



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 24: Question of Palestine: report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (continued).....	1523
Agenda item 15: Elections to fill vacancies in principal organs (continued): (a) Election of five non-permanent members of the Security Council.....	1539

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

AGENDA ITEM 24

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

1. The PRESIDENT: We heard the last speaker in the debate on this item yesterday at the 81st meeting. As announced, the representatives who have expressed their desire to speak in reply will be given an opportunity to do so before the vote on draft resolutions A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1 and A/34/L.44 and Add.1 this afternoon. I would recall the limitation of such statements to 10 minutes, and that such statements should be made by members from their seats.

2. I call on the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO], who wishes to make a statement in reply.

3. Mr. AQL (Palestine Liberation Organization): For the sake of some of the representatives who, as a result of *force majeure* and by a stroke of bad fortune, missed the enlightening statement made by the representative of Israel, [78th meeting], I shall allow myself to pinpoint some of the highlights in his statement.

4. On the question of the United Nations, the representative of Israel said that the United Nations was a failure because it did not encourage the Arabs to live up to their commitments under the Charter of the United Nations; that this Organization had long permitted itself to be exploited by the Arabs and their friends; that every item on the General Assembly agenda was being distorted and abused by the Arabs and their supporters in their campaign against Israel; that the Assembly heard nothing but an endless repetition of untruths, half-truths and myths learned from the advertising industry; that the Members of the General Assembly adopted their repetitive resolutions out of pure exhaustion and while their minds were in a state of dullness and numbness; that the United Nations not only did not promote international peace and security, but obstructed it.

5. Whereas this Organization has been the subject of a vociferous attack by the Israeli representative, full of vilification, slanderous and abusive utterances and intemperate and vituperative language, it behoves that representative to remember that his Zionist State owes its very existence to this same Organization—an error which in recent years this Organization has been trying to rectify by redressing the balance.

6. On the question of Palestine and the Palestinians, the Israeli representative's statement included the following:

“Today [in the United Nations] all the emphasis is put on the claims of the Palestinian Arabs and the empty charge is trotted out, by speaker after speaker from various quarters, that the Palestinian Arabs are, as it were, a people uprooted from its land and a nation denied its rights.” [78th meeting, para. 30.]

7. In other words, there is no such thing as “Palestinian Arabs”, because these so-called Palestinian Arabs never existed, as the late Golda Meir once put it to the *Sunday Times*. Moreover, the Palestinian Arabs were not forcibly uprooted and pulverized and have not since then been kept at the point of the Israeli bayonet. It follows, therefore, that there are no Palestinian rights—be they human, legitimate or inalienable, to use United Nations terms. The talk about the Palestine problem being the central issue in the Middle East conflict, the almost global conviction that no peace is feasible or possible without the Palestinians, the increasing support throughout the world for Palestinian rights and the Palestinian struggle, the United Nations resolutions recalling and reaffirming year after year Palestinian rights to self-determination, repatriation and independence—all of this is a *fata morgana*, a mirage, which by an astonishing dispensation of fate the Israeli representative alone managed to discover while the whole world is still lagging behind, misled and misguided.

8. In point of fact, when the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belgium, which is a leading member of the European Economic Community, recently officially invited the head of the Political Department of the PLO and negotiated with him in Brussels, he must have been, according to the Israeli representative, conducting talks with a ghost representing a non-existent people and a forged cause.

9. On the question of terrorism, one would have thought that that was the one issue which the Israeli representative would deliberately try to avoid in his statement for explicably known reasons. But the representative of Menachem Begin, the terrorist *par excellence* and the leader of the infamous Irgun Zvei Leumi, whose head in the mid-1940s was worth £10,000 in London for the crimes he had perpetrated, had both the audacity and the tenacity to charge the PLO, with terror and murder.

*Resumed from the 81st meeting.

10. Those who brought turmoil, violence and terror to our area and subjected it to years of aggression, occupation and bloodshed while forcibly dispossessing a whole indigenous people of its homeland are now, ironically enough, complaining of terrorism.

11. The Israeli representative's statement is replete with falsities, historical distortions and fabrications. Because of the time-limit, I have dwelt only on a couple of samples contained in the harangue of the Israeli representative, who, as a former university professor, failed to maintain an irreducible minimum of intellectual integrity and academic honesty or to stick to historical facts.

12. If the Zionists do not stop telling lies about the Palestinians, the Palestinians will continue to tell the truth about the Zionists.

13. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to exercise the right of reply.

14. Mr. AL-ZAHAWIE (Iraq): The short time allotted for the exercise of the right of reply does not allow for even a brief reference to the massive distortions and outright fabrications contained in the statement made by the representative of Israel. I shall therefore limit my remarks to three points, which may serve to illustrate Zionist tactics and mentality.

15. First, I should like to refer to the endless repetition of the big lie that it has been the Arabs who have always initiated the acts of aggression against the Zionists. We were treated to another repetition of how seven armies of seven Arab States attacked new-born innocent little Israel. That is what he said; however, on the other hand, David Ben Gurion, boasting of the exploits of the Haganah in his book, *Rebirth and Destiny of Israel*, inadvertently revealed the truth about Zionist aggression. He wrote:

"Until the British left, no Jewish settlement, however remote, was entered or seized by the Arabs, while the Haganah . . . captured many Arab positions and liberated Tiberias and Haifa, Jaffa and Safad . . . So, on the day of destiny"—15 May 1948—"that part of Palestine where the Haganah could operate was almost clear of Arabs."¹

16. That also reminds us of the exact expression used by Hitler and the Nazis clearing Germany of Jews—*Judenrein*. Here Mr. Ben Gurion and the Zionists were clearing Palestine of its indigenous Arab population.

17. The truth is that before the British left and before a single soldier from any Arab State was on Palestinian soil, the Zionists had occupied territory reserved for the "Arab State" and the "international zone of Jerusalem", and over 300,000 Palestinian refugees were fleeing Zionist terrorism and massacres. The Arab armies' intervention was a last-minute attempt to rescue and safeguard what was left of Palestine and its inhabitants.

18. But the real extent of the Zionist plan for Palestine and the whole of the Middle East was revealed as long

¹ David Ben Gurion, *Rebirth and Destiny of Israel* (New York, Philosophical Library, 1954), pp. 530-531.

ago as 1942 when they declared their "Biltmore programme".² On 5 May 1943 General Patrick Hurley, having been informed of the "Biltmore Programme", after consulting Zionist leaders, reported to President Roosevelt as follows:

"The Zionist organization in Palestine has indicated its commitment to an enlarged programme for:

"1. A sovereign Jewish State which would embrace Palestine and probably eventually Trans-Jordan;

"2. An eventual transfer of the Arab population from Palestine to Iraq; and

"3. Jewish leadership for the whole Middle East in the fields of economic development and control."

That was published by the United States Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States: Near East and Africa* (Washington, D.C., 1964), volume IV.

19. That brings me to the second point made here by the Israeli representative. It is the most invidious attempt to impose on the United Nations an old Zionist myth, namely, the denial of the existence of a homeless Palestinian Arab people. That is done in the face of all the reports on the subject at the United Nations from as long ago as 1948. Count Bernadotte, in his last report submitted to the United Nations, said the following:

"It is, however, undeniable that no settlement can be just and complete if recognition is not accorded to the right of the Arab refugee to return to the home from which he has been dislodged by the hazards and strategy of the armed conflict between Arabs and Jews in Palestine. . . . It would be an offence against the principles of elemental justice if these innocent victims of the conflict were denied the right to return to their homes while Jewish immigrants flow into Palestine, and, indeed, at least offer the threat of permanent replacement of the Arab refugees who have been rooted in the land for centuries."³

Count Bernadotte was shortly thereafter assassinated by the Zionist terrorists in Jerusalem.

20. Thirdly, I shall refer to the myth of the Jewish refugees from Arab lands and the attempt to equate them with the Palestinian refugees. Zionism is based on the so-called ingathering of Jews, that is, the uprooting of Jewish communities throughout the world to resettle them in occupied Palestine. When the Iraqi Jews left they were not refugees; they left as emigrants. Iraq passed a law in 1950 and 1951 concerning the voluntary relinquishment of Iraqi nationality by Iraqi Jews. That is contained in the United Nations *Yearbook on Human Rights for 1951*.⁴ Iraq, in other words, allowed the Jews to exercise their right to leave a country. That is far more than the Israelis have done with respect to the Palestinians—not even recognizing in principle their right to return to their land. That is the extent of the lies which the Zionists have been telling us.

21. I shall make one final remark. When that law was passed, the great majority of Iraqi Jews chose to stay. The Zionists then sent in their agents to throw bombs into synagogues in Iraq, in order to create panic so that

² See *The Middle East and North Africa 1976-77*, 23rd ed. (London, Europa Publications Limited, 1976), pp. 58-59.

³ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Supplement No. 11*, Part one, sect. V, para. 6.

⁴ United Nations publication, Sales No. 1953, XIV, 2, Part I, p. 178.

the Jews would leave. As one Iraqi Jew was quoted as saying in the Israeli newspaper *Ma'ariv* of 11 April 1972:

“It was the establishment that cultivated this hatred by means that were already employed when we lived in Iraq and Morocco. The Jews lived next to the Arabs in Iraq in peace until the emissaries of Zionism came and threw bombs into Jewish centres in order to generate conflicts between us and the Arabs.”

22. Mr. BLUM (Israel): In the course of this debate, Arab speakers, almost without exception, have again demonstrated their Governments' pathological obsession with Israel and their inability to recognize the rights of the Jewish people in their homeland, the Land of Israel. Some of them, like the representatives of Syria, Libya and Iraq, have not hesitated to use again obscene and vituperative language in their reference to my country and my people.

23. I think it pertinent to point out that the majority of Arab States, in refusing to reconcile themselves to the inalienable rights of the Jewish people, including their right to an independent and sovereign State, are reflecting a much broader approach of exclusivity, an attitude of racism vis-à-vis minorities in their midst, which has characterized Arab political activity since the end of the First World War.

24. This form of exclusivism and perverted political mentality leaves no room for non-Arab and non-Muslim States in the region. It is for this reason that the Arabs have consistently suppressed the rights of all the national, religious and ethnic minorities in the area. Hence, for example, in the 1930s Iraq suppressed with great brutality calls for a measure of autonomy by the Assyrians, an ancient Christian group. It was for the same reason that, in the 1950s and 1960s, Syria worked systematically to break up and disperse the concentrations of Kurds, an ethnic minority within its borders. It was for the same reason that, in the 1960s and 1970s, Iraq put down harshly and tried to stamp out any moves to achieve autonomy by the Kurds. And, even more recently, this was one of the reasons why Syria was so swift to join the civil war in Lebanon, so that an end would be put, probably once and for all, to the only multi-denominational State in the League of Arab States. Instead of displaying here his talent in the use of obscene language, the representative of Syria would have done better to explain his country's shameful role in the rape of Lebanon. Similarly, the Iraqi representative would have done better to explain his country's smashing of the Kurdish minority.

25. One could in fact expand at very great length on the catalogue of intolerance towards religious and ethnic minorities in the area. I shall refrain from doing so. What I should point out, however, is that this exclusivist attitude explains many of the phenomena in the recent history of the Middle East, including the total negativism in the formula adopted at Khartoum shortly after the six-day war in 1967, which mandated no recognition of Israel, no negotiations with Israel and no peace with Israel.

26. This attitude also explains the perverted psychology of the representative of the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan, who permits himself, in different United

Nations organs and committees, to refer to Israel as “a cancerous growth”, “a bubonic plague”, “a blood-sucking vampire” and so on. It is not that Mr. Nuseibeh has perhaps been seeing too many Count Dracula films recently; it is that he is giving unrestrained expression to a fundamental attitude which refuses to admit the right of the Jewish people to sovereignty in any part of the original area of Mandated Palestine.

27. All of this points to a sad conclusion of wider implications with regard to the entire Middle East. It is that peace will only come to the area, not only vis-à-vis the Arab-Israel conflict, but also vis-à-vis other conflicts in the region as a whole, when full recognition is given to the rights of all the national, religious and ethnic minorities which, it should be remembered, make up a very large part of the region's total population.

28. I am obliged to say a word about Jerusalem because so much has been said in this debate, with obvious intent to distort the truth about the role of Jerusalem in Jewish history and the role of the Jews in the history of the city.

29. Jerusalem has known many foreign rulers during the course of its long history, but none of them regarded it as its capital. Only the Jewish people have always regarded it as the centre and sole focus of their national and spiritual life.

30. The Jews of Jerusalem have the longest unbroken historical association with the Holy City. For the last century and a half they have been the majority of the city's population.

31. As the representative of Israel, let me therefore state here again that Jerusalem, one, undivided and indivisible, shall remain forever as it is today, the capital of Israel and of the Jewish people.

32. At the same time, the Government of Israel has always been conscious of the fact that Jerusalem is of deep concern also to other faiths and that its religious and historic sites are precious to Christians and Muslims as well as to Jews.

33. Under the Israel Law on the Protection of Holy Places of June 1967 unrestricted access to Holy Places is guaranteed to members of all faiths. In this regard, it is relevant to recall that for 19 years, between 1948 and 1967, Israeli Jews, Muslims and Christians alike were barred by the Jordanian occupation authorities from praying at the Holy Places in the Old City of Jerusalem. They gained access to them only in 1967 when the city was reunited. Millions of Muslim and Christian tourists and pilgrims have visited Jerusalem since 1967 and have worshipped freely at its mosques and churches. Those visitors can attest to the complete and unprecedented freedom of access to and worship at all the shrines holy to the adherents of all faiths.

34. I shall conclude with one short quotation from a book, published in 1811, by Chateaubriand, the famous French statesman and writer, after a visit to the Land of Israel in 1806 and 1807:

“Gaze upon the space between Mount Zion and the Sanctuary. There dwells that small people, differ-

ent from all others who live in the Land

"In order that your amazement should be complete, you should see this people in Jerusalem. There you will see these masters of this Land of Judah, the lawful owners of the Land, living as strangers and servants in their own Land, and in spite of all the pressures upon them waiting for the Redeemer to come and redeem them

"Persians, Greeks and Romans have vanished from the earth, but one small nation, more ancient still, lives on. And if there is one thing in human history which can be called a miracle—I think this is it."

35. This surely epitomizes how the world has regarded Jerusalem throughout the centuries, and no amount of wilful distortion and downright lies in this body can do away with such a fundamental fact of world history.

36. Mr. OBEIDAT (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is true that the problem of Palestine has been of concern to the General Assembly from the very beginning. This, without any doubt, has been due to the intransigence of Israel and its refusal to abide by the resolutions of the international community. I repeat that the problem is caused by Israel, and not by the Arab countries.

37. It is true that in Europe the Jews were oppressed by nazism, but is it just that the Arabs should pay the price of that persecution?

38. The representative of Israel praises the United Nations when it considers the right of the Jews alone to a national homeland. But woe to the Organization if it considers the right of the Palestinian people to establish a homeland on their own territory.

39. His Royal Highness Prince Abdullah, founder of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, thanks to the impetus created by the great Arab revolution and to his leadership of the Jordanian people, and despite the opposition of the British Mandate troops, established a State on the East Bank of the Jordan. I repeat that Prince Abdullah, son of the leader of the great Arab revolution, was able with the support of the people of Jordan to create the State of Jordan as a nucleus of Arab unity.

40. The Jordanian army was on Palestinian soil even before the adoption of General Assembly resolution 181 (II) in 1947 relating to partition. That army had withdrawn from Palestinian soil before the termination of the British Mandate, but it returned shortly afterwards, in response to the appeal of the Palestinian people, to thwart the ambitions of the Zionists, who had begun to occupy the territory beyond the limits set by the partition resolution. In other words, Jordan was safeguarding the spirit of resolution 181 (II). Israel's allegations are nothing but lies, because it was Israel that rejected the partition resolution. If that is not so, can the representative of Israel explain why his country occupied territories beyond the limits laid down in the resolution on partition adopted by the United Nations?

41. The Jordanian army's mission was a peaceful one. The representative of Israel knows perfectly well what attempts were made by Jordan, even after the 1948 war,

to establish clear and specific borders for Israel. But Israel rejected all the efforts made by Jordan. Jordan wanted peace, but Israel responded with repeated military attacks.

42. I should like to draw the Assembly's attention to the dangerous allegations of the representative of Israel, which are in flagrant contradiction of historical facts. He distorts historical and geographical facts by claiming that something called Palestine exists in his imagination, but outside the land of Palestine which the world knows. He tries to rename Jordan, a Member State of the United Nations, "Land of Palestine". Thus he is attempting to create a substitute homeland for the Palestinians. I must state again that such lies deceive no one. The Palestinian people will accept no substitute for their homeland in spite of the affection of the Jordanian and other Arab people for the Palestinians. I add that the Jordanian people, the Arab peoples and the entire Islamic nation vigorously reaffirm the Arab character of Jerusalem and that they will never change their position. In face of Israeli intransigence, we shall never give up any of our rights to what is Arab and Muslim in Jerusalem.

43. The Israeli Government is continuing to expropriate Arab territories and to annex them to Jerusalem, to the point where the representative and the leaders of Israel maintain that it has become an area of Arab-Israeli coexistence, and, as a result of all the land stolen by Israel, Jerusalem now represents 27 per cent of the area of the West Bank.

44. The Palestinian people, the Arab people, the Muslims, will never relinquish their historic rights in Jerusalem.

45. The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the next speaker, may I remind the Assembly of the standing rule that a second right of reply should be limited to five minutes.

46. Mr. AL-ZAHAWIE (Iraq): It is monstrous to hear the representative of Israel speak of exclusivism. Is there any State in the whole world more exclusivist than the Jewish Zionist State of Israel? Nevertheless, he has reverted to the same tactics of raising extraneous matters that are completely irrelevant to this debate.

47. However, I should like to refer to what Jews say about their position in Iraq and quote a Jewish writer, John Kimche, an English Jew, and author of *Seven Fallen Pillars*, who served as military correspondent for British newspapers in the Middle East. He wrote as follows:

"It has always been easy to whip up popular Arab feeling against the Westerners—the British, the French, even the Americans. But though in recent years every Arab has considered the Jews as arch-enemies, though the Jews have been publicly more hated and denounced than any of the imperial powers, they have never been the subject of Arab xenophobia.

"I will return to Baghdad for an example of what I mean: in the Iraqi capital in the spring of 1948, feeling was running high. There had been almost daily demonstrations since the beginning of the year. The Information Office of the British Embassy had been

attacked; the American Information Offices had been smashed up . . . All this time, the Arab Liberation Army was fighting the Jews in Palestine; and the press was filled with anti-Zionist exhortations. But not one Jewish shop in Baghdad—and there are many—had its windows broken, not one Jew of Baghdad's estimated 100,000 was assaulted by the crowds. Even at the height of the crisis in the Spring, the Jewish families took their Sabbath afternoon walk in their fineries, much in the same way as they did in Tel Aviv or Aldgate High Street. It was an impressive exhibition of Arab tolerance and of the underlying difference in the Arab approach to the Jew and to Western Christians."

48. On 17 November 1944, after the assassination of Lord Moyne in Cairo, Prime Minister Winston Churchill made the following statement in Parliament:

"If our dreams for zionism are to end in the smoke of assassins' pistols and our labours for its future are to produce a new set of gangsters worthy of Nazi Germany, many like myself will have to reconsider the position we have maintained so consistently and so long in the past. If there is to be any hope of a peaceful and successful future for zionism, these wicked activities must cease and those responsible for them must be destroyed, root and branch."

Unfortunately, those leaders of those Nazi-like gangsters have not been rooted out and destroyed, root and branch. They are still leaders today, the leaders of present-day Zionist Israeli aggression and expansionism.

49. Mr. EL-CHOUFI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Israeli representative has accustomed us to the false allegations which he repeats whenever the occasion arises and even when it does not arise. I think that the representative of Israel should be well acquainted with the truth, which is now clear to all and which we have repeated on various occasions in response to the allegations of the Israeli delegation.

50. The Syrian armed forces in Lebanon are part of the Arab deterrent force which was set up by the League of Arab States. Our forces are in Lebanon with the approval and at the request of the Lebanese Government and have been made available to the legitimate Lebanese authorities. Once their task is completed they will not remain in Lebanon one single moment; they will withdraw as soon as the Lebanese Government so requests.

51. Mr. BLUM (Israel): It is indeed ironic that the representative of Jordan should challenge the fact that his country is none other than the independent Palestinian Arab State established in 1946 on 80 per cent of the area of Mandated Palestine. His Ambassador, Mr. Nuseibeh, is himself the quintessence of my thesis; he embodies it in his very person. For here we have a son of a well-known Jerusalem family serving as the Ambassador of Jordan to the United Nations. Is the Jordanian representative going to tell us that Mr. Nuseibeh is not a Palestinian Arab? By challenging my thesis does he mean to imply that his Ambassador's loyalties to Jordan are questionable or that he is some form of diplomatic mercenary, a Palestinian Arab merely in the employ of the Jordanian Government?

52. I challenge the Jordanian representative to tell this Assembly how many other Palestinian Arabs like Mr. Nuseibeh, born in the area of Mandated Palestine west of the River Jordan, are Jordanian Ambassadors throughout the world today. Is he going to tell us that none of them is a Palestinian Arab and that they have gone through some extraordinary metamorphosis? Or are they all, like Ambassador Nuseibeh, diplomats of convenience?

53. Let me remind the Jordanian representative of the record. Between 1922 and 1946, Trans-Jordan remained an integral part of Mandated Palestine. In 1946, it became the independent Palestinian Arab State in that area. When King Abdullah came to the Jericho Conference in December 1943, which was attended by Palestinian Arabs west of the River Jordan, he was crowned "King of Palestine". Abdullah, in fact, wanted to rename his country "The Kingdom of Palestine". King Hussein, in his memoirs, indicates clearly that Trans-Jordan was arbitrarily siphoned off from the rest of Mandated Palestine. Crown Prince Hassan of Jordan, in the Jordanian National Assembly on 2 February 1970, stated unambiguously that "Palestine is Jordan and Jordan is Palestine. The nation is one and the land is one".

54. In the period of the Jordanian occupation of Judaea and Samaria, that is, from 1948 to 1967, some 400,000 Palestinian Arabs from those areas moved to the area east of the River Jordan which they regarded as a matter of course as the Palestinian Arab State in Mandated Palestine. As is also well known, the Arab residents of Judaea and Samaria are citizens of Jordan. Palestinian Arabs from these areas occupy leading positions in Jordan today which are too numerous to mention. The present Premier of Jordan, Mudar Badran, comes from a Nablus family. Palestinian Arabs occupy high positions in Jordan in government—in the Senate, in the Advisory Council and in the Administration. They constitute Jordan's economic and intellectual elite.

55. It is an irrefutable fact that Jordan is the Palestinian Arab State in Mandated Palestine while Israel is the Palestinian Jewish State in the same area. Those who would challenge this fact have an obvious political axe to grind or—as they would prefer—to wield.

56. The Iraqi representative has raised the preposterous canard that the life of Jews in Arab lands, including Iraq, was idyllic. I shall address myself to that ridiculous suggestion on a separate occasion. For the time being, I shall only ask him to explain the vicious pogrom against the Jews in Baghdad in 1941.

57. The PRESIDENT: I know that the representative of Iraq wishes to exercise his right of reply but, as he knows, the General Assembly has already decided that each delegation can only exercise its right of reply twice.

58. However, I also note that the representative of Jordan wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply. He now has five minutes in which to do so.

59. Mr. OBEIDAT (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I wish to explain to the delegates that the claim just made by the representative of Israel in speaking

about the union between the people of Jordan and the Arab people of Palestine is true in the sense that we form part of the same nation and that the historical links between the Arab people in Jordan and those in Palestine go back very far, to well before the existence of any colonialist entities in our region, as a result of the Sykes-Picot agreement⁵ and the Balfour Declaration.⁶

60. The Arab peoples are a single nation, whether the Israeli representative recognizes this fact or not. It is not a shame for Jordan to have blood relation and family ties with the Palestinians. It is an honour to the Arab people of Jordan.

61. The Israeli representative made lying assertions and resorted to false manoeuvres in order to propagate poisonous thoughts. By saying that our representative here at the United Nations is from Jerusalem, he is trying to taunt Jordan and sow injurious thoughts. How does he explain then his own situation? He comes from Czechoslovakia, a country that has no relations whatsoever with Palestine. How is he allowed to be Ambassador of Israel?

62. There is an undeniable and historical fact: our people of Jordan and the Arab people of Palestine and all other Arab peoples are one people and form part of a single Arab nation. Obviously, it is not shameful to find co-operation among them, in all fields.

63. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the PLO who may speak for the second time for five minutes.

64. Mr. AQL (Palestine Liberation Organization): It seems that the Israeli representative is trying to divert the attention of the Assembly by focusing on the relationship between the Palestinians and Jordan.

65. I think that there is no difference. The Palestinians and the Jordanians have very close ties: family, commercial and historical ties. We promise him that once our Palestinian territory, which is under Israeli occupation, is liberated, we shall enter into a federation or a confederation with the Kingdom of Jordan. This is our own affair; we are quite capable of deciding our future relationship with the Kingdom of Jordan.

66. I believe that, instead of trying to focus on the area occupied by Jordan and the area occupied by Palestine, using terms like "the Palestinian Jordanian State" and "the Palestine Mandate", what we should really ask him is: how much of Mandated Palestine does the State of Israel occupy nowadays?

67. It started off in 1917 with the concept of the Balfour Declaration, meaning that the wandering Jew, the persecuted Jew, had had enough suffering and that it was high time that he settled somewhere in Palestine, according to the concept of the Jewish national home promulgated by the British Government in 1917.

68. In 1947 they were accorded more than 50 per cent of the total area of Palestine under General Assembly resolution 181 (II), on partition. In 1948 they managed

to occupy almost 77 per cent of the total area of Palestine by force of arms, and in 1967 they swallowed the whole of Palestine, also by force of arms.

69. That is the question that should be asked: how much of Mandated Palestine does Zionist racist Israel occupy? It is not a question of the relations between Jordanians and Palestinians, which we are capable of arranging once our Palestine is liberated from Israeli occupation.

70. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the vote.

71. I would remind members that the Assembly will be voting only on draft resolutions A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1 and A/34/L.44 and Add.1, since the other two draft resolutions, A/34/L.41/Rev.1 and A/34/L.42, will have to be considered by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and by the Fifth Committee.

72. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Egypt firmly supports the just cause of the Palestinian people. Proceeding from that position of principle, which has always been considered the heart of Egyptian policy, the Egyptian delegation fully supports the work of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. The Egyptian delegation also supports all the recommendations of the Committee [A/34/35 and Corr.1, chap. V], which are designed to enable the Palestinian people to recover their legitimate rights and particularly their natural right, which is the right of all peoples of the world, to self-determination in full freedom, without foreign interference.

73. The main features of the Egyptian position on the just cause of the Palestinian people were explained in detail in the general debate, and in my statement on 27 November [79th meeting, paras. 132-155] during the debate on this agenda item. I again made our position quite clear. Now I shall confine myself to an explanation of the Egyptian position on draft resolutions A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1 and A/34/L.44 and Add.1.

74. Egypt attaches very special importance to the need for all resolutions on the Palestinian cause to enjoy the support of the greatest possible number of votes, if not unanimous support, for the cause of the Palestinian people is a just cause and deeply touches the conscience of mankind. It is at the heart of the Middle East conflict. The achievement of a just and lasting solution will have a direct impact on the maintenance of peace and security in the Middle East and in the whole world. These are a few general comments on the two draft resolutions now before us. Unfortunately the Egyptian delegation finds that the wording used in draft resolutions A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1 and A/34/L.44 and Add.1 includes certain formulations which would not promote the essential aim of those two drafts. Some of the language used is not at all conducive to the attainment of the objectives for which the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People was set up. That language gives rise to conflicting views and divergences, whereas the task of the Committee is to win the broadest possible support for the cause of the Palestinian people. The elements I refer to are the following.

⁵ See *The Middle East and North Africa 1979-80*, 26th ed. (London, Europa Publications Limited, 1979), pp. 57 and 58.

⁶ For the text, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Supplement No. 11*, vol. II, annex 19.

75. First, draft resolution A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1 refers specifically to one of the paragraphs in the report of the Committee which expresses an opinion on the framework agreed upon in the Camp David accords.⁷ Egypt's position on this matter has already been explained in detail. Since Egypt supports the work of the Committee, we must therefore support the Committee's recommendations. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1 but, at the same time, we wish it to be known that we have very distinct reservations. We are not in agreement with one of the references contained in the report.

76. Secondly, draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1 contains criticism of the Camp David accords. We cannot accept this criticism; we firmly reject it. I shall now merely state certain considerations which determine our position on the subject.

77. In the first place, Egypt declares yet again that the framework agreed upon at Camp David does not represent the final solution to the Palestinian problem. It is merely one step forward, which should certainly lead to progress. That step has undoubtedly put an end to the immobility affecting the Palestinian problem that has existed ever since it first emerged. Egypt has proved able to wrest from Israel commitments whose faithful fulfilment will greatly benefit the Palestinian people. The most important of these is the commitment to apply Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in all its aspects and the need to recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. In this way Egypt would have laid the groundwork for a first constructive step towards a solution of the Palestinian problem.

78. In the second place, the framework of the Camp David accords was not officially submitted to the Committee. Therefore, the Committee was unable to give serious and objective study to its positive aspects. That is why it is neither just nor possible to ask the General Assembly to give an opinion on this subject and its validity.

79. In the third place, this paragraph widens the differences and divisions in the Arab ranks—differences and divisions which actually relate to the means of implementation and not the aims to be achieved. As now worded, draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1 would, viewed absolutely objectively, have repercussions that would not be favourable to the Palestinian cause, because the draft resolution would not obtain the unanimous support required.

80. For those reasons, the Egyptian delegation requests the General Assembly to delete operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1. We ask that this proposal should be put to the vote before the Assembly votes on the draft resolution as a whole. We make this request in conformity with rule 90 of the rules of procedure.

81. Egypt asks the General Assembly to vote in favour of our proposal to delete operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1.

82. Mr. PETREE (United States of America): I ap-

⁷ A Framework for Peace in the Middle East, Agreed at Camp David, and Framework for the Conclusion of a Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel, signed at Washington on 17 September 1978.

preciate this opportunity to set forth the position of my delegation on the draft resolutions which are before us.

83. A distinguished American, Senator Abraham Ribicoff, said in the debate on this question last year⁸ that the Palestinian issue must be addressed as a political as well as a humanitarian question, adding that many of those who identify themselves as Palestinians share a sense of grievance, a sense of community and a longing for a recognized identity.

84. The draft resolutions which are before us do not contribute to bringing the achievement of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people one day closer to practical reality. On the contrary, they are totally negative and seek to undermine the only viable framework for negotiations which exists today. Most importantly, they place this body, which should be dedicated to the search for peace, in the position of rejecting a peace treaty between sovereign neighbours. Instead of defining new areas where conciliation and negotiation may be possible, they are divisive in intent and in practice. They mix important political matters with the issuance of postage stamps and occasions for propaganda. They endorse the recommendations of the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights and the one-sided Committee, both of which my Government opposes.

85. In the framework for peace negotiated at Camp David, Israel and Egypt agreed to enter into negotiations with representatives of the Palestinian people to achieve legitimate Palestinian rights. My Government remains a full partner in these negotiations and fully committed to their goals. My delegation opposes the draft resolutions on the question of Palestine in their entirety. They do not advance the cause of peace in the Middle East, nor do they serve the cause of legitimate Palestinian aspirations and rights.

86. Mr. DERESSA (Ethiopia): As this Assembly is about to pronounce itself on the two draft resolutions contained in documents A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1 and A/34/L.44 and Add.1, respectively, my delegation, in explaining the affirmative vote it will cast on those texts, would like to set forth its views as follows.

87. The uprooting of the Palestinian people from their homeland, as well as the injustices they have been made to suffer as a result, is a most unfortunate, indeed tragic, situation which continues to vex and haunt the conscience of all peace-loving peoples throughout the world. That this heroic people should have been languishing in refugee camps for over 30 years is painful to us; indeed, it is a very sad commentary on the history of our times. That this great human tragedy and injustice against the people of Palestine is being perpetuated in the name of a people that has itself suffered intolerance and oppression throughout the centuries is, to say the least, highly ironic.

88. Why the Arab people of Palestine should be held responsible for the crimes committed by others, why they should be subjected to degradation, repression and wanton killings, why they should continue to be denied their inalienable rights to self-determination and a homeland—in short, how one wrong justifies another—is incomprehensible. Only those who have made a virtue out of cynicism and duplicity can understand the

⁸ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Plenary Meetings*, 65th meeting, paras. 76-89.

weird logic of punishing the innocent for the injustices committed in the past by well-known criminals.

89. In our view, it would be in the enlightened self-interest of Israel, and its imperialist collaborators therefore, to realize that under no circumstances can one wrong justify another; that a wrong, no matter how many times it is repeated, cannot be made right; that the only road to peace in the Middle East lies first and foremost through recognizing the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, respecting the PLO as an authentic voice of the deepest, lawful aspirations of the people of Palestine, as their sole representative and the only force that can truly negotiate on their behalf; that the acquisition of territory by force, illegal settlements, expulsions, deportations, systematic repression and denial of the right of the Palestinian people to return to their homeland would only further aggravate the very dangerous situation prevailing in the region—a region that has witnessed four consecutive wars that have caused great suffering, death and destruction of life and property. That the question of Palestine is at the core of all this cannot be denied. It is also imperative that Israel should withdraw from Arab territories it has illegally occupied since the 1967 war, if peace is to prevail in the Middle East.

90. Any settlement in the region such as the Camp David scheme cannot, therefore, be durable or, still less, viable, since it fails to take full account of the Palestinian problem and has been undertaken with the exclusion of the PLO and the other directly interested parties. If anything, the separate deal only sacrifices the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people to the goals and objectives of international imperialism. In effect, it has served only to postpone a just and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East, thus resulting in increased international tensions and threatening the peace and security not only of the region but of the world as a whole.

91. It is in view of those facts and as an expression of fraternal solidarity with the people of Palestine that my delegation will cast an affirmative vote on both draft resolutions.

92. Mr. AL-MARHOON (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I wish to explain the vote of the delegation of Oman on draft resolutions A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1 and A/34/L.44 and Add.1.

93. My delegation will abstain on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1 if it is put to a separate vote, but will vote in favour of that draft resolution as a whole.

94. My delegation's support of the Palestinian cause, which is a just one, is well known and has been reaffirmed in a letter from His Majesty the Sultan Qaboos on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the People of Palestine, on 29 November.

95. We are convinced of the Arab character of the land of Palestine. This cause cannot be the subject of bargaining and we regard it as the core of the Middle East problem. Our position reflects that stated at various Arab summit meetings which have set out the measures necessary for the recovery of the occupied Arab territories.

96. There is no real substitute for peace efforts. We would like to give peace the necessary chance, but without waiving any Arab rights. Israel must withdraw from the Arab territories it occupied in 1967 and the sacred position of Jerusalem in the Arab world must be duly recognized, as must the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the establishment of their own independent State.

97. Oman views the Peace Treaty between Israel and Egypt⁹ as a first step towards a general and just peace; but this step is subject to the realization of the aforementioned objectives. I ask that our vote on draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1 should be interpreted in that light.

Mr. Koh (Singapore), Vice-President, took the Chair.

98. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The Albanian delegation in keeping with the view we expressed in the debate on the question of Palestine [79th meeting, paras. 184-200], would like to make a brief explanation of the position we shall take during the vote on draft resolutions A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1 and A/34/L.44 and Add.1.

99. The Albanian delegation, as in the past, shares the concern over the fact that the question of Palestine has not been resolved. Moreover, recent events relating to the situation in the Middle East are further complicating the situation, creating fresh difficulties and new dangers, and preventing the solution of the Palestinian problem.

100. In our opinion it is particularly important to stress the idea that the question of Palestine is at the very heart of the Middle East issue and that unless that issue is resolved we cannot settle the over-all conflict in that zone and establish peace and tranquillity there.

101. The question of Palestine must find a single solution, namely, one that will restore all the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. The only way to attain that solution is by taking account of the will of the Palestinian people, who have waged a struggle under the leadership of the PLO, their sole and authentic representative.

102. It is for these reasons that the Albanian delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1.

103. My delegation will vote in favour also of draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1. During the general debate at this session [9th meeting] and also during the debate on the question of Palestine, my delegation clearly stated its position as regards the aims and effects of the Camp David agreements and the separate Peace Treaty and has emphasized that those agreements have been considered to be a blow against the Palestinian people. Accordingly, we shall vote for draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1.

104. I would just repeat that my delegation has some reservations on some of the ideas and wordings in the texts of these two draft resolutions as well as on the

⁹ Peace Treaty between the Arab Republic of Egypt and the State of Israel, signed at Washington on 26 March 1979.

documents that are referred to in the draft resolutions. These reservations have already been expressed at earlier sessions when the General Assembly adopted resolutions 31/20 in 1976, 32/40 A and B in 1977 and 33/28 A, B and C in 1978. We do not wish to repeat our reservations at this stage since they can be found in the relevant documents of the General Assembly.

105. Mr. FILLIE-FABOE (Sierra Leone): My delegation is aware that draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1 is devoted to the question of agreements and treaties purporting to resolve the Palestine question in principle.

106. My Government welcomes all negotiations aiming at bringing peace to the Middle East. However, the Middle East issue embraces a broader and larger area than the countries represented at Camp David, and a much broader framework for a just, honourable and durable peace is needed. This view is clearly expressed in the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1.

107. Therefore, while we may have reservations on the wording of certain operative paragraphs of that draft resolution and could reflect them in our votes if they were to be voted on separately, we will nevertheless vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, since, on the whole, it underscores the need for the involvement of the international community and the people of Palestine in the solution of a problem which has confronted them for a very long time.

108. Mr. BOULE (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has always supported the work done by the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, and my country's support of the interests of the Palestinian people needs no further proof. Suffice it for me to refer to the votes cast by the Gabonese delegation in the various international bodies dealing with the problem of Palestine. When, however, it is a question of condemning the Camp David accords, we feel that this is not the proper approach.

109. No consensus emerged on the subject of condemnation of the Camp David agreements at the Assembly of Heads of State or Government of the Organization of African Unity [OAU], held at Monrovia July last, or at the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana in September, or in the communiqué adopted by the Foreign Ministers and heads of delegations of non-aligned countries at their extraordinary meeting, held at New York in October [A/34/599, annex].

110. My delegation asks that operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1, which categorically condemns the Camp David agreements be deleted, so that we may achieve a consensus. Accordingly, my delegation supports the amendment submitted by the Egyptian delegation with the aim of deleting operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1.

111. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The draft resolution under discussion, A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1 and A/34/L.44 and Add.1, are designed to further impede the peaceful solution of the Arab-Israel conflict and, particularly,

the settlement of the problem of the Palestinian Arabs.

112. With that in mind, they are specifically calculated to escalate the manipulation of the United Nations as an instrument of political warfare in the hands of the Arab rejectionist States and their collaborators. Such resolutions are detrimental to the cause of peace. They are detrimental also to the cause of the United Nations. They are harmful to all the people of the Middle East, including the Palestinian Arabs whose tribulations are in fact only prolonged by the hostilities and machinations which have inspired the draft resolutions before us.

113. The authors of these draft resolutions rely on an arithmetical majority always at their disposal in the General Assembly to carry through any and every Arab proposition against Israel out of blind acceptance, extraneous interests or sheer expediency. However, those delegations which are willing to take positions on the merits of the case would surely do well to recognize what nefarious ends they are being asked to pursue.

114. The draft resolutions in question emanate principally from the Palestine Committee which is dominated by the rejectionist Arab States and the so-called PLO, and are cut and tailored to fit their negativistic aims. These draft resolutions, as well as those they recall, are based on a denial of the inalienable rights of the people of Israel and of the State of Israel as a Member of the United Nations. Therefore, they are not only devoid of all moral and legal basis, but are also injurious to the process of reconciliation and, above all, to peace. They ignore the sovereign rights of Israel. They ignore its right to enjoy peace and security. They disregard the need to resolve the Arab-Israel conflict by serious and practical peace negotiations. Instead, these draft resolutions are intended to dictate one-sided solutions. They seek to bolster those who reject peace with United Nations resolutions which might provide them with further means to inflame the conflict.

115. Draft resolutions A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1 and A/34/L.44 and Add.1 represent yet another crude attempt to hamper the progress of the only constructive, practical and on-going peace process that has taken place in the Arab-Israel conflict for over three decades. They conspire to turn the United Nations against its very *raison d'être*, the prevention of war and the promotion of peace. In other words, they are in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and all it stands for.

116. These draft resolutions are also in complete contradiction to the provisions contained in Security Council resolution 242 (1967) which, for reasons that are readily understandable, they refrain from mentioning.

117. What is this initiative trying to obstruct? Its sponsors cannot bring themselves to acknowledge the fact that two Members of the United Nations which were at war with each other have negotiated and arrived at a peace treaty between themselves and at the same time have undertaken to work towards a comprehensive solution of other aspects of the Arab-Israel conflict. By all the precepts of international law and progress, this is surely not only a legitimate, but also a desirable and commendable, position for two sovereign States to take. No third party or parties have the legal or

moral authority to question, let alone deny, the validity of the accords attained.

118. The Camp David frameworks are only a first step towards a comprehensive peace. With regard to other regions and other international issues, the General Assembly has welcomed many other initial steps, primary agreements or signs of partial progress, whether in the social, economic, political or security fields. Why is it that in the case of the historic breakthrough to peace embodied in the Camp David frameworks, we come up against so much hostility, prejudice and ill-will? The answer is clear. These frameworks, and the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty based on them, are incompatible with the avowed desire of the rejectionist Arab States and of their pliant tool, the terrorist PLO, to destroy Israel, if not at one stroke, then by stages. These frameworks disrupt their belligerent schemes. They do not suit the interests of their allies, some close and some more distant, who are eager to continue to profit by fishing in the troubled waters of the Middle East. That is what is at stake in these proposals. They are not only biased and wasteful, they are destructive. These draft resolutions are utterly unacceptable, and we call upon all Member States with the genuine interests of peace at heart to vote against both of them.

119. Mr. AL-ZAHAWIE (Iraq): The draft resolutions contained in documents A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1 and A/34/L.44 and Add.1 were arrived at after wide consultations had taken place among a large number of delegations and have gained their support. Operative paragraph 4 in draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add. 1 reflects the views expressed and the resolutions adopted in a number of international conferences and forums. I refer in particular to the tenth Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, held at Fez, the Assembly of Heads of State or Government of OAU, at Monrovia, the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana, and last, but not least, the tenth Arab Summit Conference, held recently at Tunis.

120. My delegation has already pointed to the fact that the Camp David agreements are null and void, in view of the provisions contained in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties,¹⁰ and particularly according to articles 34, 43, 49, 52 and 53 of that Convention. Furthermore, the deletion of operative paragraph 4 under discussion would be in contradiction to paragraph 4 (a) of resolution 33/28 A, as it is referred to in the first preambular paragraph of the present draft resolution, and which reads as follows:

“Recalling and reaffirming the declaration, contained in paragraph 4 of its resolution 33/28 A of 7 December 1978, that the validity of agreements purporting to solve the problem of Palestine requires that they be within the framework of the United Nations and its Charter and its resolutions on the basis of the full attainment and exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right of return and the right to national independence and sovereignty in Palestine, and with the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization”.

121. Furthermore, the deletion of operative paragraph 4 would mean a denial of the rights to self-determination of the Palestinian people. Finally, the deletion would encourage third parties to take it upon themselves to determine the future of the Palestinian people. The operative paragraphs show exactly what it is that the Camp David agreements are aiming at. Therefore, we request the retention of operative paragraph 4 in draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1.

122. Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): We stated our position on this problem quite clearly when we spoke in the general debate [19th meeting], and I shall not repeat it here. Furthermore, we have already expressed Zaire's support for the cause of the Arabs, our Arab brothers, and for the cause of the people of Palestine, and I shall not go into that either.

123. We shall accordingly vote in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1. However, I have asked to speak in order to support the proposal for the deletion of operative paragraph 4 from draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1, in accordance with rule 90 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Indeed, it seems to us that the reference to rejecting or condemning the Camp David agreements is not absolutely indispensable in this context. Moreover, it does not seem to us to be a good idea to make of the rejection or condemnation of those agreements another basic or main element in the search for a solution to the Middle East problem. We do not think that deleting that paragraph could constitute a denial of the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people, a right which we reaffirm and which all delegations have already reaffirmed here. We should rather individually and collectively direct our efforts at persuasion towards those that are still reluctant and encourage them to agree that the PLO must be involved and play a full part, on a basis of equality with others, in the process leading to the return of peace in that region, for the question of Palestine is at the core of the crisis. That is the main thing and that is what we must do; everything else is a side issue.

124. We do not believe that condemnation or rejection of the agreements could become a basic element in the settlement of the Middle East crisis. It is not through excesses that we shall achieve the necessary convergence of opinions and approaches with regard to this extremely complex, delicate and serious problem, which requires the goodwill of all of us.

125. For those reasons, I repeat, we firmly support the Egyptian proposal to delete operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1.

126. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1, I should like to express our opposition to the proposal of Egypt to delete operative paragraph 4. That operative paragraph is the logical conclusion of the preamble and the first three operative paragraphs.

127. In the first preambular paragraph, what is referred to is in fact the Camp David agreements, which must not be allowed to infringe the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. That paragraph was approved last year.

¹⁰ See *Official Records of the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties, First and Second Sessions, Vienna, 26 March-24 May 1968 and 9 April-22 May 1969* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.70.V.5), p. 287.

128. Operative paragraph 4 of this draft resolution was the subject of very difficult consultations within a working group of the non-aligned countries made up of 17 members, including—and I wish to stress this—Egypt, which attended our discussions and was kept fully informed of the text of this paragraph. Some changes were made, but the sense of the final text is quite clear. I should like to read it out again so that its true wording may be fully appreciated. It declares

“that the Camp David accords and other agreements have no validity in so far as they purport to determine the future of the Palestinian people and of the Palestinian territories occupied by Israel since 1967”.

129. Despite the denials of the representative of Egypt, the Camp David agreements are prejudicial to the interests of the Palestinian people in a most terrible way. They maintain the Palestinian people as a wandering people; they maintain the Palestinian people in their present humiliating situation. Consequently, on behalf of the sponsors, I call upon the General Assembly to vote in favour of retaining operative paragraph 4 in order to preserve the unity of draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1. I request a recorded vote.

Mr. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania) resumed the Chair.

130. Mr. TLOU (Botswana): Botswana attributes great importance to the question of the Palestinian people, which we regard as the core of the Middle East question. We are convinced that, ultimately, only a comprehensive solution can bring peace to that troubled region of the world.

131. To that end, Botswana will support any initiative aimed at a durable solution to the problem. It is for these reasons that we have so far consistently voted for all the resolutions on the Palestinian questions. Botswana this time again will vote for draft resolutions A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1 and A/34/L.44 and Add.1, but we shall reserve our position on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1, the wording of which raises certain problems.

132. Mr. ALLAGANY (Saudi Arabia) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1 and A/34/L.44 and Add.1.

133. Our vote for draft resolution A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1 requires no explanation. We endorse all the decisions and action taken by the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. This morning my delegation made a statement on behalf of the Crown Prince of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia on the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People.¹¹

134. However, with regard to draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1, I should like to say that we support in particular condemnations of all partial agreements which ignore the rights of the Palestinian people and especially the Camp David agreements, which we consider to have no validity at the international level, particularly in the light of the fact that they ignore General Assembly resolution 33/28 A and because the

Camp David agreements were concluded outside the framework of the United Nations.

135. Accordingly, my delegation will vote in favour of the two draft resolutions and will vote against the proposal to delete operative paragraph 4 from draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1 if put to the vote.

136. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will vote first on draft resolution A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Fiji, Finland, France, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Malawi, Mexico,¹² Paraguay, Portugal, Samoa, Sweden, United Republic of Cameroon.

The draft resolution was adopted by 117 votes to 14, with 16 abstentions (resolution 34/65 A).¹³

137. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the draft resolution contained in document A/34/L.44 and Add.1.

138. The representative of Egypt has proposed an amendment to delete operative paragraph 4. I shall first put that amendment to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

¹² The delegation of Mexico subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

¹³ The delegation of Nicaragua subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

¹¹ See A/AC.183/SR.35.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Zaire.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining: Angola, Argentina, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Central African Republic, Colombia, Comoros, El Salvador, France, Greece, Honduras, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Nigeria, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela.

The amendment to delete operative paragraph 4 was rejected by 56 votes to 51, with 30 abstentions.¹⁴

139. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

140. Mr. PETREE (United States of America): Mr. President, on a point of order I ask that you rule that the adoption of this draft resolution requires a two-thirds majority of delegations present and voting. Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter requires that recommendations concerning the maintenance of international peace and security must obtain a two-thirds majority for adoption. If a draft resolution which notes, rejects and condemns basic accords between two States relating to issues of war and peace does not concern the maintenance of peace and security, what does it concern? Clearly, peace and security are involved, and consequently the two-thirds requirement of Article 18, paragraph 2, applies.

141. The PRESIDENT: In view of the nature of the proposal made by the representative of the United States, I shall leave it to the General Assembly itself to take a decision. In order that the Assembly may take a decision on the question, I wish to explain that delegations which consider that adoption by the Assembly of draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1 requires a two-

¹⁴ The delegation of Nicaragua subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been against the amendment.

thirds majority should vote "yes". Delegations which consider that adoption of the draft resolution does not require a two-thirds majority should vote "no". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Samoa, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Zaire.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining: Brazil, Burma, Colombia, El Salvador, Fiji, France, Greece, Lesotho, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Singapore, Spain, Suriname, Venezuela.

The motion was rejected by 65 votes to 53, with 19 abstentions.¹⁵

142. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1 entitled "Question of Palestine" as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Oman,

¹⁵ The delegation of Nicaragua subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been against the motion.

Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Samoa, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Zaire.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, France, Greece, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Singapore, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Venezuela.

Draft resolution A/34/L.44 as a whole was adopted by 75 votes to 33, with 37 abstentions (resolution 34/65 B).¹⁶

143. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote.

144. Mr. KATAKA (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): There is no need for me to state again in detail the position of Togo on the question of Palestine, which is, as has long been evident, at the very heart of the conflict in the Middle East. We wish to reaffirm our unreserved support for the courageous Palestinian people in their struggle, under the aegis of the PLO, their sole and authentic representative, for the exercise of their inalienable and infeasible rights to self-determination, to the possession of a homeland and to national sovereignty.

145. We vigorously denounce the Zionist policy of establishing Israeli settlements on land that does not belong to Israel.

146. With regard to the condemnation of the Camp David agreements in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add. 1 which has just been put to the vote, the position of our delegation is clear and unambiguous. The first courageous step of Egypt is, in our opinion, an important effort towards the peaceful solution to this painful problem. On 24 September, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of Togo stated in the General Assembly:

“To say that settlement of the present problem of peace in the Middle East must take account of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people is

merely to acknowledge the simple truth. It is a matter of justice, of justice for the Palestinian people.

“The Government and the people of Togo cannot bring themselves to concede that these essential elements—the right to self-determination and a homeland for one group and the right to existence and tranquillity for the other—should be sacrificed on the altar of arrangements which are liable to complicate the situation even further.

“The fact is that the Togolese Government is firmly devoted to the settlement of conflicts by peaceful means and is moved by any initiative leading to that end. That is why Togo has stated its position by expressing satisfaction at the peaceful orientation of the approach to the Middle East problem, while indicating that these agreements would be a good thing if considered as only a beginning: a point of departure for a solution to the fundamental problem” [6th meeting, paras. 192-199.]

For, as the Chinese proverb says, “Even the longest journey has to begin with a first step”.

147. For all these reasons, my delegation voted against the aforementioned draft resolution.

148. Mr. TRAORE (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): At this juncture in our discussions, and in the light of the statement I made yesterday [81st meeting], I will confine myself to a few brief remarks on the position my delegation has taken in the votes on draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add. 1.

149. My delegation was unable to support the proposal of the representative of Egypt with regard to the deletion of operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution because we feel, if only on purely procedural and textual grounds, that should such a proposal have been adopted, it would have resulted in an imbalance that would have left the draft resolution void of any meaning.

150. Similarly, my delegation was unable to vote in favour of the proposal that the draft resolution should be considered as an important question, not because it is not, but because we are astonished to see that it is felt that one draft resolution alone should be considered as dealing with an important question when we are dealing with the Middle East problem. Indeed, we do not feel that the various components of the Middle East question, and, *a fortiori*, the question of Palestine, can be dissociated, for I believe I said yesterday that the national rights of the Palestinian people are not divisible and I called the Assembly's attention to a number of recommendations that would have of necessity to be implemented before those rights could be respected.

151. A number of delegations, including my own, found it regrettable that the Security Council, for reasons which are familiar to all of us, was unable to adopt, in keeping with the Charter and its mandate, the expected measures, based on the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

152. These recommendations are a vitally important issue, and we would have been glad if, when they were

¹⁶ The delegation of Nicaragua subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

considered in the Security Council, it had been recognized that the whole question of the Middle East is important and that the proposals of the Committee formed part of its recommendations.

Mr. Naik (Pakistan), Vice-President, took the Chair.

153. Although my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1, it has some difficulties with operative paragraph 4. As the Foreign Minister of my country has already pointed out, the Government of Mali recognizes that each State has a right to negotiate and conclude agreements within the framework of its sovereignty. The Camp David agreements, even though that was their objective, fell far short of solving the problem of the tragedy from which the Middle East has suffered for more than 30 years.

154. It will be recalled, however, that the international community as a whole rejected the "no war, no peace" situation which the Israeli Government would have liked to preserve. Mali hopes there will be no more war in the Middle East; we hope there will not be a fifth war in that area. We must therefore inject a new dynamism for peace into that area. These efforts would be fruitless and peace precarious without the support, solidarity, friendship and fraternity of the Arab peoples. In other words, we believe that international efforts to restore peace to the Middle East will have no future without the support of all Arabs.

155. The people and Government of Mali are anxious to see all the Arab parties unified, not divided, as their history and their political and diplomatic options dictate. For, as the representative of Jordan rightly observed a moment ago, the Arab people, the Arab people of Palestine and all the other Arab peoples form a single nation [see above, para. 59].

156. Mr. BUENO (Brazil): The vote that the delegation of Brazil has cast in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1, which has just been adopted, does not necessarily imply an endorsement of all the provisions included therein.

157. Mr. OBIANG NGOMO (Equatorial Guinea) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote following the vote on draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1, on the question of Palestine just debated in the General Assembly.

158. We appreciate the efforts made by the sponsors in drafting this text, but we wish to express our reservations with regard to operative paragraph 4.

159. My country is committed to the language of peace, and we have always advocated the peaceful settlement of international disputes, in conformity with the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter, the charter of OAU and the principles of the non-aligned movement.

160. My delegation had serious doubts about accepting a condemnation of the Camp David agreements, as expressed in document A/34/L.44 and Add.1.

161. The Middle East crisis is of grave concern to my Government, and the question of Palestine has always elicited the unswerving support of my country.

Nevertheless, a dialogue which began a little more than a year ago, despite the fact that it has not yet yielded any concrete results, has opened the door to negotiations on a lasting peace in the Middle East. The categorical condemnation contained in this draft resolution is not at all conducive to the kind of atmosphere of peace desired by the international community. To condemn such an attempt to secure peace is in contradiction to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

162. Although we supported draft resolution A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1, my delegation voted against draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1, for the reasons we have just stated. None the less, my delegation agrees that any solution to the Middle East problem must involve the full and effective participation of the PLO.

163. Mr. PALMA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Peruvian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1, in keeping with the support that we have always given to the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which have been recognized by the General Assembly.

164. Our delegation would like to reiterate its conviction that the question of Palestine is fundamentally linked to the over-all Middle East problem and should be resolved in such a way as to treat both questions within the same context, in accordance with the guidelines in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). Of course, this would include respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all the States in the region and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

165. My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1 because we felt it challenged the fundamental sovereign rights and prerogatives of States and might impose limitations on the actions of this world Organization.

166. We feel that the exercise of the rights of the Palestinian people and a solution to the problem of the Middle East can and must be achieved through peaceful negotiations.

167. We are of the opinion that the long period of inactivity that has characterized and aggravated the problems of the region is now being compounded by the special difficulties involved in bringing together two communities whose relationship has involved and continues to involve confrontation. We therefore believe that we must support constructive steps towards a comprehensive global settlement in order to ensure peaceful coexistence and co-operation between these age-old civilizations which have given a culture, tolerance and a love for justice to the world.

168. Mr. DAGO TSHERING (Bhutan): The situation in the Middle East and developments in that area continue to pose a serious threat to international peace and security.

169. Even as we gather here once again to adopt a series of resolutions, many resolutions of this Assem-

bly and of the Security Council have yet to be implemented.

170. There is no doubt that the problem of Palestine is at the heart of the situation in the Middle East. We believe that a just and lasting peace can be achieved only on the basis of the total and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all occupied territories and the restoration to the Palestinian people of their inalienable national rights, including their right to return to their homeland and to self-determination.

171. At the same time, we are also convinced that there is a need to recognize the reality in the area so that all countries can live within recognized and secure boundaries.

172. In this regard, His Majesty the King of Bhutan, when addressing the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, at Havana, stated:

“There have been some efforts to improve the situation through peaceful negotiations. We support any move which seeks to bring about the comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem through peaceful means rather than resort to arms. We recognize the legitimate rights of every State to enter into agreements in the exercise of its inalienable sovereign rights. In that process, however, the rights and aspirations of other peoples and States must not be jeopardized.”

173. In view of the foregoing statement, we voted in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1 despite our reservation on operative paragraph 4.

174. Our affirmative position on draft resolution A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1 should also be seen in the light of this statement.

175. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): It is the well-known and unchanged position of the Finnish Government that a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict must be based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). That solution further requires a recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians, including their right to national self-determination. The Palestinians must be fully involved in any settlement and be able to participate in its negotiation. Israel has to withdraw from Arab territories occupied in 1967. Likewise, it is imperative that the right of Israel and its neighbours to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries be guaranteed.

176. On the Peace Treaty concluded between Israel and Egypt, with which draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1 deals, the Finnish Government has expressed the hope that it will promote the achievement of a comprehensive settlement. Progress in this direction is indeed urgent because a comprehensive settlement alone can bring a just and lasting peace in the region.

177. Given this position of the Finnish Government, my delegation voted against draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1.

178. Mr. ESQUEA GUERRERO (Dominican Republic) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation con-

siders that it is only by taking into account the legitimate inalienable rights of the Palestinian people that it will prove possible to attain a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. For that reason, my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1.

179. None the less, our delegation also feels that any measure designed to bring about such peace is desirable. We therefore recognize the validity of the Camp David agreements, and we voted against draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1.

180. Mr. DÍEZ (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted against draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1 because we consider that the General Assembly is not in any circumstances empowered to pronounce on the validity of an agreement between two or more States concluded in the exercise of their sovereignty and independence.

181. My Government on numerous occasions has declared its desire for early peace in the Middle East, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), and we have also supported the legitimate right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and independence.

182. None the less, it is the duty of my delegation to draw the attention of the Assembly to the harmful precedent which the adoption of this resolution constitutes. This resolution, while claiming to defend the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, which are recognized by the international community, has only weakened the exercise of the will of this Assembly in that respect.

183. In our view, the text adopted by the Assembly runs counter to the standards and principles of international law. The introduction of political considerations in this manner is harmful. The legal norms are the sole guarantee of peaceful coexistence among States and they must be protected from the deleterious effects of such decisions.

184. Mr. MATANE (Papua New Guinea): I have asked to speak on this occasion to explain my delegation's voting position in regard to draft resolutions A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1 and A/34/L.44 and Add.1.

185. The Government of Papua New Guinea believes that the Palestinian people are entitled—and I repeat, entitled—to a homeland, to national independence and sovereignty. Likewise, the State of Israel should continue to have the right to exist.

186. It is my Government's belief, further, that the just cause of the Palestinians should be peacefully pursued with all vigour. Their plight should be given maximum publicity. We reiterate our full support for any reasonable moves designed to achieve a just and lasting solution to the problems which at present exist in the Middle East. For this reason we voted in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1.

187. My Government holds the view that the Camp David agreements represent a positive step, even if beset by problems, in the quest for peace in the Middle East. We note with disappointment and regret that the PLO did not participate in the negotiations leading up to those agreements. Furthermore, it is disappointing and

unfortunate that other countries in the Middle East most intimately concerned with the current crisis were not participants.

188. But this had to be. Someone had to take the initiative and we congratulate those who did. While we believe there are many obstacles to overcome, we regard the Camp David agreements as being a step in the right direction. We could not, therefore, vote in favour of operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1 which declares those agreements to be null and void. That is why instead of voting in favour of the draft resolution we abstained.

189. Mr. THAMAE (Lesotho): My Government's position on the Palestinian question is well known. We have often stated that there can be no peace in the Middle East until full recognition is given to the rights of the Palestinian people. We have therefore voted in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1, because we sincerely believe that no State or group of States should take upon itself the responsibility for negotiating on behalf of the Palestinian people without their consent, let alone their participation. It was on the basis of that principle alone that we voted in favour of the draft resolution.

190. Had a separate vote been requested on operative paragraph 3, my delegation would have abstained, because we recognize the right of Egypt and Israel to enter into any arrangements to resolve whatever disputes might exist between them.

191. My country cannot be party to a condemnation of bilateral treaties or agreements entered into by two sovereign States, as that would constitute undue interference in the internal affairs of those States.

192. Similarly, since a separate vote was taken on operative paragraph 4, my delegation abstained, because my Government does not wish to make any determination as regards the legal validity of the Camp David agreements in relation to any of the aspects covered therein, as we consider this to be a matter that concerns the Governments of Egypt and Israel.

Mr. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania) resumed the Chair.

193. Mr. CAMPS (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1, just adopted. As the Foreign Minister of my country stated in the general debate at this session of the General Assembly [8th meeting], Uruguay believes that there should be no obstacles on the path of any attempt to make positive progress in regard to the Middle East problem. We feel that the peace treaties between Egypt and Israel are a step in that direction.

194. Just as Israel is entitled to live within secure and recognized boundaries, so the Palestinian people has the right to self-determination, to its national territory and to the establishment of a State. We feel that in order to achieve these aims and to ensure a just and lasting peace in the region, a clear and comprehensive agreement must be reached, with the participation of all the parties to the conflict, on a footing of equality and mutual respect and recognition.

195. For those reasons, and because the resolution just adopted does not contribute to the solution of the problem or to the strengthening of peace in the region, my delegation was compelled to vote against it. On the other hand, my country has traditionally been a defender of the rules of international law. In the present case in particular, we have serious doubt about the competence of the General Assembly to make the kind of statement that is made in paragraph 4 of the resolution.

196. Mr. PIZA ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In view of the implications of draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1, I consider it indispensable to explain my delegation's views, as well as the reasons why we voted against that draft resolution, after having supported the amendment proposed by the delegation of Egypt to delete operative paragraph 4 and after having voted in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.43 and Add.1/Rev.1.

197. First, as we said yesterday during our statement in the general debate on the question of Palestine [80th meeting], we wholeheartedly support the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, independence and sovereignty. Hence, we support the right of the Palestinian people to establish a sovereign State of its own in the territory reserved for it by the General Assembly in its resolution 181 (II) of 1947.

198. We support also the right of the Palestinian people to participate in the actions and negotiations relating to its future, and we support the legitimacy of the representation of that people by the PLO. On that basis, we feel that the so-called Camp David agreements and any other agreements reached without the participation of the Palestinian people that have as their purpose the determination of that people's future cannot be effective because they impose on the Palestinian people obligations, limitations or conditions against its will and without its participation.

199. Hence, we must interpret the inclusion of such provisions in the Camp David agreements as having the sole object of placing in the hands of the Palestinian people and its representatives certain possibilities that the parties appear to regard as favouring the solution of some of the problems faced by that people; but only the Palestinian people and its legitimate representatives can accept or reject those possibilities. If, as is obvious, the Palestinian people and its legitimate representatives have absolutely rejected these provisions, it follows that they lack any legal or moral effectiveness. That does not mean that in our opinion the Camp David agreements have no value or should be condemned by the international community. On the contrary, we believe that anything that contributes to peace and understanding among peoples should be encouraged and, in that context, the Camp David agreements are a positive step towards the solution of the serious problems of the Middle East, in so far as their aim is to strengthen and guarantee peace and harmony between two of the States involved in this conflict—Egypt and Israel.

200. My delegation regrets that it was not able to vote in favour of draft resolution A/34/L.44 and Add.1, because that text condemns the Camp David agreements in general, without making any mention of the positive aspect of their contribution to peace through the reaching of an understanding between two States that only a short time ago were engaged in bloody wars. Nor could

we agree with the statement in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, which amounts to having the General Assembly say that certain international agreements are invalid—a statement that the Assembly has no competence to make. We wish, however, to make it clear that our vote against the draft resolution, for the reasons we have just set forth, in no way means that we agree that such agreements can in any way manipulate the human rights of the Palestinian people, their territorial rights or their right to sovereignty, against their will and without their participation through their legitimate representatives.

AGENDA ITEM 15

Elections to fill vacancies in principal organs (*continued*)*

(a) Election of five non-permanent members of the Security Council

201. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now resume the election of one non-permanent member of the Security Council from the group of Latin American States for a two-year term beginning on 1 January 1980.

202. Following the inconclusive ballots held at its 47th, 48th, 50th and 53rd meetings, on 26 and 30 October and 2 November, the Assembly will now proceed to the next ballot, which is the twenty-ninth ballot.

203. In accordance with rule 94 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, this ballot will be the first of a series of three unrestricted ballots. In this unrestricted ballot, any Member State from the group of Latin American States may be a candidate for election except, of course, Bolivia, which is about to vacate its seat, and Jamaica, which is already a member of the Council. The ballot papers are now being distributed.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mardovich (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. Çelikol (Turkey) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

204. The PRESIDENT: I propose now to suspend the meeting while the ballots are being counted.

The meeting was suspended at 5.50 p.m. and resumed at 5.55 p.m.

205. The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows:

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	147
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	147
<i>Abstentions:</i>	1
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	146
<i>Required majority:</i>	98

<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Cuba	82
Colombia	63
Saint Lucia	1

206. The PRESIDENT: Since no country has obtained the required majority in the first in this series of unrestricted ballots, we shall proceed to the second unrestricted ballot. As in the first unrestricted ballot, any member State from the group of Latin American States may be a candidate for election except, of course, Bolivia and Jamaica. The ballot papers will now be distributed.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mardovich (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. Çelikol (Turkey) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

207. The PRESIDENT: I propose now to suspend the meeting while the ballots are being counted.

The meeting was suspended at 6.05 p.m. and resumed at 6.15 p.m.

208. The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows:

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	146
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	146
<i>Abstentions:</i>	1
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	145
<i>Required majority:</i>	97

<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Cuba	83
Colombia	60
Peru	1
Saint Lucia	1

209. The PRESIDENT: Since the second in this series of unrestricted ballots has proved inconclusive, we shall now proceed to the third unrestricted ballot. As before, in this unrestricted ballot any Member State from the group of Latin American States may be a candidate for election except, of course, Bolivia and Jamaica. The ballot papers will now be distributed.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mardovich (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. Çelikol (Turkey) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

210. The PRESIDENT: I propose now to suspend the meeting while the ballots are being counted.

The meeting was suspended at 6.20 p.m. and resumed at 6.30 p.m.

211. The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows:

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	148
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	148
<i>Abstentions:</i>	1
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	147
<i>Required majority:</i>	98

* Resumed from the 53rd meeting.

Number of votes obtained:

Cuba	88
Colombia	57
Mexico	1
Saint Lucia	1

212. The PRESIDENT: Since the third unrestricted ballot has proved inconclusive, the Assembly will now proceed to the first of a series of three restricted ballots in accordance with rule 94 of the rules of procedure. This balloting is restricted to the two candidates which have obtained the largest number of votes, namely Cuba and Colombia. The ballot papers will now be distributed.

213. May I remind representatives that any ballot paper containing any name other than that of Cuba or Colombia will be declared invalid, since the balloting is restricted to those two States.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mardovich (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. Çelik-kol (Turkey) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

214. The PRESIDENT: I propose now to suspend the meeting while the ballots are being counted.

The meeting was suspended at 6.40 p.m. and resumed at 6.45 p.m.

215. The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows:

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	148
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	148
<i>Abstentions:</i>	3
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	145
<i>Required majority:</i>	97

Number of votes obtained:

Cuba	87
Colombia	58

216. The PRESIDENT: As neither of the two countries obtained the required two-thirds majority, the General Assembly will continue the voting and will hold a second restricted ballot. As in the last ballot, the only countries whose names may be included in the ballot papers are Cuba and Colombia. Any papers containing the names of other countries will be declared invalid. The ballot papers will now be distributed.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mardovich (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. Çelik-kol (Turkey) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

217. The PRESIDENT: I propose now to suspend the meeting while the ballots are being counted.

The meeting was suspended at 6.55 p.m. and resumed at 7.00 p.m.

218. The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows:

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	148
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	148
<i>Abstentions:</i>	1
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	147
<i>Required majority:</i>	98

Number of votes obtained:

Cuba	84
Colombia	63

219. The PRESIDENT: As neither of the two countries obtained the required two-thirds majority, the General Assembly will continue the voting and will hold a third restricted ballot. As in the last ballot, the only countries whose names may be included in the ballot papers are Cuba and Colombia. Any papers containing the names of other countries will be declared invalid. The ballot papers will now be distributed.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mardovich (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. Çelik-kol (Turkey) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

220. The PRESIDENT: I propose now to suspend the meeting while the ballots are being counted.

The meeting was suspended at 7.10 p.m. and resumed at 7.20 p.m.

221. The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows:

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	147
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	147
<i>Abstentions:</i>	2
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	145
<i>Required majority:</i>	97

Number of votes obtained:

Cuba	86
Colombia	59

222. The PRESIDENT: Since the third restricted ballot did not produce a candidate with the required two-thirds majority, the General Assembly will proceed to an unrestricted ballot in accordance with rule 94 of the rules of procedure.

223. In this unrestricted ballot, any Member State from the Latin American group may be a candidate for election except, of course, Bolivia, which is about to vacate its seat, and Jamaica, which is already a member of the Security Council. The ballot papers will now be distributed.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mardovich (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. Çelik-kol (Turkey) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

224. The PRESIDENT: I propose now to suspend the meeting while the ballots are being counted.

The meeting was suspended at 7.25 p.m. and resumed at 7.35 p.m.

225. The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows:

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	146
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	146
<i>Abstentions:</i>	2
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	144
<i>Required majority:</i>	96

<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Cuba	83
Colombia	56
Brazil	2
Chile	1
Mexico	1
Venezuela	1

226. The PRESIDENT: Since the first unrestricted ballot did not produce a candidate with the required two-thirds majority, we shall proceed to a second unrestricted ballot. As before, in this unrestricted ballot any member State from the group of Latin American States may be a candidate for election except, of course, Bolivia and Jamaica. The ballot papers will now be distributed.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mardovich (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. Çelikol (Turkey) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

227. The PRESIDENT: I propose now to suspend the meeting while the ballot papers are being counted.

The meeting was suspended at 7.40 p.m. and resumed at 7.50 p.m.

228. The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows:

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	144
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	144
<i>Abstentions:</i>	1
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	143
<i>Required majority:</i>	96

<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Cuba	83
Colombia	57
Brazil	1
Mexico	1
Uruguay	1

229. The PRESIDENT: As the second unrestricted ballot has proved inconclusive, we shall now proceed to the third unrestricted ballot and, as before, in this unrestricted ballot any Member State from the Latin American group may be a candidate for election except, of course, Bolivia and Jamaica. The ballot papers will now be distributed.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mardovich (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. Çelikol (Turkey) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

230. The PRESIDENT: I propose now to suspend the meeting while the ballots are being counted.

The meeting was suspended at 8 p.m. and resumed at 8.10 p.m.

231. The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows:

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	145
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	145
<i>Abstentions:</i>	2
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	143
<i>Required majority:</i>	96

<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Cuba	82
Colombia	57
Chile	1
Mexico	1
Paraguay	1
Uruguay	1

232. The PRESIDENT: I have had inquiries as to how long I intend to continue with this exercise. I wish to draw the attention of the Assembly to the fact that we are dealing with a serious matter and that a serious responsibility has been entrusted to us by the Charter and by the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

233. The hour is late and it will not, of course, be possible to continue this exercise indefinitely. Therefore it is my intention to proceed to the maximum of three restricted ballots, should they prove necessary. Thereafter I shall inform the Assembly as to how I intend to proceed.

234. Since the third unrestricted ballot did not produce a candidate with the required two-thirds majority, the General Assembly will proceed to the first of three restricted ballots in accordance with rule 94 of the rules of procedure. This ballot is restricted to the two candidates which have obtained the largest number of votes, namely Cuba and Colombia. Any ballot papers containing the name of any other country will be declared invalid. The ballot papers will now be distributed.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mardovich (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. Çelikol (Turkey) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

235. The PRESIDENT: I propose now to suspend the meeting while the ballot papers are being counted.

The meeting was suspended at 8.15 p.m. and resumed at 8.25 p.m.

236. The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows:

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	146
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	146
<i>Abstentions:</i>	2
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	144
<i>Required majority:</i>	96

<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Cuba	87
Colombia	57

237. The PRESIDENT: As the first restricted ballot has proved inconclusive, we shall now continue the voting and proceed to a second restricted ballot. As in the last ballot, the only countries whose names may be included in the ballot papers are Cuba and Colombia. Any papers containing the names of other countries will be declared invalid. The ballot papers will now be distributed.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mardovich (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. Çelikol (Turkey) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

238. The PRESIDENT: I propose now to suspend the meeting while the ballots are being counted.

The meeting was suspended at 8.30 p.m. and resumed 8.40 p.m.

239. The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows:

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	148
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	148
<i>Abstentions:</i>	1
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	147
<i>Required majority:</i>	98

<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Cuba	85
Colombia	62

240. The PRESIDENT: As the second restricted ballot has proved inconclusive, we shall now proceed to hold a third restricted ballot under the same terms and conditions. As in the last ballot, the only countries whose names may be included in the ballot papers are Cuba and Colombia. Any papers containing the names of other countries will be declared invalid. The ballot papers will now be distributed.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mardovich (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. Çelikol (Turkey) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

241. The PRESIDENT: I propose now to suspend the meeting while the ballots are being counted.

The meeting was suspended at 8.45 p.m. and resumed at 8.55 p.m.

242. The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows:

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	148
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	148
<i>Abstentions:</i>	1
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	147
<i>Required majority:</i>	98

<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Cuba	87
Colombia	60

243. The PRESIDENT: The third restricted ballot has proved inconclusive and I therefore feel compelled to bring the following important points to the attention of the Assembly. This evening we have held a total of 12 ballots. This makes a total of 40 which we have held during this session on this question. Despite these efforts and the lateness of the hour, it is obvious that we have not yet been able to arrive at a decision.

244. I feel obliged to remind members that one of the important obligations of the General Assembly under Article 23 of the Charter is to elect the non-permanent members of the Security Council. Rule 142 of our rules of procedure specifies:

“The General Assembly shall each year, in the course of its regular session, elect five non-permanent members of the Security Council for a term of two years.”

Furthermore, in implementation of this provision, rule 94 of the rules of procedure specifies that when the balloting is inconclusive after a series of unrestricted and restricted ballots, the procedure shall be repeated “until all the places have been filled”. It is my intention to do everything that I can to ensure that the Assembly discharges this responsibility.

245. Our ability to perform this function in the brief time remaining to us in this session, which is now only two and a half weeks from its conclusion, becomes increasingly limited in view of the very heavy work programme, with which you are all familiar. Accordingly, it is my intention to schedule the next round of voting for next Wednesday, 5 December, at 10.30 a.m. I am confident that during this interval Members will give their most careful consideration to the need to bring our efforts to a successful conclusion.

The meeting rose at 9 p.m.