council of the need to bring the PLO into the process, now that the door to negotiations is open, so as to be able to merge the approach of the General Assembly with that of the Security Council as set out in the latter's resolution 242 (1967).

180. The debate on principle is now over. What remains—and it is not the least—seems to us to be a matter of ways and means; and it is here that we must

calm our anger and display lucidity, political courage, perseverance and a great spirit of negotiation.

181. It is in this spirit that we plead for the full participation of the PLO in the negotiations which will then lead to a just and durable peace in the region. This same attitude makes it difficult for us to join in an irreversible and unequivocal condemnation of the peace efforts of Egypt and of the Camp David agreements.

182. The great weakness of the approach that seeks to make condemnation or rejection of the peace efforts of Egypt and of the Camp David agreements a basic, if not primary and prior, requisite in the search for a solution to the Middle East and Palestine crisis—lies in the very wording used by the advocates of that approach themselves in condemning or rejecting the Camp David agreements and the peace efforts of Egypt.

183. In fact, they declare the Camp David agreements to be null and void in so far as they tend to determine the future or the fate of the Palestinian people and of the Palestinian territories occupied by Israel since 1967; in so far as those agreements ignore, violate or deny the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to return to their homeland and the right to self-determination, independence and sovereignty. Or else, in their very wording, they condemn or reject, without specifying, those provisions of the agreements which would violate the rights of the Palestinians.

184. If these agreements are only to be condemned and rejected and can only be declared null and void to the extent that they violate the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, does that not indicate in clear terms that the authors of this wording are not convinced that these agreements really violate those rights? There can be no other explanation for that conditional condemnation, for that conditional rejection. This means, furthermore, that the authors of this approach and of this wording are not convinced that there are negative provisions which are harmful and prejudicial to others.

185. In view of this situation, such a condemnation may prove in point of fact to have no relationship with the letter and spirit of the Camp David agreements. It would then be an invitation for us to embark on a course totally contrary to the principles of international law, since we cannot condemn either the peace efforts of a country or a State concerned over the occupation of its territory and the usurpation of its resources or the sovereign right of a State to reach agreement on matters which concern it.

186. It also seems to us that it is neither sound nor just to condemn negotiations undertaken by certain Member States of the United Nations outside the United Nations framework, precisely in order to assist in establishing the necessary conditions for the implementation of United Nations decisions and resolutions.

187. Within the framework of decolonization, for example, can one, in all decency, condemn the negotiations, in the Zimbabwe crisis, of the States members of the Commonwealth, with a view to finding solutions in conformity with the spirit and letter of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations? Can one, in all decency, condemn the individual and collective negotiations of the members of the Association of South-East

Asian Nations to find a solution to the Kampuchea crisis, in conformity with the spirit and letter of both the principles and the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations?

188. To conclude, we believe that all the peace efforts of Egypt and the Camp David agreements, while they are far from having solved all the problems at the outset, have unleashed the dynamic process of peace by opening the way for the progressive implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). They have placed Israel in a most uncomfortable position by having made it accept the prior admission of the illegality and illegitimacy of its presence on Arab and Palestinian land since 1967; and that is extremely important.

189. The new challenge that the international community must face, after solemnly recording this fact, is to bring all the interested parties in this crisis, including the PLO, on an equal footing, to the negotiating table so that Israel can draw the conclusions which flow quite naturally from its agreement to return Arab lands to Egypt and arise out of its recognition of the illegality of its presence on lands which do not belong to it.

190. The day when the rebel administration of Ian Smith in Zimbabwe recognized, albeit under an illegal constitution and equally illegal elections, the accession to power of the blacks, albeit on the basis of imperfect majority representation, he himself created an unprecedented breach in his system and implicitly recognized the futility of all his prior claims and the illegality and illegitimacy of his situation. It was written in the annals of history on that day that the negotiations of all the parties concerned would lead to the solution of the crisis in Zimbabwe, a solution which would plainly be the opposite of what Ian Smith believed the day he raised the Union Jack over Southern Rhodesia. We invite all States Members of the United Nations, indi-

vidually and collectively, to exert every effort to have the PLO participate in all negotiations leading to a just and durable peace in the Middle East, to the return of the Palestinians to their homeland and to the creation of a Palestinian State. The rest, in our opinion, is a mere diversion.

191. The people and Government of Zaire find it repugnant that, in the consideration of so serious and tragic a question, we are being used by some who look on the question of the Middle East and Palestine as one affording them the opportunity to settle accounts with other States. We refuse and shall continue to refuse to engage in such a debate.

192. Our philosophy of life forbids us to stir up hatred and encourage division among brothers engaged in a dispute, especially since we have no certainty that we shall be either present or consulted the day they come together. At present, we are not even in a position to know the terms of reconciliation. In this affair, we do not regard division within the Arab world as a positive contribution to the success of their liberation struggle against Israel. On the contrary, we are convinced that by closing their ranks and strengthening their unity, they will hasten the happy outcome of their struggle and the moral and political defeat of their enemies, with the assistance of the entire international community.

193. The PRESIDENT: At the request of the sponsors, the voting on draft resolutions A/34/L.43 and A/34/L.44 will take place as the first item of business tomorrow afternoon, 29 November. Since draft resolutions A/34/L.41 and A/34/L.42 have financial implications, the vote on those two draft resolutions will have to be postponed to a date to be announced.

*The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.*