

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

UN LIBRARY

2206th MEETING: 3 APRIL 1980

OCT 25 1980

UN/SA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2206)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights:	
Letter dated 6 March 1980 from the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13832);	
Letter dated 24 March 1980 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13855)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2206th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 3 April 1980, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. Porfirio MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Bangladesh, China, France, German Democratic Republic, Jamaica, Mexico, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2206)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights:
Letter dated 6 March 1980 from the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13832);
Letter dated 24 March 1980 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13855)

The meeting was called to order at 4.40 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights:

Letter dated 6 March 1980 from the Acting Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13832);

Letter dated 24 March 1980 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13855)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings [2204th and 2205th meetings], I invite the representatives of Algeria, Egypt, India, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yugoslavia to participate in the discussion without the right to vote and I invite the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the representative of the Pal-

estine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take places at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bedjaoui (Algeria), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. B. C. Mishra (India), Mr. Bafi (Iraq), Mr. Blum (Israel), Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan), Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon), Mr. Mansouri (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber and Mr. Kane (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People) and Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took places at the Council table.

2. Mr. ESSAAFI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, it gives us great pleasure to see you presiding over such an important debate of the Council and we are convinced that your wisdom and diligence, as well as your statesmanlike and diplomatic skills, will assist us in making progress on the crucial question of the rights of the Palestinian people, a question which has once again been brought to the attention of the Council.

3. I should also like to pay a fraternal tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Mills of Jamaica, and express to him our esteem for his devotion and his tireless efforts in the fulfilment of his responsibilities, and for his diplomatic qualities, which he demonstrated in March in presiding over a debate where the logic of events led him to bring to the attention of the Council two questions which are politically and organically linked: the situation in the occupied Arab territories and the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

4. I should like right away to express our profound concern at the situation currently prevailing in the occupied Palestinian territory. On the one hand we see the Council apparently confining itself to a wait-and-see approach, and on the other hand we have a military occupation that is speedily and before our very eyes laying the foundations of annexation. Therefore the decisive importance of the time element can be seen, and why not only the neighbouring States but also the non-aligned countries as a whole are anxious to resist the speedy evolution of such a situation and to replace it by broadly based and effective international action.

5. Rarely has such a crucial question, affecting the fate of a whole people and region the strategic im-

portance of which is decisive for international peace and security, come up against so much inaction, so much impotence and so many false starts, at the very time that it has actually been the subject of numerous debates in the Council.

6. The recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people should not be allowed to fall prey to the calculations or compromises involved in any kind of indirect strategy. The absoluteness of this need is dictated both by our conscience and by our sense of responsibility. Anyone who would endeavour to subordinate it to external considerations is certainly thinking of using it for his own ends. Tunisia will never lend itself to such an exercise. In our view this debate is necessary for more than one reason.

7. Do we really need to have a war before the Council can measure up to its responsibilities and raise its thinking to the level and scope of the tragedy which is constantly sowing death and terror throughout the region? As long ago as June 1976 the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People were transmitted to the Council for it to approve them and to use them as a basis for the solution of the Palestinian question. In spite of the appeals of the Committee and the various resolutions of the General Assembly, including the very latest, resolution 34/65 A, which was adopted on 29 November 1979, the Council has done nothing. The hesitation of certain of its members is all the more unjustified as these recommendations are all based on resolutions adopted both by the General Assembly and by the Council itself.

8. With regard to the substance of the problem—that is, a comprehensive and definitive settlement of the Palestinian question—we subscribe to the recommendations of the Committee, which contain four fundamental principles, recalled by the Chairman of the Committee, Ambassador Kane, as follows: first, the question of Palestine is at the very heart of the Middle East problem; hence no just and lasting solution is possible without taking fully into account the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people; secondly, the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people must be fully exercised; thirdly, the Palestine Liberation Organization must participate on an equal footing with the other parties in all conferences and negotiations on the Middle East; fourthly, the acquisition of territory by force is inadmissible, and there is an obligation flowing therefrom for Israel to withdraw totally and rapidly from all territory occupied in that way, including Jerusalem.

9. However, as we can see, nothing tangible has been done so far to render justice to the Palestinian people, that is to say to recognize their legitimate rights and to put them in a position where they can exercise them peacefully. It would be tragic to allow resentment to break out, knowing that the consequences would have an impact on the whole international community.

10. Indeed we cannot recognize the existence of the Palestinian people and at the same time deny it the rights enjoyed by all other peoples or simply agree that it has interests only when, as is said, "they are legitimate". The existence of a people is linked to the existence of natural fundamental rights; those are the rights that the Palestinian people is determined to acquire. That is the very essence of the statement made in the Council by the representative of the PLO on 31 March [2204th meeting].

11. In fact, two arguments or rather two speeches on peace were presented to the Council on that day. The Council is capable of discerning in those speeches which elements are in keeping with law, with the principles of the Charter and with the will of the United Nations. We should like to highlight three particular points.

12. First, can one possibly claim today to be striving to resolve the Middle East problem, while at the same time one denies the existence of the Palestinians as a people and as an indispensable partner in the negotiations? Should this elementary fact, which is conceded by everyone, really constitute a problem? Denial of it or the attempt to identify the Palestinian problem solely and exclusively with its refugee aspect stems from confusion, if not actual blindness, which the Council is in duty bound to dispel. For our part, we believe that such an attitude constitutes the essential obstacle to conceiving peace.

13. Secondly, it is certainly admissible in all negotiations to challenge any part or the whole of one's adversary's argument, provided that one's intention to negotiate is clear from the substance of one's challenge and from one's attitude. But surely it is not admissible simply to deny the adversary or to reduce him to the level of a terrorist in order to make it easier to avoid the necessity of negotiating. How otherwise can we interpret the diatribes that have as their target the representative of the Palestinian people, the PLO, when an elementary quest for peace would obviously involve bringing precisely that partner into the negotiations? Thus, the statement of the representative of Israel testifies not only to an inability to conceive of peace but also to the actual refusal even to speak the language of peace. We believe that that statement actually expresses more directly a refusal to countenance peace.

14. Thirdly, a preoccupation with security is certainly a fundamental element in an overall solution. We recognize the need for a comprehensive system of guarantees that should satisfy the need for stability, détente and trust throughout the region; but at the same time we must denounce this confusion whereby, on the principle of unilateral security, a militaristic doctrine is built up openly aimed at legitimizing permanent military supremacy of one State over all its neighbours, the final goal of which is nothing other than the denial of peace and the perpetuation of military

terror, which is bound to have reverberations at distances increasingly further from the Middle East itself. A system of guarantees that would be in keeping with the authentic principle of security must be based on the common claims of all States of the region, including the future State of Palestine. This element cannot be dissociated from the comprehensive solution and should be tackled with a proper sense of responsibility here in the Security Council.

15. It is high time for the Israeli authorities to understand that peace and security cannot be brought about at the expense of the rights of others to existence and to liberty or on any other basis than that of respect for the elementary principles of morality and international law. Force and oppression cannot lead anywhere; four wars have not reduced the people of Palestine to silence. Today, more than ever before, the Palestinian people is determined to recover its rights and its sovereignty, supported as it is by the vast majority of the peoples and nations of the world, which have expressed their profound conviction that there can be no peace in the Middle East without a just settlement of the Palestinian problem.

16. The Palestinian people cannot continue to be the victim of a situation that it did not create—indeed, of a situation for which our Organization must assume its share of responsibility. Should it be unable to solve the underlying problem that is linked to the recognition of those rights, no other peripheral measure, even the sending of emergency forces to the south or to the north, can spare it exile, persecution or uncertainty. This people has a right to peace too. The Council has the ability to define and to put into effect the terms of a peace based upon justice and law and to put an end to this uncertainty, which constitutes the plight of the Palestinian people and has become that of all the peoples of the region.

17. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, observer for the League of Arab States, to whom the Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure at its 2204th meeting. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

18. Mr. MAKSOUD: Mr. President, at the outset I wish to express my appreciation for the invitation to address the Council on an issue that is vital to the Arab nation and the Arab States and crucial to the future of peace and stability in the region. Needless to say, we, the League of Arab States, are deeply involved and very much interested in the outcome of the Council's deliberations.

19. I should like to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in the congratulations due to you personally on assuming the presidency of the Council. Your country, Mexico, has for a long time exhibited that degree of independent judgement that places it

among the catalysts when the world seems to be on the brink of strife and makes it a genuine contributor to the efforts at deepening the roots of justice amongst its people and among the peoples of the world. The States members of the Arab League appreciate the hospitality and equality enjoyed by thousands of our people who became ultimately citizens of your beautiful country and exponents of our humanist culture.

20. The Council is meeting at this time because it has become clear that the prospects of peace in the Middle East will diminish as long as the national rights of the Palestinian people are not satisfied. This is such an elementary and obvious reality that it seems redundant to underline it. However, because this fact is so obvious and self-evident there is a disposition—which is diminishing, it is true—to consider the crisis that stems from Israel's perpetual violation of these Palestinian rights as "manageable". The Council should not mistake the Palestinian and general Arab commitment to exhausting all the peaceful, diplomatic and persuasive channels and options as licence for the international community to keep on postponing the inevitable need—indeed this is an imperative requirement—to impose sanctions on Israel and clearly penalize it for its usurpation of territory, its violation of rights, its annexation of land, its planting of colonies, and its ongoing defiance of and contempt and utter disregard for the will of the international community, the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations. That Israel's record is replete with such contemptuous disregard should not be an excuse to thwart the deliberations and functions of the Council.

21. We are equally aware that there is a difference among the members of the Council about the timing of addressing this crucial issue. We in the League of Arab States and in many non-aligned countries believe that it is never too soon to spell out unequivocally the modalities by which the Palestinian people can exercise their inalienable rights inasmuch as the Palestinian people are perhaps the only people now deprived of their right to self-determination and to build their independent State in their homeland. This continued flagrant violation by Israel of the elementary, normal, natural and national rights of the Palestinian people constitutes not only a destabilizing factor in the region but also a clear threat to the chances of total peace.

22. We also know that those of our friends in Western European countries that agree with our overall assessment, and have taken positive and constructive steps in committing their countries to the achievement of the rights of the Palestinian people and of the right of self-determination, at times consider that, in deference to the sensitivity of their strategic intimacy with the global position of the United States, they would like to enable the United States to discover on its own the futility of the Camp David framework and then bring about a resolution of the Council that would in substance reiterate the draft resolution before this body

today, submitted by the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, and elicit from the United States perhaps a positive vote or at least an abstention.

23. We do not at all question the motives of our European friends. As a matter of fact we are deeply appreciative of the degree of collective statesmanship that has been demonstrated in dealing with the question of Palestine and by their recognizing the Palestine Liberation Organization as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. We are equally not oblivious to the measure of difference in our respective priorities and way of seeing things, but in the light of the very nature of Israel's addiction to intransigence we have our doubts as to the wisdom of enabling this intransigence to obtain a new lease on life.

24. As far as the United States is concerned, it probably wished this debate not even to take place. Although the United States has frequently and very recently experienced the muscle of Zionist pressure and the intellectual and diplomatic terror techniques of Israel, it seeks to keep the Camp David agreements floating, although there is a growing erosion of the credibility of these agreements among American decision-makers and opinion-makers. The eagerness of the United States to give the Camp David agreements another chance is extraneous to the issues before us. This is linked more to the requirements of electioneering politics than to the imperatives of consistent and coherent policies.

25. So we are confronted with a dilemma in the search for what is feasible and credible at the same time. The dilemma is that the Council's convictions are thwarted in part by the variations and the question of timing and by the shadow of the veto power of the United States on this issue. The Israeli representative has sought to entrap the Council into responding to his distortions so that it may lose sight of the central issue. His rehashing of fabrications and obvious lies does not transform them into the "truth" he so arrogantly asserts. The colonization of Palestine by the Zionists is still too fresh, and within this generation's memory, for it to be the subject of controversy as to the facts. Hence we shall not attempt to respond to the historical claim, except to say that claims dating back 2,000 years in history have for the Zionists become contemporary claims on Arab territories, and 30 years of Zionist usurpation of Palestine and Israeli violation of Palestinian rights have for Israel become ancient and obsolete facts.

26. Treating the question of rights from the vantage point of territories and square miles, as the Israeli representative has done, when what is at issue is the human and national rights of the Palestinians and the usurpation of their land, is typical of racist behaviour throughout modern history. As for his attacks on the PLO, all we have to say is that there is nothing new in his insulting, invective remarks,

because all liberation movements in modern history have been given the same titles—"terrorists", "murderers", and so on—by the various racist régimes and the colonialist Powers. Hence the PLO is in good company with all the national liberation movements that have so gallantly achieved for their countries and their nationals the freedom and independence which they deserve and to which they are entitled. We only have to remember that scarcely a year ago the white racist régime in Rhodesia was calling the present Prime Minister of Zimbabwe by the same titles and names as Israel's Begin and his henchmen use for the PLO leadership.

27. That the Israeli representative should attribute the growing conviction in the European Economic Community countries about the justice of the Palestinians' struggle and the validity of their right to self-determination and the recognition by those countries of the representative character of the PLO to utilitarian motives and to a need for our oil is so demeaning that it should not elicit any response, either from us or from those who have been so insulted.

28. The issue that we face is that Israel has already annexed more than 30 per cent of the Palestinian territories occupied in 1967, sometimes by establishing *nahals* or colonies, on the pretext of "archaeological sites", or "theological seminaries", as at Al-Khalil (Hebron), or for security reasons. In most of the colonies they have armed the settlers, while imposing curfews on the Arab towns, exactly as the Ku Klux Klan vigilantes did in the early 1920s in the United States South. But in this case they are officially sponsored. Therefore, this body must concentrate on what the Israelis' hands are doing, and not on what their tongues are saying.

29. Since the Camp David agreements were signed, more colonies have been established and planted, and existing colonies have been expanded and have proliferated. The United States condemned these colonies as illegal; we have, however, repeatedly noticed the discrepancy between United States utterances and its declared policy, on the one hand, and the United States performance and its practical pursuits, on the other. We should like in this respect to ask the United States—or at least to ask the Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim, in turn to ask the United States—how many American citizens there are in those illegal settlements and colonies in the occupied territories. How can we tally them? The United States is declaring that those colonial settlements are illegal; yet it does not raise the question with its own citizens who are beefing them up.

30. These are not polemical questions: these are questions that have to be answered unequivocally and clearly, because the inconsistency between what is declared and what is pursued, and the discrepancy between what is uttered and what is performed, have constituted the input giving Israel the ability to treat

the international community in the insulting manner that has characterized its attitude and behaviour throughout.

31. The timetable that the United States has been advertising with 26 May as the deadline for bringing out an outline for the so-called negotiations for "Palestinian autonomy" is rejected by the Arab States because it emerges from agreements that municipalize the national rights of the Palestinians and the PLO has been excluded from taking part in negotiations of consequence within the framework of a comprehensive and just peace.

32. The legality and legitimacy of the Camp David agreements are questioned precisely because the mechanism established by them conceives of those agreements as a substitute for an alternative to and a replacement of the United Nations and the Security Council. The League of Arab States and the Arab States in general have exhibited their unflinching commitment to the authority of the United Nations by suspending one of the members of the League from its activities because it had acquiesced, unfortunately, in the Camp David agreements, which flout the authority of the United Nations and seek to jeopardize its credibility and effectiveness.

33. Permit me, Mr. President, to depart for a moment from the text to comment on the Egyptian representative's statement in this respect.

34. First, no Arab doubts the commitment of Egypt or the Egyptian people to the Arab cause and to the rights of the Palestinian people. Secondly, the Arab States, and the Arab League in particular, consider Egypt an integral part of the Arab nation and believe that its involvement is historical, authentic and extremely valuable. This is in contradiction and in contradistinction to the policies, behaviour patterns and objectives of the present leadership of Egypt. Thirdly, the PLO and the Arabs, in the opinion of the Egyptian delegation, must wait for the outcome of the Camp David negotiating process and then accept or reject it. This is precisely the issue. The PLO, the League of Arab States and its members do not want to be faced with an outcome to which Egypt is forced to commit itself while the Arabs reject it. That is why, since the inception of the League, the Charter of the Arab League, with Egypt as a founding member, has made illegal any unilateral treaty with the Zionist State. Fourthly, to the question posed by the Egyptian representative, "What is the alternative for those who reject the Camp David framework?", our response is as follows. If President Sadat can conceive of a strategy without the Arabs, the Arabs cannot, in view of their nationalist commitment, evolve a national strategy without Egypt. Hence our definite preference and commitment are for the return of Egypt to the Arab national framework and consensus. We consider the so-called Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty an interruption—nay, a disruption—in the authenticity and continuity

of the Egyptian people's valiant commitment to our concerns and to the common Arab cause.

35. Even if the timetable spelt out by the Camp David agreements and put forward by the adherents of those agreements is adhered to, the objective of those agreements is so-called autonomy for the Palestinians. Let me state to this body, on behalf of the League of Arab States, that, as I am sure this body is equally convinced, autonomy does not correspond to national rights. Autonomy is pre-emptive of sovereignty and independence; autonomy is an administrative formula with no political or legal meaning in international law and international relations. Autonomy reduces national rights to municipal rights, reduces the rights of the Palestinians to be citizens and transforms them into subjects of an Israeli empire in perpetuity. Autonomy is, at best, an outgrowth of a colonial and occupying glutton; it is not, under any circumstances, the food of human dignity, dignity for the Palestinian people.

36. So autonomy is not even an option that any Palestinian or Arab is willing to entertain, whether ultimately or in the immediate future. That is why we say that the whole framework of the Camp David agreements and the so-called negotiations on Palestinian autonomy are, at best, diplomatic day-dreaming. Yet, in fact, they are a means to enable Israel to buy more time, create new facts, proliferate new colonies and obliterate the demographic, cultural and national character of the Palestinian constituency in the occupied territories. They also introduce new elements that render genuine efforts towards peace not only more complex and more difficult, but almost impossible, unless the Palestinians and the Arabs are willing to accept passivity as a substitute for genuine peace.

37. We are sure that the international community does not want this fate for them, and the Council is entrusted with seeking ways and means to bring about an expeditious peace by removing and dismantling the obstacles to peace. Hence the timetable spelt out by the Camp David agreements is irrelevant to us and, I am sure, irrelevant to the Council, as it seeks to deflect the efforts of the Council to deal directly with the central issue—namely, Palestinian national rights.

38. We are not trying here to paraphrase the past; nor do we want to get bogged down in the deadlock of the present. We hope that we can contribute, through the United Nations, to charting for the future a course that will ensure the transformation of the Middle East from an arena of conflict into an arena of peace and justice. Yet the past cannot be removed from our present experience. Let me just mention that in pre-1967 Israel—in 1948—there were 475 Arab villages; now the number is 90 Arab villages, which means that 385 Arab villages have been totally obliterated. Ninety per cent of the territories annexed by Israel since 1967, in the West Bank and Gaza, 125,630 dunums of cultivable land, belonged to private

Arab land-owners; 9 per cent were from lands in the public domain. The number of colonial settlements in the occupied territories established to date is 133. In accordance with Israeli Government plans, many more are envisaged and existing ones are expected to multiply and, in Israeli terms, to be "thickened".

39. While efforts are being pursued to freeze diplomatic initiatives, are those who are willing to postpone their diplomatic initiatives able to guarantee that the United States can, in turn, freeze the continued Israeli mutilation of the Palestinian homeland and entity in the occupied territories? We say that that is the centre of the dilemma, not our insistence on bringing about a credible resolution in the Council that will enhance the prospects of genuine peace and embolden the authentic peacemakers.

40. Finally, I should like to take this opportunity to commend the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People on its work and on its recommendations, which constitute coherent, principled and consistent components of a policy resolution that could bring about the outcome for which the world has long been looking, that would finally enable the Palestinians to exercise their inalienable rights and build in their homeland the independent, sovereign State to which they are historically entitled and that would lead to the peace in the region that has long eluded us.

41. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of India. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

42. Mr. B. C. MISHRA (India): Mr. President, I should like at the outset to thank you, and through you the other members of the Council, for giving my delegation the opportunity to participate in the current debate on the question of the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

43. In extending to you my warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of April, I should like to state that we are especially gratified to see you, Sir, presiding over the current deliberations. India and Mexico are linked by warm and long-standing ties of friendship and co-operation. We are also conscious of your own considerable diplomatic skills, wisdom and negotiating ability, which will no doubt find full expression in your handling of the deliberations of this body. We wish you the best in your tasks.

44. I should also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Mills of Jamaica, for the patience, sagacity and dignified composure with which he conducted the proceedings of the Council during last month. No doubt his professional reputation has, over the years, been built on those very qualities.

45. The Council has been convened at the request of the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People so that it may concentrate its attention on the continued violation by Israel of the inalienable rights of those people, and also under the terms of paragraphs 7 and 8 of General Assembly resolution 34/65 A, which urged the Council to consider and to take as early as possible a decision on the recommendations of the Committee endorsed in successive resolutions by the Assembly at its thirty-second, thirty-third and thirty-fourth sessions. It is not necessary for me to go into detail about the substance of those recommendations, which contain a phased and time-bound programme for the resolution of the question of Palestine, a question which has been generally recognized as being at the heart of the problem of West Asia. In his exhaustive statement before the Council, the Chairman of the Committee has already made a convincing presentation of the case [2204th meeting]. The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization has also expressed [*ibid.*], with feeling, the anguish of the people of Palestine and the depth of their yearning for a free and independent State of their own in Palestine.

46. Just a few weeks ago, the members of the Council considered the report of the Security Council Commission established under resolution 446 (1979), which culminated in the unanimous adoption of resolution 465 (1980), expressly calling upon Israel to dismantle existing settlements and to cease as a matter of urgency the establishment of further settlements in the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem. The resolution also determined that measures of that nature taken by Israeli authorities in Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, had no legal validity whatsoever.

47. Israel has chosen, however, to treat the unanimous decision of this body with contempt and has proceeded on a series of provocative gestures and violations, including the expropriation of vast areas of Arab-owned land in order to establish new settlements. These actions have, if anything, further exposed Israel's own nefarious designs and they hold out dangerous portents for peace and stability in the area.

48. The threat to international peace and stability resulting from Israeli policies can be removed only by a just solution of the question of Palestine, which is at the very root of the conflict in West Asia. India's position on this question has remained clear and consistent over the years. In this regard, I could do no better than to quote from the speech made by the Prime Minister of India on 28 March welcoming Chairman Yasser Arafat to India. She said:

"Our sympathy for the Palestinian Arabs has been a part of independent India's foreign policy from its very inception. Even in the 1930s, when we ourselves were struggling for freedom, Mahatma

Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru spoke out against the injustices to which Arabs, and Palestinians in particular, were subjected. Thus our support for the Palestinian cause has been time-tested and consistent."

49. An important prerequisite for the attainment of a peaceful solution is the full and equal participation of the PLO in any peace negotiations. In regard to the people of Palestine, there is general international recognition that the PLO is their only genuine representative. To quote again from the speech of the Prime Minister of India:

"The plight of the Palestinians has been one of the tragedies of history. Few people have been more systematically oppressed and humiliated in their own land. I hope—indeed I am sure—this will change soon and that achievement will be the key to harmony in West Asia. The PLO has striven to provide its people a distinct and forceful identity. The Palestinian people in turn have entrusted to you, Chairman Arafat, the responsibility of leading them to their destiny. I assure you of the full support of the people of India in your struggle."

In recognition of this pre-eminent role of the PLO, my Government last week accorded full diplomatic status to the office of the PLO in New Delhi.

50. There can be no peace in West Asia and no reduction of the threat to international peace and security unless there is clear recognition of the just cause of the Arabs and Palestinians. In a joint India-PLO press statement issued in New Delhi on 30 March at the conclusion of Chairman Arafat's visit to India it was said:

"The Prime Minister of India reiterated India's principled support of the Arab cause in general and the Palestinian problem in particular. The Prime Minister stated that a just peace and comprehensive solution to the Middle East crisis can be found only with the full participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization as an equal partner in any settlement. Such a settlement would have to be based on complete withdrawal of Israel from all occupied Palestinian and Arab territories, including Jerusalem, enabling the Palestinian people to return to their homeland, to self-determination and to the establishment of an independent State in Palestine. In this regard the two sides emphasized the resolutions on the Middle East question, including the question of Palestine and the Camp David accords, adopted at the sixth non-aligned summit conference in Havana. They condemn Israel's continued flouting of the United Nations resolutions, its intransigence, expansionism and aggression in occupied territories and south Lebanon, establishment of settlements and exploitation of the natural resources in the occupied territories."

51. The Palestine Committee has been mandated by the General Assembly to strive for the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people by all possible peaceful means available to it under the Charter. It is in the context of that mandate that the Committee has placed before the Council its recommendations for appropriate consideration. We hope that the Council, as a body with the requisite authority and power to give effect to these recommendations, will objectively examine them and act upon them in order to bring peace and security to the region, in conformity with the principles of justice and international law. Only in that way can the sad cycle of violence, suffering and strife be broken and a just solution of the problem attained which will restore to the people of Palestine their basic human dignity and their legitimate national rights. Such a solution cannot but prove to be in the ultimate interest of the people of Israel also.

52. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of Yugoslavia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

53. Mr. KOMATINA (Yugoslavia): It gives me great pleasure to congratulate you, Sir, as the representative of Mexico—a country with which Yugoslavia maintains traditional and very friendly relations of overall co-operation—on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of April and to wish you success in carrying out your responsible duties. You are a well-known political figure, both in your country and beyond its borders, and we are confident that your outstanding qualities will greatly contribute to enabling the Council to discharge its task in dealing with one of the most complex and pressing issues facing the international community.

54. I wish also to pay due tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Mills of Jamaica, for the excellent manner in which he guided the work of the Council during the month of March.

55. The Yugoslav delegation, for its part, wishes to contribute to the debate on this very complex and urgent problem, in whose very essence is embodied the destiny of a whole people and its basic right to establish its own State.

56. As a member of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, my country is directly involved in the fulfilment of the Committee's extremely complex and responsible task. The General Assembly's appraisal, expressed on several occasions, has been that this important organ has been carrying out successfully the obligations entrusted to it and that it has been exerting its utmost efforts, both in searching for a just solution with respect to the realization of the national rights of the Palestinian people and in informing and mobilizing world public opinion. My country will continue to

contribute effectively and actively to the work of the Committee, in co-operation with the Palestine Liberation Organization and all the members of the Committee, so that the latter may continue to perform its function of reaching the goals that have been set by the General Assembly and defined and stipulated in numerous documents of the world Organization.

57. We attach great importance to this debate, considering it to have a far-reaching character. We would say that this is an exceptional moment at which the Council should pronounce on the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. In doing so, it would contribute substantively to the settlement of the Middle East crisis and to arresting the dangerous trend of deterioration in the international situation in that region and in the world at large.

58. The Middle East crisis is undoubtedly one of the most acute and explosive focal points of crisis in the world today. It is further deepened by attempts to reach partial solutions and by the general aggravation of relations in the entire Middle East region. We are still confronted with continued Israeli aggression and occupation of Arab territories, with the denial of the national rights of the Palestinian people and with the refusal of Israel to comply with United Nations decisions. In this respect there is no sign of a change for the better. Moreover, the world is faced with growing negative tendencies taking the form of the use of force, military intervention and interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States as a result of the policy of spheres of interest, bloc rivalries and attempts to impose on peoples and countries new relations of dependence. This poses a threat to peace and security in the world. Individual non-aligned countries are the main victims of such trends, while constant pressure is brought to bear on the Non-Aligned Movement, which is a global and independent factor of peace, equitable co-operation and independence on a broader international level.

59. Therefore, we believe that it is necessary to consider the Palestinian problem with a sense of responsibility and to take decisions which will contribute to its solution, because it is unthinkable that, in an age of emancipation, the Palestinian people, which every day offers proof of its unshakeable national consciousness and its sense of responsibility for peace in the region, should be deprived of its inalienable right to live in its own national State like any other people. In taking such decisions, the Council not only would meet the legitimate national aspirations of the Palestinian people, but would also clear the only realistic path to the settlement of the Middle East crisis in its entirety.

60. It is constantly being confirmed that the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people is the core of the Middle East crisis, and without that realization the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East cannot even be imagined.

All the greater, therefore, is the responsibility for the present state of affairs, both of Israel and of all those who assist that country directly or indirectly or who approve in any form of its policy based on constant expansion.

61. No people can allow anyone else to decide on its inalienable national rights. Consequently, the acceptance of the fact that only the PLO can negotiate legitimately on behalf of the Palestinian people is a prerequisite on any realistic road leading to the solution of the Palestinian question. The international community is becoming ever more aware of this fact, because the PLO not only has asserted itself as a constructive participant in international life, including in the peaceful settlement of the Middle East crisis, but has actually been recognized as an international legal and political subject, with whom over 110 Member States have established ties characteristic of relations between sovereign States. No one can turn a blind eye to this fact and remain idle without running the risk of becoming a willing or unwilling accomplice.

62. International political practice has provided us—especially in more recent times—with abundant proof of the short-lived and limited value of the policy of force, occupation and colonization. It is true that force, especially when used against small peoples and countries, can bring some short-term geo-strategic advantages; however, in the long run, it exposes to peril the very proponents of the use of force. History has already provided a large number of examples of unsuccessful attempts to eliminate individual peoples from the world scene. Therefore, no one should entertain any illusions in that respect.

63. The just objectives of the struggle for national liberation and self-determination were, and have remained, the main bulwark of and factor for peace and stability in international relations in general. The liberation of peoples under colonial and foreign domination has become a fundamental principle of international relations, while support for this struggle has been transformed into a duty in the conscience of mankind. As a matter of fact, no one can proclaim on the one hand his attachment to these principles while on the other hand violating them in practice and acting in complicity with their constant infringement. The question of respect for the right to national independence is a test of credibility for every national policy on the international plane. It is an integral part of the struggle to change international relations in their entirety. Peoples refuse to reconcile themselves to relations of dependence in general and even less are they prepared to acquiesce in their own enslavement. In the present-day world, this is one of the most real of the facts of life which are becoming the motive force of positive evolution in the world. Every far-sighted policy must take this into account, because involved here are both realism and moral and humanizing elements in international relations.

64. Along the lengthy road leading to the realization of its national objectives, the Palestinian people has been confronted with a number of difficulties and pressures, with misunderstanding, opportunism and attempts to use its fight for purposes which are not in accordance with its liberation struggle. The whole classical and modern arsenal—ranging from the direct use of force to forcible displacement and acts aimed at altering the demographic structure of the population and at expropriating land and natural resources, as well as other direct or indirect methods designed to extirpate the Palestinian people—has been marshalled against that people. However, all this has been to no avail. The stronger and the more direct the force used against it, the firmer has the Palestinian people become in its aspirations, the clearer in defining its objectives, the more constructive in its messages to the world and the more oriented towards co-operation in the choice of roads towards the realization of its aims.

65. We are deeply convinced that, with regard both to the content of its decision and to its implementation, the Council should compel Israel to behave in conformity with the principles on which contemporary international relations are founded. Among those principles, the non-recognition of the results of aggression and of the policy of *faits accomplis*, the non-acquisition of foreign territories by force, and the recognition of the right of all peoples to self-determination and of all States to free and secure development constitute the cornerstone of those relations. The report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People contains recommendations taking into account both these principles and all the realities and complexities of the current situation, proceeding, of course, from the absolute necessity of realizing the basic objective, namely, the recognition of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people.

66. The positions of Yugoslavia concerning the settlement of the Middle East crisis have been explained repeatedly in the Security Council, the General Assembly and other bodies of the United Nations dealing with this crisis. These stands are based on the generally accepted principles of unconditional withdrawal by Israel from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967; recognition of the inalienable national right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including the right to establish its own State; and recognition of the right of all peoples and States in the region to an independent and secure existence.

67. We are convinced that the solution of this complex crisis can be based only on a comprehensive approach, within the framework of the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, with the participation of the PLO on equal terms. Attempts at finding solutions or at imposing settlements by means of partial approaches or by circumventing the PLO not only have failed but have even further exacerbated the Middle East crisis. Practice

has shown once again that there can be no settlement of the Palestine problem without a substantive solution of the basic question concerning the realization of national rights. A positive decision of the Council regarding this question would constitute a giant step forward.

68. There is no doubt whatsoever that the establishment of an independent and non-aligned Palestinian State is a *conditio sine qua non* for the settlement of the Middle East crisis. We do not say "non-aligned State" merely for formal reasons, because the PLO—the authentic representative of the Palestinian people—is a full-fledged member of the non-aligned movement, nor only because the non-aligned countries have provided the broadest platform for a just solution of the whole problem and have given the widest and strongest support to the realization of the historical aspirations of the Palestinian people to freedom and independence. I emphasize this because we are convinced that non-alignment reflects, today, the interest and desire of every people and every country to strengthen its national independence, to develop freely and to participate in international life on a footing of equality. A positive decision would be a major step taken by the world Organization in rejecting every policy of aggression, occupation and intervention and in defending the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty.

69. Non-aligned and socialist Yugoslavia will continue to exert efforts for a lasting, just and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East crisis, proceeding from the necessity of opposing the use of force and from the fact that the freedom and independence of peoples constitute inviolable values indispensable for strengthening peace and security everywhere in the world.

70. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

71. Mr. MANSOURI (Syrian Arab Republic): Mr. President, I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to speak to the Council. First of all, I should like to express my congratulations to you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. The long-standing friendly relations between our countries as well as your experience and high qualifications assure us that you will conduct the work of this Council in a very efficient manner. Allow me at the same time to pay due respect to your predecessor, Ambassador Mills of Jamaica, for the efficient manner in which he presided over the work of the Council last month.

72. For a long time the Council has been seized of the question relating to the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable national rights. Unfortunately,

in the past it has not been able to deal positively and effectively with this question once and for all.

73. The history of the United Nations since its establishment, and especially during the last two decades, has shown remarkable achievements in the acceptance and recognition of and support for the struggle of peoples who desired to achieve freedom from colonial domination and, indeed, the United Nations membership has increased greatly by reason of the emergence of new States. But, unfortunately, the United Nations up to now has failed to exert its full power and authority in helping the Palestinian people to acquire its freedom and national independence. It is a well-known fact that the General Assembly, by an overwhelming majority, adopted resolution 3236 (XXIX) of 22 November 1974, which, *inter alia*, expressed its grave concern that the Palestinian people has been prevented from enjoying its inalienable rights, in particular its right to self-determination, and reaffirmed the right to self-determination without external interference and the right to national independence and sovereignty.

74. Peace and stability in the Middle East cannot be achieved without settling the Palestinian question, which is the core of the Middle East problem. It may be worth mentioning that the Political Declaration of the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries stated that:

“No just peace can be established in the region unless it is based on total and unconditional withdrawal by Israel from all the occupied Palestinian and other Arab occupied territories, and the recovery by the Palestinian people of all its inalienable national rights, including its right to return to its homeland, to self-determination and to the establishment of an independent State in Palestine, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX).”¹

75. During the last session, the General Assembly adopted resolution 34/65 A, in which it reaffirmed the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and urged the Council once again to consider and take a decision on the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which were repeatedly endorsed by the Assembly in its resolutions 31/20, 32/40 A and 33/28 A, as well as in the aforementioned resolution.

76. It is beyond any doubt and, in fact, it is needless to say that owing to obstacles such as the refusal of one permanent member of the Council, namely, the United States, the Council up to now has not been able to give endorsement to the wishes and desires of the overall majority of the Member States in their endeavour to recognize the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and its right to establish its own State in its own land. We hope that this time the Council will be able to overcome those obstacles

and recognize the reality of the facts in the Middle East.

77. We sincerely believe that it is high time that the United Nations, as an international organization, moved forward and acted immediately to remove the injustice which was inflicted upon the Palestinian people more than 30 years ago by the United Nations itself. The only possible solution is to recognize the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and independence. The solution should come within and from the Organization as a whole. No solution can be imposed from outside the United Nations. We are more than convinced that all that is happening in the Middle East outside the framework of the United Nations will not lead to any peaceful settlement in the area. Consequently, we consider the Camp David accords and the so-called peace treaty between Israel and Egypt and any other agreements that may emerge out of them as null and void. This point of view of ours is shared with a majority of Member States, as was clearly expressed during the debates at the last session of the General Assembly.

78. Furthermore, we regard the provisions of the Camp David accords and the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt as far away from and in fact denying the Palestinian people their inalienable rights. That denial is in fact an insult to the Palestinian people and to the Arab nation as a whole. Any negotiations outside the United Nations and without the full participation of the Palestinian people through its representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization, would not have any chance of survival or success and would not even be considered by it.

79. The Palestinian people, who were forcibly expelled from their homeland, whether in 1948, 1956 or 1967, have the right to return to their homes. Nothing less than a sovereign national independent State will meet the demand and satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people. Anything less is doomed to failure.

80. We in the Middle East are looking for lasting peace and stability, but we want a peace based on justice. We are sure, as everyone knows, that peace in our part of the world cannot be achieved until the fundamental issue, that is, the acceptance of the right of self-determination for the Palestinian people, is resolved. We appeal to the Council members to uphold their responsibility, with their powers, and to act immediately along two parallel lines, and those are: first, to ensure Israeli withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories, and, secondly, to accept and endorse the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, namely, to ensure that the Palestinian people are able to exercise their inalienable rights, including their right to self-determination and to a sovereign independent State.

81. Finally, on 1 March the Council adopted unanimously resolution 465 (1980). That resolution was the first unanimous step by the Council on behalf of the international community towards acceptance of the fact that Israeli policy in the occupied Arab territories has largely contributed to a deterioration of the situation and that it is incompatible with the pursuit of peace in the area, and towards asking the Israeli authorities to dismantle the existing settlements.

82. We hope that after this debate the Council will take another step forward in the direction of peace by accepting and endorsing the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to a sovereign national independent State in their homeland.

83. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization has asked to make a statement in reply. I now call on him.

84. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization) (*interpretation from Spanish*): First of all, please allow me to express my sincere congratulations to you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of April. Thousands of Palestinians in search of new opportunities have found in Mexico a home away from home. The relations between the Palestine Liberation Organization and Mexico are friendly ones and serve our common interests as well as the cause of peace and justice. Mr. President, we are certain that your dynamism and prudence will produce positive results during this month.

[*The speaker continued in English.*]

85. Now I wish to put on record here the great appreciation of the Arab nation, and the Palestinian people in particular, of the historic role of the Egyptian people and the Egyptian armed forces; it is an historical fact, one of those facts of history that make people feel elated, thankful and reassured. It is an historical fact that since 1948 the armed forces of Egypt have given all they could, including their lives, in order to defend, protect and support the cause of their brothers in Palestine. The Egyptian people have paid with great sacrifice; that is an historical fact that no one can deny. To us Palestinians that is a very bright and honourable page in the history of the Palestinian people, the complete and full identification of cause, purpose and struggle. There should be no malicious distortion or twisting of words. It is the current policy of Sadat and his régime that is damaging the image of Egypt—of its people as well as its armed forces. Sadat's policy, to say the least, does not do honour to the glorious history of Egypt and the Egyptian people, especially the armed forces.

86. This morning our attention was called to African maturity. African maturity and wisdom have been praised. We fully agree, and on this particular issue of

the Camp David accords let us hear again African maturity as expressed by Mr. Tolbert, President of Liberia, speaking in the General Assembly in his capacity as current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity. President Tolbert said:

“... Africa reaffirmed in Monrovia its unrelenting support and unswerving commitment to the struggle of the Palestinian people for the full realization and exercise of all of their national rights.

“In pledging its full support and determination to continue to work for a lasting and just peace in the Middle East, Africa, speaking in Monrovia, condemned all partial agreements and treaties which violate the recognized rights of the Palestinian people and contradict the principles of just and comprehensive solutions to the Middle East problem.

“If current peace initiatives in the Middle East are to lead to a comprehensive, just and durable settlement, it would seem imperative, in our view, that the framework of negotiation be expanded to include the Palestinian people, represented by the Palestine Liberation Organization. For the Palestinian people alone are entitled to speak for themselves, and their participation is indispensable to the success of any peace initiative in the Middle East.”²

87. This is the maturity of Africa. Lessons have to be drawn from history and the most recent lesson is the glorious victory of the people of Zimbabwe under its internationally recognized leadership, the Patriotic Front. But we should like those who wish to learn from history to remember that it was the Patriotic Front that represented the people of Zimbabwe at Lancaster House, and not a single State from among the front-line States usurped the right of the people of Zimbabwe and tried to designate its representatives.

88. In contrast to the case of Camp David, the Lancaster House negotiations were conducted on the basis of full recognition of the inalienable rights of the people concerned, the people of Zimbabwe, and agreements were concluded with the participation of their representatives, the Patriotic Front. This was not the case, the pattern or even the aim of the Camp David accords; and, please, enough of distortions of history. For those who want to learn from history, the people of Zimbabwe knew whom to trust; they trusted the leaders of the Patriotic Front, and not the Muzorewas and the Quislings.

89. On the issue of inalienable rights, I wish to recall here that at this time, on Holy Thursday, is the hour of agony, and in the penitentiary in Chicago a 20-year-old Palestinian, Ziyad Abu Eain, is agonizing in a hunger strike. He is awaiting deportation in response to a request by the Israeli authorities for his extradition for alleged acts against the enemy. The matter has been before different courts of justice as

well as before the Secretary of State. Ziyad Abu Eain has even been denied a request to be released on bail until the legal labyrinth has been exhausted. This action against a 20-year-old Palestinian is clearly discriminatory.

90. I am aware that this is not a court of justice, but where can a Palestinian go when his adversary is the United States Department of State, acting in collusion with the Zionist forces of occupation? Again, this action of so-called justice is taking place while a Nazi criminal like Andrea Artukovich has been living on the West Coast for the last 35 years despite undisputed and abundant evidence of his effective

role in the massacre of Europeans, mostly Yugoslav Jews, and despite several requests by the Government of Yugoslavia for his extradition.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

NOTES

¹ A/34/542, annex, sect. I, para. 102 (c).

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 10th meeting, paras. 35-37.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم - استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a : Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
