

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

UN LIBRARY

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

APR 22 1988

UN/SA COLLECTION

2220th MEETING: 30 APRIL 1980

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2220)	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

UN LIBRARY

APR 28 1988

UNISA COLLECTION

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.

2220th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 30 April 1980, at 3.30 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/2220)

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 5.15 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, 2205th, 2207th, 2208th and 2219th meetings], I invite the representatives of Algeria, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Cuba, Egypt, Guyana, India, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Madagascar, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United

Arab Emirates, Viet Nam 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 Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take seats at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bedjaoui (Algeria), Mr. Al-Saffar (Bahrain), Mr. Yankov (Bulgaria), Mr. Roa-Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Douglas (Guyana), Mr. B. C. Mishra (India), Mr. Bafi (Iraq), Mr. Blum (Israel), Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan), Mr. Tuéni (Lebanon), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. Ayachi (Morocco), Mr. Jamal (Qatar), Mr. Allagany (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Adan (Somalia), Mr. Mansouri (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Lipatov (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Humaidan (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Ha Van Lau (Viet Nam) 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. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should now like to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Democratic Yemen in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ashtal (Democratic Yemen) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

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

4. Mr. YANKOV (Bulgaria): Mr. President, I should like at the outset to express the satisfaction of my delegation at your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month and to wish you success in the discharge of your important duties, especially at the end of your term of office today. I am pleased to note

that your wide experience as a statesman and your outstanding abilities as a diplomat have, indeed, contributed to making the work of the Council constructive and fruitful. I should like also to express the gratitude of my delegation for the opportunity accorded to us to participate in the discussion and to put on record the position of the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria on the question of the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

5. My delegation has been following closely the present deliberations of the Council focused on the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People¹ and on its recommendations. The Council has had ample opportunity to consider this issue on various occasions in the past. Taking into account the wide recognition of the imprescriptible rights of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination and independence, including the right to establish their own State, and also the prevailing conviction that the recognition and realization of those rights is indeed the key to the achievement of a comprehensive, durable and fair settlement of the whole Middle East crisis, the Council is now called upon to adopt practical measures aimed at resolving the issue on the basis of the recommendations set forth in the report of the Committee. In the light of the extremely critical evolution of the Middle East situation and the continued denial by Israel of the rights of the Palestinians, the elaboration and implementation of such measures assumes an increasingly urgent nature.

6. It is the considered opinion of my delegation that the Middle East continues to be one of the most dangerous hotbeds of tension, fraught with dangers for peace and security. The situation is rendered all the more complicated and explosive by the separate Camp David accords. The overall deterioration of the situation which ensued in the aftermath of those accords, as well as more recent events in the Middle East, have furnished new evidence which has further substantiated our conviction that the separate deal between Israel and Egypt under the sponsorship of the United States does not lead to peace but to still further aggravation and inflammation of the conflict. Attempts to settle the fate of the Palestinian people without their participation have so far yielded no positive results whatsoever. As the President of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov, said during his recent visit to the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya,

"The People's Republic of Bulgaria, together with all progressive and democratic forces in the Arab world, flatly rejects the separate deal between Israel and Egypt, including their talks on so-called administrative autonomy for the Palestinians and the so-called normalization of relations between Egypt and Israel."

This basic position was reiterated only a few days ago by the President of the State Council, during his official visit to the Syrian Arab Republic.

7. The explanation behind those United States-sponsored moves is very simple. They represent a conspiracy against the interests of the Arab countries and an attempt to undermine their unity. Obviously, they are designed to allow further procrastination and to raise artificial impediments to the achievement of a lasting and equitable peace in the Middle East, as well as to perpetuate the illegal occupation and colonization of the Israeli-occupied Arab territories, in contravention of international law and all relevant decisions and resolutions of the United Nations, including those of the Security Council.

8. The continued insistence of the Government of Israel on going ahead with its own plans to establish new Jewish settlements in the occupied West Bank and its ongoing violations of the status of Jerusalem, as well as the aggressive acts against Lebanon and the United Nations forces in Lebanon, are a complete confirmation of the truth that pursuit of the road of separate talks, tempting as it may appear, can only fan the smouldering conflict, hinder the just cause of the Arab people and postpone indefinitely the prospects for a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem. It is our view that the Camp David agreements and the rapidly developing Egypt-United States-Israel alliance are heading precisely in this direction, despite the efforts of those countries to convince the world of their successful outcome.

9. With regard to this, I should like to reiterate the firm conviction of my Government that the establishment of a truly just and lasting peace in the Middle East necessitates, above all, the complete and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab lands occupied since 1967, the realization and the exercise by the Arab people of Palestine of their legitimate and indisputable rights, including the right to self-determination, to the creation of their own sovereign State under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine, and the guaranteeing of the independent existence and national security of all countries in the region.

10. It is the hope of my delegation that it is precisely in this spirit that the members of the Council will endeavour to work out their decisions, decisions that will best serve the interests of all countries in the region and the interests of peace, security and co-operation in the whole world.

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

12. Mr. ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen): Sir, on this, the last day of your presidency of the Council, I have every reason to commend you for your vitality as well as your distinguished leadership. You represent a friendly country whose revolutionary tradition and

respect for the rights of peoples are matched only by its dedication to the ideals of liberty, peace and justice. Your predecessor, Ambassador Mills of Jamaica, was equally successful, thanks to his diplomatic elegance and intellectual depth.

13. A few weeks ago the Council adopted a resolution categorically condemning the illegal Israeli settlements in the occupied territories. It was not without significance that the United States Government retracted its vote under heavy Zionist pressure. Be that as it may, those creeping settlements clearly demonstrate the aggressive nature of a Zionist State bent on expansionism. Since its inception, Israel has shown the world a model of a racist settler State with unlimited territorial ambitions. For the Palestinians, those settlements represent but one episode in a painful tragedy; for they have been denied not only their elementary human rights, but indeed their very national existence.

14. Ironically, the United Nations was primarily involved in the Palestinian tragedy when the General Assembly decided, in 1947, to legitimize the Zionist usurpation of Palestine. That infamous decision was taken at a time when the Assembly, then consisting of some 50 States, was subjected to imperialist pressure and blackmail. Ever since, the United States Government has sustained Israel by providing it with not only the means of survival but the military capacity to wage aggressive wars—the last of which was its invasion of southern Lebanon. Emboldened by United States political support as well, Israel feels secure enough to flout the Charter, ignore United Nations resolutions and disregard world public opinion.

15. But times have changed since the imperialist Powers could bully the General Assembly and impose their will. Gone are the days when the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America languished under the yoke of colonialism. Twenty-seven years later, the Assembly, representing virtually all nations, in a historic moment of international redemption, adopted resolution 3236 (XXIX), recognizing the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination, national independence and statehood in Palestine. The Assembly also recognized the Palestine Liberation Organization as the sole and authentic representative of the Palestinian people, thanks to its unrelenting struggle to resist Zionist occupation of its motherland. Subsequently, at its thirtieth session, the Assembly established the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which first presented its recommendations in 1976, reaffirming the right of the Palestinians to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty in Palestine, including their right to create their own independent State and the right to recover their property and their homes.

16. That international consensus in support of the Palestinian people was denounced by Israel and by

its main ally, the United States Government. Having lost ground in the United Nations, the United States Government sought to circumvent that international consensus by disregarding it, while at the same time undermining it through extra-international manoeuvres and arrangements.

17. The ill-fated Camp David affair was to be a framework for peace in the Middle East, and it ostentatiously purported to solve the Palestine problem as well. The results, however, came only too soon: first, a bilateral Egyptian-Israeli deal, according to which Egypt would regain its nominal sovereignty over a demilitarized Sinai and Israel would be guaranteed military superiority over Egypt, thus enabling Israel to be even more intransigent; and, secondly, talks on Palestinian autonomy that neither involve Palestinians nor secure so-called autonomy, let alone Palestinian national independence and statehood.

18. It was no accident that the Camp David accords were concluded at a time when the Shah of Iran was tumbling from his peacock throne. The United States had to find an alternative to serve its interests in the region. It needed a staging board to arrest the revolutionary tide in the Middle East and Africa. The Camp David accords and the Washington treaty provided a geopolitical substitute for the loss of Iran—nothing more. They are irrelevant to the Palestine problem, which is the core of the conflict in the Middle East.

19. Now the Camp David affair is winding up in exploratory talks intended for internal consumption and election politics here and there. But the United States, which had hoped to re-enter the Middle East arena in a big way, is now emphatically being asked to stay away from our region—thanks to the unified Arab stand forged at Baghdad and Tunis.

20. As for the Palestinian people, their just cause is being espoused by the whole international community. Even the allies of the United States are wisely keeping their distance from the Camp David fiasco. They only have to be more forthcoming in asserting their independence.

21. Attempts are being made to divert public opinion from the deteriorating situation in the Middle East, but they have been fruitless. The Palestine problem remains at the heart of the conflict in the Middle East, threatening international peace and security.

22. The Security Council cannot indefinitely ignore the international consensus on Palestine. Four million Palestinians are now waiting for the Council to recognize their inalienable right to self-determination, national independence and statehood. Not only that: they are expecting this august body to enforce the international consensus so that they may be able to take their place among the nations.

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

24. Mr. LIPATOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, allow me first to express gratitude to you and to all the other members of the Council for having given our delegation the opportunity to participate in the discussion of such an important item as the question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights. We should like to join in the expression of congratulations to you made by previous speakers in connection with your assumption of the responsible duties of the presidency of the Council for this month.

25. As a member of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic supported the initiative for the convening of an urgent meeting of the Council, so that it could finally adopt practical measures to give effect to the Committee's recommendations aimed at enabling the Arab people of Palestine to exercise their inalienable rights.

26. The question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights is not a new item for the Council. It took that question up in 1977 and in 1979 but, because of the negative position of the United States, which gave active support to the expansionist policy of Israel, the Council was unfortunately not able to take a decision on the question.

27. It is generally recognized that at the present time the question of Palestine is the core of the Middle East conflict. Unless a cardinal solution is found, a just and lasting settlement in the Middle East is impossible, and without such a settlement there can be no peace in the region. Consequently, international security and peace will continue to be under a real threat for which the Council bears direct responsibility. That has been reaffirmed repeatedly by the General Assembly and in other international forums, including the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Havana last year. That Conference quite definitely stated that, if the Council was unable to take a decision on the question of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people because of the absence of unanimity among the permanent members, a special emergency session of the General Assembly would then have to be convened.

28. To our mind, it is inadmissible for the Security Council further to disregard the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which were drawn up and unanimously adopted by that Committee back in 1976 with due regard for the relevant decisions of the Council and the General Assembly. The recommendations contain concrete proposals for ways and means

to find an objective and just solution to that problem. In particular, they reaffirm provisions which are of vital concern to the Palestinian people, such as their inalienable right to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty in Palestine, including the creation of their own independent State, and the right of the Palestinians to return to their homes and their lands. In its recommendations, the Committee likewise recalled the basic principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and emphasized the need for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967.

29. All these recommendations should be implemented without delay because the ruling circles in Israel not only are continuing most flagrantly to violate the inalienable national rights of the Palestinians but are hatching schemes with a view to liquidating the Arab people of Palestine.

30. During the debate in the Council, it has been noted several times that the aggressive aspirations of Israel have been considerably intensified since the Camp David deal and the conclusion of the separate Egyptian-Israeli treaty under the aegis of and with the active participation of the United States. Such actions can only be evaluated as an attempt to legitimize the presence of an aggressor on foreign territory expropriated by force of arms. That evaluation is borne out, in particular, by the negotiations which have continued for many months on so-called administrative autonomy for the Palestinians residing in the West Bank and Gaza.

31. It is quite obvious that attempts to resolve the problem of the Palestinian people in a manner inconsistent with the interests of its representatives and without its participation are doomed to failure. That appears to be recognized now throughout the world by everyone, with the exception of Israel and its protector, the United States.

32. Israel's aim is to hang on to the Palestinian lands it has occupied under the cover of a so-called administrative autonomy, and that aim cannot be masked by any manoeuvring or hypocritical statements endlessly repeated by the parties to the separate talks.

33. It is our profound conviction that the Palestinian problem cannot be resolved by a separate deal, such as that which has been attempted behind the backs of the Arab people of Palestine. The only just solution to that problem is the satisfaction of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to self-determination and the creation of its own independent State, within a comprehensive political settlement in the Middle East, with the participation on an equal footing of all the parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization as the sole authentic representative of the Palestinian people. That is precisely the thrust of the recommendations of the Committee.

34. We express the hope that the Security Council, which in accordance with the Charter was invested with the appropriate competence and powers, will finally take the steps necessary to settle the Palestinian problem on a peaceful and just basis.

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

36. Mr. ALLAGANY (Saudi Arabia): To begin with, I wish to express my delegation's deep appreciation and commendation to the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and to its Chairman for the Committee's thorough and objective report, which has left no doubt regarding the formidable plight of the Palestinian people under Israel's yoke of occupation—Israel which has violated and continues to violate the basic principles of human rights, including the right of self-determination.

37. Ever since 1949, the Israeli Government and its Zionist agents have been harping on the tune that Israel has no territorial ambitions and has merely been interested in securing a peaceful coexistence with the Arabs in which each party would respect the territorial integrity of the other. From time to time, however, some of the more outspoken Israeli leaders have let it be known in public pronouncements that their Government will never withdraw from parts of the occupied territories. Those belligerent pronouncements of intent were sometimes based on the alleged security needs of Israel, but, realizing that that would not provide sufficient credibility, their authors sometimes invoked historical and religious grounds for considering the occupied territories as theirs on the basis of a covenant from God. The individual pronouncements by public Israeli figures appeared to embarrass the Israeli Government since they betrayed the true but hidden aggressive Israeli designs, which Israel has preferred to accomplish through its notorious and fiendish policy of "creating" facts. That policy had helped the Israeli politicians in the past and they saw no reason why, with the support of their staunch friends in the West, it should not continue to help them in the future. On 10 August 1967, General Moshe Dayan made a statement reported in *The Jerusalem Post* of the same date wherein he said that people must realize that "the mountain range west of the Jordan lies at the heart of Jewish history", and that

"if you have the Book of the Bible, and the People of the Book, then you also have the Land of the Bible—of the Judges and of the Patriarchs in Jerusalem, Hebron, Jericho and thereabouts. On no account will we force ourselves to leave. This may not be a political programme, but it is more important—it is the fulfilment of a people's ancestral dreams."

38. In regard to Jerusalem, the occupying Israeli Government took a more drastic and defiant position. Shortly after the military invasion in 1967, it declared the annexation of Arab Jerusalem to Israel. When I call it Arab Jerusalem, as distinct from Jewish Jerusalem, I am only referring to the *de facto* lines dictated by Israel in the 1949 Armistice Agreements. Those arbitrary lines absorbed about 10 exclusively Arab quarters whose inhabitants were driven out, their properties being placed under the jurisdiction of the so-called Custodian of Absentees' Property. The Arab houses were given by the custodian to Jewish immigrants, mostly with the Arab furniture left behind, and those quarters became part of Israeli Jerusalem. The "creation" of facts through sheer force had paid off in the past and Israel was determined to follow the same pattern in 1967 and the following years. This time, however, the world community began to see through the Israeli deception, despite the intense barrage of Israeli propaganda and falsehoods. At an emergency special session in that year, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2253 (ES-V) by 99 votes to none, with 20 abstentions, declaring the Israeli annexation measures invalid, and calling upon Israel to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem. The incredible response to that resolution by the then Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Israeli Minister for Labour was that "the world must reconcile itself to the permanency of the annexation". On 21 May 1968, the Security Council adopted resolution 252 (1968) in which it recalled resolution 2253 (ES-V) and reaffirmed that the acquisition of territory by military conquest was inadmissible. It also deplored Israel's failure to comply with the General Assembly resolutions and considered that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel, including the expropriation of land and properties in Jerusalem which tended to change the legal status of Jerusalem, were invalid and could not change that status. The Council again called upon Israel to rescind all such measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any further action which tended to change the status of Jerusalem.

39. Israel continued to ignore the recurrent and repeated resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council regarding Jerusalem, the whole of the West Bank and Gaza. I am limiting myself to the Palestinian territories occupied by Israel since 1967 because the subject before the Council is the question of Palestine and the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. With utter defiance and contempt for the Organization to which it owed its very existence, Israel proceeded to expropriate and/or confiscate land and to build new Jewish homes and settlements for militant, aggressive and fanatic Jews, changing *de facto* the status of the occupied Palestinian Arab territories with the clear intention of "creating" more facts and forestalling any future attempts to implement Council resolution 242 (1967). One cannot overlook the fact that Israel could not have pursued such

aggressive and illegal measures were it not for the direct and indirect support of its friends in the Council, support that has rendered all those repeated resolutions ineffective.

40. Now we hope it has become more obvious, even to the closest of Israel's supporters, that it was not peace that Israel was interested in but territorial expansion, aggrandizement, annexation and the calculated change of the physical character, demographic composition and institutional structure of the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. To those who know, the security needs of Israel are not a factor but a convenient tool used to deceive and win the support of an influential segment of the Western, and particularly American, public and Israel's supporters in the United States Congress. The Camp David accords, given so much fanfare by certain circles, did not even attempt to curb Israel's voracious appetite for territory. The Palestinian people, who were the direct victims of the Jews of Palestine and the international Zionist movement in the process of the creation of a Jewish State in Arab lands, were totally ignored, and Israel succeeded by political pressures and devious manoeuvres in excluding them, by excluding their legitimate representatives, from participation in the so-called peace process. The Palestinian Arabs, like the Palestinian Jews, were under a British Mandate awarded to Britain to prepare the country for independence. When Britain ended its Mandate in May 1948, the Jews declared themselves an independent sovereign State on Arab lands evacuated by their population, which constituted two thirds of the population of Palestine. Instead of statehood, the Palestinian Arabs were doomed to exile and to living in refugee camps for over 30 years. According to Israeli arguments, now the Palestinian Arabs can only be granted self-rule, not self-determination, or what it calls sovereignty of the people, not sovereignty of the land. This is a new theory of self-determination conceived by Israel and its supporters which has no precedent or basis in international law, but which, according to *Time* magazine of 14 April, the Israeli Professor Yacob Talmon rightly called "an archaic concept, a trick to shut the Gentile's mouth".

41. Of course, Israel intends to retain sovereignty over the land, so as to enable it gradually and illegally to usurp more Arab lands and to replace the Arab population by transplanting Jews, thereby accomplishing the Israeli plan of annexing the West Bank, which Israel already calls Judaea and Samaria.

42. As I have already stated, the deceptive Israeli quest for peace is not and never has been genuine. Israeli and Zionist leaders have used it for so long that they have now lost their credibility, and the world community, including Israel's close supporters, does not believe them any longer. They have played too long on the Western conscience by portraying Israel as a persecuted and harassed peace-loving and peace-

seeking community. Time has shown that Israel is the persecutor and oppressor and that peace is not its real objective. The Israeli leaders seem to have built around them a fortress capable of repelling world opinion and world criticism. Indeed, Israel has become the prisoner of its aggressive, insensitive, inhuman, rigid and inflexible racist mentality. It seems to relish and bask in the status of isolation and combat with the world community. The Israelis claim that these are precautions which they have to take for their security, knowing very well that it is not their security that has been or is currently in jeopardy. On the contrary, it is the security of the neighbouring Arab countries and the very existence and future of the Palestinian people that are in grave jeopardy.

43. Even the leading American press, which has a tradition of supporting Israel, has begun to feel embarrassed by Israel's loss of credibility in speaking peace and practising aggression. On 12 February 1980, *The Washington Post* published an editorial under the title "The price of West Bank settlements", in which it pointed out that the movement of Jews into the West Bank was the patented formula for further trouble. It went on to state:

"... some Israelis still try to treat Jewish settlement in the West Bank as an issue with two sides: so let us argue it out, but meanwhile let us not allow it to get in the way of more important questions. But you have to be pretty stupid to swallow that line. There is no more important question. Jewish settlements are regarded everywhere—and most of all by the settlers themselves—as Israel's way to establish its permanent control, leading eventually to outright annexation. The settlements undercut Israel's pledge to leave open to negotiation, one in which the Palestinians who live there would take part, the 'final status' of the West Bank."

The editorial continued:

"... further criticism of Israel on this issue is pointless. So is wrist-slapping. More direct tactics are called for. Why not put a measurable value on the settlements and let Israel decide whether it wants to forfeit that much from its American aid?"

44. On 13 February 1980, *The New York Times* published an editorial in which it warned that while it returned the Sinai to Egypt, Israel was moving by stages to annex the West Bank. It suggested that the Israeli people had been frightened by pretexts of "security" into supporting the extreme Zionist dream of a minority of their fellow citizens. It stated that Egypt had been disarmed by the Sinai transaction and enormous amounts of American aid, and that the American President was judged helpless to resist, especially in an election year focused on confrontation with the Russians. The editorial continued:

"Under the cover of the Camp David accords and East-West tensions, Israel continues to change the

legal and demographic conditions in the West Bank. By one ruse after another, Jews are encroaching upon the region's Arabs, adding to the 'archaeological' and 'army' camps with newly requisitioned or purchased rural lands and now with claims to ancestral homes inside hostile Arab cities."

The New York Times editorial went on to describe the devious Israeli procedures as follows:

"As in the latest move into urban Hebron, the Israelis are careful never to create a clear focus for objection. New policies are adopted, but not immediately acted upon; new rules are labelled tentative, then kept indefinitely; laws are observed, but then bent out of shape. The move into Hebron was widely justified as retaliation for the murder there of a young Israeli; no one seemed to care that this demeaned the historical rights of settlement so heatedly claimed at other times. With every new step, a few more Israelis are exposed to terror and Arab hatred. They then need more protection from the army, more settlers to enhance security, more restrictions on the surrounding Arab life. The tentacles spread."

The editorial concluded as follows:

"Israel's defence of creeping annexation is no longer persuasive. The cries of 'security' ring hollow when Arab hostility is knowingly provoked and when the Israeli Army is left to cope with increasingly vulnerable outposts. The view that Camp David did not forbid settlements does not make them right. They offend the spirit of the 'autonomy' promised to the Palestinians."

45. With regard to the status of Jerusalem, the Israeli Government resorted to a different apologia: they had to annex the eastern sector of Jerusalem and keep it within a so-called undivided Jerusalem because that was the only way they would secure Jewish access to the Western Wall within the Old City and that would also guarantee access to the holy shrines for the Christian and Moslem peoples of the world.

46. Israel argues that, under Arab rule, Jews were denied access to the Old City and the Western Wall, whereas since 1967 Israel has allowed such access to all Moslems. That is an entirely false, deceptive and misleading distortion of the facts. Throughout Arab and Islamic rule, Jews have never been denied access to the City of Jerusalem or to the Western Wall. For centuries travel and worship were freely open to members of all religious faiths and denominations. In fact, the Jewish Quarter in the Old City was built during Arab rule and the Arabs provided shelter to Jews who had escaped Western persecution. The only period during which access to the eastern section of Jerusalem was denied to Israeli Jews was during the short period between 1949 and 1967 when

a state of war existed between Jordan and Israel. There is no mystery there, and that was not aimed at Jews as such. A state of war existed between Israel and Jordan and neither country admitted the nationals of the other.

47. But Israel has denied and continues to this day to deny access to Islamic Holy Places to the nationals of all Arab and Islamic countries, on the pretext that it has no diplomatic relations with those countries. Palestinian Arabs are only allowed to travel to visit their families who live under Israeli occupation after they have been carefully screened and granted permission by the Israeli military authorities. Many of them are denied permission to visit and many others are allowed in to face arrest and arbitrary administrative detention. Yet Israel claims, with incredible audacity, that by its so-called unification of Jerusalem it has guaranteed free access to the Holy Places to people of all faiths.

48. My Government does not and will not accept this aberration and insists that Jerusalem, as well as all the other Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, be relinquished to their Arab owners, so that they may freely choose their own form of government without any interference from Israeli or any outside authority. The Palestinian Arabs are no less capable of ruling themselves than the Israelis and, in fact, they have displayed a far greater sense of international responsibility and respect for human rights than have the Israelis, by any standards. The Palestinian Arabs have been struggling for the liberation of their country against a ruthless enemy which has denied them not only the right of self-determination but even the right to exist.

49. Israel has based its policy on the racist concept of a superior and an inferior race. The killing of an Israeli is an unforgivable crime, but terrorism by the Israeli Government against masses of civilian Arabs and the massacre of women and children by the use of the most devastating weapons is a defence of democracy and liberty.

50. My Government firmly believes that the world community has tolerated more than enough of Israel's procrastination, intransigence, defiance of the United Nations, of the Geneva Convention and of world public opinion and, above all, its denial of the human rights, including the right of self-determination, of a nation which has had a greater share of suffering than any other in recent memory.

51. The Palestinian Arabs were entitled to independence and the right to choose their own government at the termination of the Palestine Mandate. Israel cannot, on pretexts of security and so-called historical and religious roots, decide to deny this inherent and natural right of self-determination and sovereignty to the Palestinian people in the small portion of Palestine which escaped the land grabs of

1948 and 1949. The Zionist leaders of Israel must come to their senses and realize that they cannot place themselves above the precepts of international law, that they are not a super-race which can deny to others what it has allowed to itself. They have arrogantly proceeded on the premise that they are the only democratic peace-loving country in the Middle East, while the Palestine Arabs are possessed by the demon of hate and violence. This cannot fool anyone any more. They must realize that arrogance and the resort to sheer force will sooner or later—and probably much sooner—lead the whole region into an uncontrollable situation the consequences of which even mighty Israel cannot escape. Let Israel remember that those who live by the sword will perish by the sword. There can never be peace in the area unless and until the Palestinians enjoy full and undiminished self-determination coupled with complete and unmitigated sovereignty over the regions of the West Bank and Gaza, including Jerusalem.

52. There is no such thing under the Charter or under the International Covenants on Human Rights as self-determination for the people independently of the land on which they live. Again Israel arrogates to itself the right to lay down new concepts of international law, as though it were the law-giver of this universe. The Palestinian people are the party directly concerned in the Palestine issue and their problem is the core of the problem in the Middle East. The sooner Israel and its supporters realize this, the better it will be for all the parties concerned, for the world at large and no less for the Israelis themselves. If Israel wants real peace, it must change its mentality and place itself on a peace course, instead of the grave and ominous collision course on which it is currently proceeding.

53. My Government trusts that the Council will not fail to uphold the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to the establishment of an independent Palestinian State, which can only be implemented through the withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories occupied since June 1967. My Government also trusts that the Council will unanimously affirm its previous resolutions, particularly with regard to the right of the Palestinians to return to their homes and live in peace with their neighbours, and to their inalienable right to self-determination and the establishment of an independent sovereign State.

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

55. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): During the past week, a torrent of very grave reports has been received from the occupied territories of the Holy Land, describing the intensification of acts of despicable oppression, terrorism, hooliganism and vandalism and a military occupation establishment going literally

berserk. These acts of heightened Zionist terrorism have been indiscriminately directed against a wholly unarmed people, victim of over 13 years of occupation which have turned the hallowed soil of occupied Palestine into Orwell's Animal Farm.

56. Spearheading these acts of terrorist assault is the Gush Emunim dehumanized movement, whose spiritual fathers are no lesser terrorists than Menachem Begin, Borg, Shamir and their like. They evidently cannot overcome their deep-rooted terrorist behaviour and have a compulsive penchant to return to it when acting against valiant but unarmed civilians in various towns and villages throughout the occupied territories. The following are just examples of what has been happening, events which have received the scantiest of coverage.

57. The twin towns of Ramallah and Bireh, to the north of Jerusalem—Ramallah, incidentally, even though we make no distinctions whatsoever, is an overwhelmingly Palestinian Christian Arab town whose inhabitants have quite a substantial number of relatives of American citizenship since the turn of the last century—were the target of a savage attack by Israeli colonists at 1.30 a.m. in the dawn of 24 April, during which attack the windows of numerous houses and shops were smashed by iron-bar-wielding hooligans, who also “cannibalized” 150 cars. This dawn attack occurred when the inhabitants were, of course, asleep.

58. The reports indicate that the occupation authorities have resorted to a new pattern of which this is just one manifestation, the purpose being to make life so intolerable—or so they think—as to induce the inhabitants to leave their homeland.

59. The attackers, armed with iron bars and machine-guns, divided themselves into various assault units to destroy as much of the inhabitants' property as they could, simultaneously. All information indicates that the hooligans come from a number of Israeli colonies in the area, planted illegally amidst the Palestinian Arab population centres, which proves that the after-midnight assaults were premeditated, well-prepared and carried out with the knowledge of the occupation authorities, who boast of having a highly sophisticated intelligence apparatus. A three-day strike was carried out by the inhabitants, and the damaged cars were paraded in occupied Jerusalem and in the locations of the Israeli settlers. The Mayor of Ramallah declared after those dastardly acts: “Our people will respond in an appropriate manner to these attacks whose aim is to drive us out of our country”.

60. The twin towns of Ramallah and Bireh were littered with broken glass and the debris which followed the clashes between the Palestinian youths and inhabitants and the Israeli usurpers, while the Israeli forces patrolled the streets of the battle-scarred towns.

61. The Israeli Military Governor, General Benjamin Ben Elizar, gave a warning to Mayor Khalaf of Ramallah that if another protest demonstration took place he would have him gaoled, removed from his elected office and subsequently expelled from the occupied territories.

62. If any stones were thrown at intruding Israeli vehicles, it was not at the urging of the Mayor but was an inevitable consequence of an endless occupation. Troops did open fire on student demonstrations which erupted in several towns and villages and the students responded with the only weapons they possess: stones and empty bottles.

63. Curfews were imposed upon the villages of Ein Yabrood, Silwad and Dair El-Assal and many other villages, and army reinforcements have been brought to the area in increasing numbers. The Israelis claimed that stones were thrown at an Israeli military patrol near Dair El-Assal, but the truth is that armed Israeli bandits driving a Peugeot had tried to storm the homes of villagers at midnight, in an attempt to steal the villagers' livestock and belongings. The villagers pursued them and their car collided with a bus. Several villagers were wounded and hospitalized as a result of Israeli gunfire.

64. The Israelis also attacked the Kalandia vocational training school and Bir Zeit University because people there had demonstrated against the Camp David accords and demanded independence. A suspension of studies was decided on at Bir Zeit University to prevent Israeli army atrocities.

65. A total strike was observed in various towns and villages of the Holy Land, including Arab Jerusalem and various universities and colleges, on the occasion of the thirty-second anniversary of Israel's usurpation of Palestine. The Gush Emunim conducted provocative parades which led to clashes between the inhabitants and Israeli troops. In those clashes scores of Palestinians and Israeli soldiers were injured, six of them mortally.

66. The Israelis also arbitrarily decided to prevent the holding of elections to the municipal councils, although the time to hold them had come, for fear that the outcome would be a reiteration of the Palestinian Arabs' rejection of the discredited Camp David accords.

67. Another aspect of Israel's lawlessness and its systematic attempts to strangle the inhabitants economically has been the destruction of large areas of cultivated land by helicopter spraying with poisonous herbicides in the village lands of Dura, Idna, Al-Dhahiriya, Yatta and a score of neighbouring villages in the Al-Khalil governorate. Olive, wheat and barley crops have been destroyed; the crops of a whole year of toil and sweat by the area's farmers were instantly lost to a people impoverished by 13 years of occupa-

tion. This abominable deed was perpetrated by an agricultural squad known as the Sharoon Patrol. The secrecy surrounding this mission of destruction could not be maintained for too long, when these helicopter herbicide sprays resulted in the total destruction of the crops.

68. Even philanthropic societies have been prevented from obtaining funds either internally, from their people, or from the outside, so as to paralyse their humanitarian programmes.

69. The Zionist Rabbinical Congregation in Israel recently and provocatively adopted a resolution demanding jurisdiction and sovereignty over the land of the Al-Haram Al-Sharif Holy Sanctuary in Jerusalem. This, I need hardly state, has been responded to by our people under occupation, and will be more universally responded to as the Zionists' aggressive plot against Islam's first Qibla and third holiest shrine unfolds. These are the lands and the people who for 13 years have been brutally held hostage by a Zionist entity which holds far stronger forces hostage, preventing them from exercising their will and shouldering their world-wide responsibilities.

70. No matter what the outcome of this debate on the draft resolution [S/13911] before the Council, I urge the Council to raise its voice loud and clear to safeguard the oppressed Palestinians pending a final solution. This is a humanitarian act devolving upon the Council and the Secretary-General. It is a matter of elementary human rights for which I appeal to the Council to shoulder the responsibility. There is nothing in the draft resolution, as I see it, which has not already been enshrined in numerous resolutions of the United Nations.

71. Self-determination and the cessation of an oppressive occupation should be a *sine qua non* of any just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East. The right of return is as natural as it is incontrovertible under all laws, human and divine. Failure to support it would simply demonstrate the serious malfunctioning of a United Nations true to its ideals, true to its resolutions and true to the eternal laws of justice and humanity. This is the acid test of honesty versus hypocrisy, freedom versus bondage, humanity versus subservience to the brutality of power and inhumanity.

72. It is the earnest hope of my delegation that the Council will find it possible to see the light of truth and the road to a just peace, thus ending the indescribable agony and suffering of the Palestinian people.

73. Mr. OUMAROU (Niger) (*interpretation from French*): It is far from my intention to digress, but I should like to relate a rather juicy piece of news: a former member of the Rhodesian Government of the notorious Ian Smith, Mr. Rowan Cronje, asked the

South Africans a few weeks ago to make a rapid "change", "so as to stabilize the whole of southern Africa". Mr. Cronje, himself of South African origin and a white member of the Zimbabwe Parliament, added that the changes he called for should not take place "to satisfy the international community, but to resolve the internal problems of the inhabitants of the country". "Do it now; it is imperative", cried this former racist minister to the no less racist white South Africans whom he was addressing.

74. This warning, clearly the bitter fruit of a belated facing of the facts, could equally well apply, word for word, to Israel, whose stubbornness with regard to the vital problems of its region is at least the equal of the blindness of the South African régime.

75. This is the umpteenth time that the international community, and Israel's friends, allies and sympathizers, have called upon that country to make the necessary effort to contribute to restoring peace in the Middle East. It is the umpteenth time that, having heard the international community, its own friends, allies and sympathizers, Israel has persisted in its refusal and increased its acts of arrogance to make it clear that it is still invulnerable in its isolation. The daily deterioration of the situation in the West Bank, in which the Israeli settlers and soldiers are closely involved, the unbridled colonization of Arab lands in which Israel continues to strengthen the Jewish settlements, the Judaization or impending Judaization of several Arab towns in the occupied territories, frequent and murderous raids on the territory of certain neighbouring States, the continued and carefully intensified profanation of Jerusalem, all this demonstrates that Israel is determined to defy international opinion and to engulf the whole region in a vast conflagration if necessary.

76. Neither the Security Council nor the world can permit so explosive and dangerous a situation to continue. That is why Niger believes that the time has come to call on the Council to abandon an attitude which is far too dilatory and has the grave disadvantage of giving comfort to Israel, and which keeps the Arabs and the Palestinians seething with frustration.

77. The resolutions of the General Assembly must be vigorously followed up in the Council. They must be translated by us into a courageous resolution in which the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people are finally recognized, proclaimed and protected. The report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which has been before the Council since 1976, contains recommendations in that regard, and the least we can do is put them into effect rapidly. These recommendations highlight the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, national sovereignty and a return to their homeland; they deplore Israel's annexation of Palestinian territories occupied since 1967; and, at the same time, they indicate ways and means to solve the Palestine problem.

78. Niger vigorously supports those recommendations and calls for the opening, on the basis of the recommendations, of urgent talks between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization, which more than 110 countries throughout the world have recognized as the sole and authentic representative of the Palestinian people.

79. But Niger believes also that at least two countries are needed for a fight, and that the will to peace must equally emanate from all the parties in question. That is why Niger is making an urgent appeal for the cessation of the state of belligerency in the area so that in all quarters grudges may be set aside and future relationships fashioned on the basis not of military commitments, aggressive intransigence or warlike aims, but of a firm and positive determination to come to terms with the circumstances, while preserving what is essential and showing respect for law. As the Committee has itself affirmed, the existence of Israel is a reality which must be taken into account. But there is also the Palestinian reality, and at long last that reality must be given hope and a future through the creation of a free and sovereign Palestinian State. It is our duty to work towards that end.

80. Mr. ESSAAFI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): In opening this debate in the Council, on 31 March, the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Ambassador Falilou Kane of Senegal, reminded the Council of this elementary imperative:

"if we truly desire to solve the overall problem of the Middle East we must start by recognizing the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, a right that is at the very heart of the Palestinian question" [2204th meeting, para. 36].

He concluded:

"We have every hope that the Council will do this because that is the price of peace in the Middle East and, indeed, in the whole world." [*Ibid.*, para. 37.]

81. The draft resolution before the Council in document S/13911 only reproduces, in their essence, the recommendations of the Committee, which have been before the Council since 1976. If the Council did not take a decision then, or in October 1977 or in June and August 1979, it was because a member of the Council on each occasion asked for a postponement of a decision, pleading the negotiations under way on the Middle East problem.

82. The argument seemed convincing in the sense that it gave rise to some hope for progress on the political outcome and on a lessening of tension in the area. On both scores, the Council is today quite well educated, because our discussions during the past six weeks have dealt with one or another of the aspects

of the situation in the Middle East, and have demonstrated to us a continued deterioration of that situation and an escalation of provocations that are apparently impossible to control, including provocations by the very ones who have been preaching patience to us for four years.

83. At its last session, the General Assembly took note of the danger and, in its resolution 34/65 A, urged the Council "to consider and take as soon as possible a decision on the recommendations endorsed by the General Assembly". We believe that the Council is in a position to do that, and indeed has the duty to do it.

84. The draft resolution before the Council was prepared by the Committee. It is our hope that the members of the Council will come out clearly and overwhelmingly in favour of it.

85. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on Mr. Falilou Kane, the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

86. Mr. KANE (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People) (*interpretation from French*): Thank you, Mr. President, for giving me this final opportunity to express the views of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which initiated this series of Council meetings.

87. Since 31 March, when the Council began its consideration of the question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights, all the delegations that have participated in the debate, with one sole exception, have unequivocally stated that they favour self-determination for the Palestinian people and that people's right to establish a sovereign, independent State. That means that the international community is fully aware that no lasting solution can be envisaged or implemented in the Middle East while there is disregard for the aspirations of a people that has been and is still being trampled under foot, martyred and condemned to exile.

88. How can we respond to the hopelessness of that people? How can we redress an injustice which has lasted far too long, an injustice the perpetrators of which are among us? Those are the questions which arise and to which the Security Council is called upon to reply.

89. There can be only one reply: the one that preserves peace in that part of the world, the one which we have advocated and which is embodied in the draft resolution before us, sponsored by Tunisia. In a disrupted world in which uncertainty and insecurity tend to become the rule rather than the exception, it is difficult to believe that the Council could adopt a position which would contradict that of the General

Assembly, which is, we must recall, the deliberative body of the Organization. Whether we like it or not, that would result in a crisis of confidence in the United Nations as an institution. Let us reflect on that.

90. In our view, there cannot be two opposing and contradictory wills in this institution, that of the General Assembly and that of the Security Council. The countries which might bring that about must shoulder the full responsibility, which would be comparable to the responsibility of the Horsemen of the Apocalypse who sowed terror, death and destruction in their path.

91. The region of the Middle East is a powder keg. It has been so and is even more so today, if one takes into account what is occurring in Afghanistan and in Iran. Who can foresee today what could happen in that region? The boldest experts would hesitate to advance hypotheses. Continuing to act like an ostrich by refusing to recognize the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination will not enhance the prestige of the Council nor contribute to restoring the fortunes of the United Nations. On the contrary: it is the opposite attitude, that of courage, which has been adopted by almost all the delegations taking part in this debate, which is logical and understandable. That is the only path that is in accordance with the Charter because it preserves peace and security in the world. Finally, it is that path which will enable us to foster the hope for justice among the oppressed peoples, and first and foremost the Palestinian people.

92. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of MEXICO.

93. Today we shall come to the end of another stage in the consideration of an age-old problem, a problem that has repeatedly and urgently held the political attention of our Organization. In fact, the multilateral treatment of the question of Palestine antedates the existence of the United Nations and is clearly the vestige of past imperial disputes.

94. In the course of more than 30 years, the question on our agenda has become a prototype which bears witness to the evolution of the international conscience, as reflected in the votes in the General Assembly, and which has constantly tested the prestige and the effectiveness of the Security Council.

95. One by one, almost 100 peoples have attained their independence during the life of the United Nations. One by one, the political and territorial conflicts in the Middle East have found the paths to a solution. Viewed in that light, the still pending case of Palestine appears both as an unjustifiable exception and as the main centre of instability in what is today the most coveted region in the world.

96. Every approach to the question of Palestine has been taken in this forum: from political pleas to

juridical analyses, from historical studies to anecdotes. Virtually everything has been tried but we have not managed to define what is fundamental: the right of the Palestinian people to establish an independent State.

97. With the passage of time, however, the international community has reached certain irreversible conclusions, namely: that there will be no just and lasting peace in the Middle East without a recognition of the right of every nation to an independent existence; that the self-determination of the Palestinian people entails and presupposes the full exercise of its national rights; that Israel must withdraw from the territories occupied by force since 1967; and that the Palestine Liberation Organization is the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and of its struggles for freedom.

98. Those tenets have been defined through the expressed will of the majority in the United Nations and they derive from the fundamental rules on which the Organization rests. For Mexico, as well as for many other countries which have suffered oppression and persecution, the affirmation of those principles is closely identified with national dignity.

99. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of my country, in referring, *inter alia*, to the question of Palestine at the Sixth Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, stated:

“The first and foremost right of man and of peoples is the right to self-determination, which is a prerequisite of all other rights. No other claim, to so-called historical or any other rights, enjoys the same pre-eminence in our time as that to self-determination. For Mexico, that is the overriding and key principle which must obtain before any other consideration. We believe that the main political problems of the world arise from the fact that the right of many peoples to determine, for themselves and in a sovereign way, their political organization as independent States has not been enforced.”

100. When my delegation spoke on 27 February [2202nd meeting], it expressed various considerations about this conflict. We have now reached a definition of principle which some are attempting to oppose with arguments of interpretation and timing with which we do not agree.

101. The first such argument refers to the scope of the concept of self-determination. For some, recognition of the right to the existence of an independent and sovereign State is tantamount to prejudging the direction in which a people will exercise its right to self-determination. This argument is historically inaccurate. Any nation which has emerged to independent life after a process of armed struggle has claimed the right to independence, not only as a logical conse-

quence but also as a precondition to the exercise of its self-determination. This has been the internal logic of all the independence movements in Africa, the Americas and Asia. Otherwise, the birth of a State would be subject to outside strategies and even to the will of the occupying Power. The possibility would then open up of alternative formulas, such as autonomy—which is only one type of administration—replacing the exercise of national rights, thus frustrating the exercise of political self-determination. I am convinced that none of us would agree to the replacement of his country's sovereignty by a mere status of administrative autonomy.

102. It is also argued that it is out of order to reaffirm the right to constitute a State unless we previously define its territorial boundaries. That thesis is put to rest by a reading of resolution 242 (1967) to which, in the view of my delegation, we should add this afternoon. Thus, we would recognize the right of all the peoples of the region to existence as States and conditions would effectively be created for them to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

103. Finally, some maintain that the time for issuing statements on the substance of the question has not yet come. We respect the reasons of those who hold this view, but we believe that, since we are dealing with fundamental principles on which the existence of a nation as well as the maintenance of peace depend, the sooner the better.

104. Any effort in good faith which may be under way or which may be attempted to resolve the problem must begin with a recognition of the principles and the rights embodied in the draft resolution before us. That is the framework which should guide the actions of the interested parties and of all States in the search for a true solution to this conflict.

105. At the end of this meeting we shall also come to the end of the period during which the delegation of Mexico, after more than a third of a century, has had the honour to preside over the work of the Council. I wish to express my appreciation to all members for their co-operation, to the Secretary-General for his diligent interest in our work and to the Secretariat for its invaluable co-operation with us.

106. We have worked very intensely from the first to the last day of the month. The present circumstances, together with the sense of responsibility of the members of the Council, have kept us in practically continuous activity. The debates have concluded with two resolutions adopted on problems which required urgent decisions—acts of aggression against Zambia and in Lebanon. The question on our agenda today will also culminate in a vote which we hope will contribute to the solution of an old and serious problem.

107. The questions we have considered reflect, at the same time, the pressures of everyday political

reality and the legacy bequeathed by the past to the international community. That is what motivates the Council to act and also what limits the scope of its action.

108. The questions we have dealt with during this year have one characteristic in common: all of them have taken place in developing countries and all of them reflect or involve global interests and strategies of a unilateral character.

109. In recent months we have suffered from a trend towards bipolarity, which we had thought was a thing of the past, and, in response to that, the medium-sized and small countries which do not wish to lose any part of their independence or to be placed under the security guarantee or trusteeship of any Power, have tended to realign themselves.

110. Every day we witness new incidents which affect not only the precarious political stability of the world but also the life and safety of diplomatic agents, that is to say, representatives of national States. This is but a symptom of the deeper evils that we must remedy through a comprehensive understanding of the root causes of the crises.

111. Mexico has taken an active part in the process of making international life more democratic. This trend, which summarizes the evolution of today's world, today meets with new resistance and obvious dangers. It is our responsibility, as developing countries, to promote at all levels a juster international system. We sincerely believe that the activity of the Council must be increasingly tailored to the essential mission which has been entrusted to it, namely, the maintenance of international peace and security.

112. Several delegations concur as to the need for us to adopt a more active stance which might enable us to foresee the course of events and to enter into dialogues that may prevent crises. For that purpose, we may meet at any time and even resort to the exceptional procedures provided for in Article 28, paragraph 2, of the Charter. The holding of meetings at the highest level might allow us, through participation on an equal footing, to overcome the obstacles along the path to greater political and economic co-operation among States. In any event, it is our duty to explore whatever means may be necessary and possible so that the process of political and social change is not interrupted and so that it can take place peacefully.

113. I inherited the presidency of the Council from a diplomat of irreproachable integrity who represents a country with which we stand as brothers in our common decision in favour of independence. I shall hand over the presidency to the noble representative of a nation which shares the same concerns and hopes. I wish him every success.

114. I shall now resume my functions as PRESIDENT of the Council.

115. It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to a vote now on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

116. I shall first call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the vote.

117. Mr. YANGO (Philippines): My delegation approaches the issue before us today imbued with a profound sense of responsibility and aware that the decision of the Council will be a milestone in its history. It is an issue that has defied solution for decades. It has been before the United Nations from the adoption of the partition resolution of 1947 and—before that—it had been before the League of Nations since 1922, following the Balfour Declaration of 1917. Our decision can make or break the peace, already made fragile by the loss of so many lives, the destruction of so much property, and by so many tragedies and so much suffering of the peoples in the Middle East.

118. For the sake of a just peace in the region, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document S/13911, in keeping with my country's policy of support for the just and legitimate cause of the Palestinian people. More specifically, the Philippines supports the right of the people of Palestine to exercise its inalienable national right to self-determination, including the right to establish an independent State in Palestine. In doing so, we affirm once more that the question of Palestine lies at the very heart of the Middle East problem and that unless it is first solved there can be no hope for a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in that region. Unless there is a just peace in the region, international peace and security are imperilled. This is the syllogism of peace that the international community must pursue with all resolve and vigour.

119. In my delegation's statement on the item entitled "The situation in the occupied Arab territories" [2201st meeting], we said that the illegal occupation of Arab territories denies a homeland to the Palestinian people, which has every right to it. Just as resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) recognize the right of the Israeli people to a secure existence as a State, so must we recognize the right of the Palestinian people to a secure existence as a State to ensure an even-handed and balanced approach to the whole question.

120. Resolution 242 (1967) provides a progressive series of steps leading to a comprehensive and just solution of this problem, first, by providing for the withdrawal of all occupying forces and, secondly, by recognizing the right of all the peoples in that region to live within secure and recognized boundaries as States. That must necessarily entail the right of the Israeli State to exist, as it must entail the right of the Palestinian State to exist. Justice demands that the

international community recognize and give decisive support to the full exercise of this fundamental right by the peoples of Palestine and Israel.

121. Palestinian refugees wishing to return to their homes and to live in peace with their neighbours should be enabled to do so, and those choosing not to return should receive just compensation for their property, as provided in General Assembly resolution 194 (III).

122. Experience has shown that there may be practical difficulties in implementing decisions achieved at the conference table, difficulties arising from, first, the obvious lack of mutual trust and confidence between the parties—a serious effort must be made to establish a favourable climate; secondly, the cloud of suspicion that hangs over attempts to negotiate this issue—which must be dispelled; thirdly, the refusal of both parties to recognize each other's existence and even each other's right to exist. Let us appeal to both parties to begin to recognize each other's existence.

123. Because this question has confronted humanity for so long, my delegation welcomes all initiatives, including the draft resolution that is now before the Council, aimed at achieving a just, peaceful and comprehensive solution. Let us hope that in an effort to bring this question to a successful conclusion, all parties will henceforth resolve their differences at the conference table.

124. We can debate this issue endlessly; we can adopt resolutions one after another; but unless the parties directly concerned begin to face up to and accept their responsibility to mankind, we shall never be done with this problem. We believe that nothing is impossible of achievement in human affairs, as long as all the parties are willing to come together and exercise political will in the spirit of good will and mutual trust. It is time indeed for the peoples of Israel and Palestine to embark upon this historic enterprise and for all humanity to stand fast with them.

125. Mr. MATHIAS (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of Portugal has always emphasized in the Council the importance it attaches to decisions adopted by consensus. Our efforts have always been directed towards achieving consensus; for we are aware that politics is the art of the possible and that it is preferable and certainly more constructive to obtain by means of negotiation and in a spirit of conciliation results that can mobilize the general will of the members of the Council.

126. The patient search for that kind of solution, made with a clear awareness of the facts and a humble spirit of balance, must however take place at a time or within a context that requires both a softening of positions and some flexibility of views. But we fear that in the case before us this initial difficulty has not been overcome, and we note with great regret that

there are still too many different views about the best way for the Council to approach the question we are considering today, the way that would make possible, as we would have hoped, a broad consensus in support of the Palestinian cause.

127. In so far as my delegation is concerned, and addressing ourselves to the substance of the matter, we wish once again to reaffirm that we consider that no all-encompassing search for peace in the Middle East can be undertaken without first taking into consideration the legitimate national and political rights of the Palestinian people and, therefore, its right to return, its right to self-determination and its right to a homeland. The fate of this people lies at the very core of the question of peace or war in the Middle East, and only respect for these rights will, in our view, make possible a lasting, peaceful settlement of this conflict in the region.

128. Such a settlement would also call for the direct participation of the legitimate representatives of the Palestinian people in all negotiations aimed at achieving a just and comprehensive peace and would have to be accompanied by the total withdrawal of Israel from the Arab and Palestinian territories occupied in the June 1967 war, including Jerusalem. The acquisition of territory by force is inadmissible, as we have already emphasized.

129. Finally, and without any ambiguity, we wish to reaffirm the right of the State of Israel to exist within secure and recognized boundaries.

130. These elements, which we consider essential, constitute the framework within which the search for peace should be conducted. My Government hopes to be able to contribute to its success and is willing and determined to do so. However, some conditions must accompany these steps. We earnestly hope that they will soon emerge, but in as much as they still seem to be lacking today, we shall abstain in the vote on the draft resolution before the Council.

131. Mr. KOLBY (Norway): The Security Council is addressing the question of Palestinian rights at a particularly delicate stage in the Middle East peace efforts. It is important that the present debate be concluded in a way which may be helpful in achieving our common goal, namely, a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. At the present stage, this may require considerable restraint, as well as flexibility, from all the parties concerned.

132. Norway supports resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) as a basis for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. According to the Norwegian view, peace in that area must be based on the following principles: first, the acquisition of territory by force cannot be accepted; secondly, all the States in the area must have the right to exist in peace within secure and recognized boundaries; thirdly, the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people must be implemented.

133. Norway has from the outset given full support to the Camp David agreements as an important first step towards a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict. We strongly welcome the rapid normalization of relations between Israel and Egypt and the fact that the Israeli withdrawal from Sinai and other bilateral arrangements have been implemented on schedule.

134. On the other hand, progress seems so far to have been rather modest in the trilateral talks on autonomy for the West Bank and Gaza. These talks are, as we know, supposed to be completed before 26 May this year. In accordance with the Camp David agreements, autonomy for the West Bank and Gaza can only be seen as a transitional arrangement, pending a just, comprehensive and durable settlement of the Middle East conflict. Whatever the outcome of the current trilateral talks, the Palestinian issue will remain the key issue which has to be solved if a comprehensive settlement of the conflict is to be achieved.

135. Since 1974, my Government has taken the view that an overall peaceful solution to the Middle East conflict must give the Palestinian people the opportunity to exercise its right to self-determination. Invariably, my Government has at the same time strongly underlined the fact that the right of the Palestinians to self-determination must not in any way undermine or threaten the right of Israel to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

136. Whatever the outcome of the trilateral talks, Palestinian participation in the negotiations for a comprehensive settlement remains a key element, both as a requirement for further progress and as a concrete expression, at the present stage of the peace efforts, of the Palestinian right to self-determination. Also, the Camp David agreements stipulate that representatives of the Palestinian people should participate in negotiations on the resolution of the Palestinian problem in all its aspects.

137. The question of Palestinian participation in future negotiations of course raises the question of the role of the Palestine Liberation Organization. The question can always be raised as to how representative a given Palestinian group or organization in fact is. However, it is clear that no other organization, group or individual can claim to be more representative than the PLO. Hence it is difficult to envisage real progress without the PLO's sharing responsibility for the negotiations in one way or another.

138. The Council is now about to vote on the draft resolution before us. My delegation regrets this. It would have been advisable to await a larger measure of agreement before the Council takes a decision on a question of such major importance. We consider the draft resolution before us unbalanced. It also seems to prejudge the outcome of future negotiations. Norway will therefore abstain in the vote on it.

139. Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): The complex and constantly interacting problems of the Middle East have been a source of instability and tragedy for many decades. Continuing efforts have been made to reach a comprehensive settlement. Time and again, dedicated efforts and imaginative proposals have been frustrated by seemingly uncontrollable events.

140. But there are some positive developments. As a result of statesmanship on all sides, a peace treaty was signed between Israel and Egypt, and this was an historic event which would have been considered unachievable prior to President Sadat's trip to Jerusalem and his warm reception there.

141. Important as the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty is, all concerned recognize that it deals with only one aspect of the many-faceted Arab-Israeli conflict. The Palestinian dimension is one of the crucial issues which must be resolved in the context of working towards a comprehensive settlement. Accordingly, the Camp David accords call for the solution of the Palestinian problem in all of its aspects.

142. As everyone knows, we are now engaged in serious and intensive negotiations to provide for the security of Israel and to fulfil the commitment in the Camp David framework to establishing full autonomy for the people of the West Bank and Gaza during a transitional period, pending further negotiations to resolve the final status of these territories. If successful, these negotiations will provide the Palestinians living in those areas with a real opportunity to manage their own lives for the first time in modern history.

143. The Palestinian issue is of central importance. The question is how best to make progress on this and other important outstanding issues.

144. We recognize that the approach we have taken has generated disagreement among some in the Middle East. This is not unexpected, nor are we surprised at the difficulty of the problems that are now under negotiation. We do not seek to persuade the pessimists or those who despair of a peace settlement. We know that conviction will come only with results, and that results will require time. The point is that this is the only politically viable avenue available at this time. No one has been able to come up with a workable alternative. Although all of us agree on the necessity for a solution of the Palestinian problem in all its aspects, there is wide disagreement on the best means of achieving this goal. It is nevertheless essential that we do so.

145. There are over 3 million Palestinians in the Middle East, including many of the best educated and most able people of the region. Their voices must be heard and their desire to manage their daily lives and their political future must be recognized. Some live in the Arab world outside the West Bank and Gaza and

have made distinguished contributions. Others remain, tragically, refugees in camps, dependent in some degree on services provided by the international community through the United Nations. Over a million in the West Bank of the Jordan River and the Gaza Strip live under Israeli military rule. Wherever they are, with few exceptions, they think of themselves as Palestinians. This reality must be taken into account if an end to the conflict is to be found.

146. At the same time, the people of Israel have sought for more than 30 years to live at peace with their neighbours, within secure and recognized borders. Until President Sadat's visit to Jerusalem, Camp David and the signing of the Israeli-Egyptian peace treaty, Israel was denied any practical expression of that desire. With the autonomy talks, Israel has a chance to move one step closer to the comprehensive peace it has long sought, and this reality too must be taken into account.

147. On an issue of such importance for the world, and for the Palestinian and Israeli peoples, we should not be distracted by approaches that offer no prospect for making practical progress. We should not adopt an approach that does not endorse resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), the agreed basis for all peace efforts in the Middle East, an approach which, indeed, seeks to change resolution 242 (1967). We should not allow the United Nations to be used in this way. The clash of opposites and the sharpening of contradictions have no place here, in this body dedicated to the maintenance of peace and the resolution of disputes through peaceful means.

148. The United States is engaged in negotiations within the framework agreed on in September 1978 at Camp David with the participation of the President of the United States. By accepting the Camp David framework, Israel and Egypt have committed themselves to working towards a comprehensive peace in the Middle East, a peace which, the two parties affirm in the accords, must resolve the Palestinian question in all its aspects and recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. This must be done in such a manner as to permit the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza to participate in the determination of their own future while preserving the security of all the parties. We are now entering a crucial stage of the negotiations which, if successful, will constitute an important step towards the realization of those objectives.

149. I know that in many quarters there is scepticism as to whether the negotiations in this framework can succeed. The road ahead will be difficult. But together with Israel and Egypt we ask only to be judged by the results we obtain. At the same time, if we ask that others judge us by the results of our efforts, we will apply the same standard to this draft resolution. Judged by that standard, it cannot bring the achievement of peace one day closer to practical

reality. A solution cannot be found by fiat. It must be the result of negotiation. It is to this end—the attainment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East—that the United States has committed itself. We reaffirm that commitment today.

150. There, simply stated, is the approach which the United States takes towards the draft resolution before the Council. It follows, therefore, that the United States will oppose the draft resolution.

151. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/13911.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Bangladesh, China, German Democratic Republic, Jamaica, Mexico, Niger, Philippines, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Zambia

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: France, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The result of the vote was 10 votes in favour, 1 against and 4 abstentions.

The draft resolution was not adopted, the negative vote being that of a permanent member of the Council.

152. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

153. Mr. MANSFIELD (United Kingdom): For reasons which my delegation has explained clearly and repeatedly to the parties principally concerned, the United Kingdom abstained on the draft resolution on which the Council has just voted. The decision to abstain was taken solely because of the timing of the draft resolution. We have not considered its substance. But this should not be taken as a sign that we are not interested in the active search for a peaceful and just settlement in the Middle East, or that we do not accept that the right of the Palestinians to determine their own future as a people lies at the heart of the problem, or that we do not believe that Israel has a right to exist within secure boundaries. On the contrary, the question was discussed at the recent meeting of the Heads of State and Government of the European Community in Luxembourg, when they directed their Foreign Ministers to submit a report on the Middle East problem for the next session of the European Council, which will be held in Venice at the end of June.

154. Mr. LEPRETTE (France) (*interpretation from French*): We have now reached the end of a further debate on the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. On several occasions in the past my delegation

has had an opportunity to express the views of the French Government on this problem, which is one of the most complex ever faced by the Council. Last August [2163rd meeting] we recalled in this very chamber the need for a settlement of the Palestinian problem if peace and security were to be established in the Middle East. In particular, we stressed the conditions that had to be met if such a settlement were to be possible. Only recently, on 8 March 1980, during his visit to Amman, the President of the French Republic himself stated:

“The right of each State in the region to live in peace within secure, recognized and guaranteed borders must be confirmed. This right to security is a universal right, as we have pointed out in the United Nations, and France understands in that connection the legitimate concerns of the State of Israel. But Israel must recognize that its occupation of Arab territories since 1967 prevents it from establishing with its neighbours the peaceful relations to which it aspires . . . At the same time, we must recognize the true nature of the Palestine problem. It is not a refugee problem but, rather, the problem of a people aspiring to exist and organize itself as a people. By exercising its right to self-determination—also a universal right—within the framework of a peace settlement, it must be able to take a decision on its own destiny and to possess a homeland. For France, those are the two conditions for peace in the Middle East. Their implementation requires the co-operation and support of all the parties concerned.”

155. Now, who can say precisely that that co-operation and support exist at the present time? I am sure that no one would venture to make such a claim in present circumstances. That is why, from the very beginning of this debate, a postponement seemed to us by far the best course. During consultations over the past few weeks, we have been unstinting in our efforts to have this view conceded and to spare the Council a deadlock. And that had seemed to us to be the view of several other delegations too.

156. When it became clear, nevertheless, that that appeal would not be heeded and that our Council would have to take a stand on a text that could not be adopted, the French delegation made one last effort. It seemed to us that if certain amendments were made, the draft before the Council could win broader support. But our efforts did not meet with the response we had hoped for. Thus, although this text does contain a number of provisions that also reflect our point of view, we have had to abstain in the vote taken this evening.

157. My delegation remains convinced, however, that matters must not be left as they stand and that everything possible must now be done to establish conditions that would enable the Council to take up again—and this time under favourable conditions—the

question of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. In that regard, I should like to recall in particular that during its meeting on 23 April, the European Council made the following statement:

“Only a just and lasting comprehensive settlement could bring about true peace in the Middle East. Aware that Europe can, when the time comes, play a part, the Council instructed the Foreign Ministers to submit to it at its next session a report on this problem.”

158. The countries of the European Community thus had in mind the search for a common position leading to a new initiative when the necessary conditions have been met. I would express the wish that very soon we shall have grounds for hope in this regard.

159. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic, like the overwhelming majority of the members of the Council, voted in favour of the draft resolution in document S/13911 because it contains the necessary fundamental requirements for a comprehensive and just solution to the Middle East conflict. The draft resolution confirms the inalienable national right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including the right to establish an independent State in Palestine. It demands that Israel withdraw from all the Arab territories occupied since June 1967, including Jerusalem. It also calls for guarantees for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all States in the area, including the sovereign independent State of Palestine, and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

160. This draft resolution thus constitutes appreciable progress when compared with previous resolutions of the Council. In the view of the delegation of the German Democratic Republic, however, a comprehensive and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict cannot be achieved without vigorous resistance to the imperialistic manoeuvres typified by Camp David. We stress this even more energetically in connection with the dangerous policy that has once again been demonstrated here today by the use of the veto. We see here a link with other actions by the imperialistic circles in the United States designed to intensify international tension in various parts of the world, be it the Near and Middle East, the Indian Ocean or the Caribbean.

161. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic would like once again to confirm its support for and solidarity with those peoples offering resistance to that kind of imperialistic policy, whether in the Near and Middle East, in South-West Asia or in the Caribbean.

162. We wish once again to express the hope that reason and an understanding of the facts will prevail.

163. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation, along with the majority of the other members of the Council, supported the draft resolution on the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people that was before the Council. In spite of the fact that, for well-known reasons, that draft resolution has not been adopted, the Soviet delegation believes the Council's discussion of the question of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people has been useful and important. The discussion in the Council has demonstrated the growing support for the just cause of the Arab people of Palestine by the overwhelming majority of the members of the Council and of the Member States of the United Nations as a whole. It has confirmed that the Palestinians must be allowed to exercise their inalienable national rights to self-determination and national independence without delay. It is now clear to everyone that the Palestinian problem is at the very core of a settlement in the Middle East and that a genuine settlement is impossible without a just solution to that problem, on the basis of respect for the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. Those rights must include the right to establish a truly independent State in Palestine, the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all territories occupied in 1967, including Jerusalem, and the confirmation of the right of all States in the area, including the sovereign, independent State of Palestine, to live in peace within secure and recognized frontiers.

164. The United States, which has just prevented the Council from adopting a resolution confirming those fundamental principles of a just settlement in the Middle East, cannot fail to understand this.

165. There can be no doubt that everyone fully realizes that without satisfying the legitimate demands of the Arab people of Palestine for the restoration of the homeland which has been taken from it, there can be no peace or tranquillity in the Middle East.

166. The natural question then arises, is the United States really interested in a just and lasting Middle East settlement? Is not the United States seeking to maintain in the Middle East a situation of instability and tension, so as to expand its military and political beach-heads in the region, which, besides Israel and Egypt, might include other Arab States?

167. United States policy in the Middle East is not determined only by considerations of the electoral campaign in this country, as the press sometimes tries to imply. Four years ago, when the United States twice voted in the Council against resolutions confirming the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, there was also talk at the time of so-called electoral difficulties in the United States. Now, four years have gone by since the presidential elections of 1976 and the United States not only failed to take advantage of the existing opportunities to establish a lasting and just peace in the Middle East but indeed adopted the

course of a separate settlement, which is an impediment to a just solution to the Palestinian problem and creates a division among the Arab countries as they struggle against imperialist penetration of their region. Regarding the talks which are now under way between the United States, Israel and Egypt within the framework of the Camp David agreements on so-called administrative autonomy for the Palestinians, it was quite rightly pointed out by the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, A. A. Gromyko, at a recent press conference in Paris: "What we are dealing with here, in actual fact, is the consolidation of a régime of occupation."

168. I listened most attentively just now to the representative of the United States and I must confess my disappointment. None of the arguments that he adduced, if subjected to scrupulous analysis, justifies the position taken by the United States in the Security Council. In spite of painstaking attempts by the United States to represent itself as the defender of Arab interests, the anti-Arab essence of American foreign policy in the Middle East is becoming more and more obvious with every passing day. The fact that the United States today prevented the adoption of a draft resolution in support of the lawful rights of the Arab people of Palestine surprised no one. It came as no surprise to the Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, who at the Sixth Summit Conference, held last September in Havana, adopted the following statement:

"The Conference condemned the threat by the United States to use the veto in the Security Council against any resolution concerning the implementation of the Palestinian people's inalienable national rights."²

169. The discussion of the Palestinian problem in the Council and the vote on the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Tunisia have served as one more powerful and clear reminder of the fact that we cannot go on postponing a solution to the Palestinian problem, since upon its speedy and just solution depend not only the fate of 4 million Palestinians but also the fate of peace and security in the Middle East, and indeed not only in that region. It could not have been more cogently demonstrated that the Palestinian problem cannot be resolved behind the backs of the Palestinian people without the full participation of its sole legitimate and authentic representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization.

170. At the same time, the discussion in the Council has shown that an early and just solution to the problems of the Middle East is certainly not being facilitated by the position of those States which, in words, recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and even declare they are in favour of the participation of the PLO, on an equal footing, in talks on these problems, but when it comes to taking a concrete decision, openly boycott any discussion of

the question and resort to entirely unjustified delays and procrastinating tactics.

171. The present situation in the Middle East is so tense and so explosive that it calls urgently for an immediate resolution of the Palestinian problem. It calls for further efforts to support the just cause of the Palestinian people until such time as the Arab people of Palestine has established its own independent State.

172. In conclusion, the Soviet delegation would like to stress that the struggle for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East and for the implementation of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people will not be ended by this discussion but will continue and will draw ever more supporters. The important thing, in this difficult and noble struggle, is not to weaken the efforts of the Arab peoples and their friends to reach that goal. We are sure that that struggle will inevitably be crowned by success, like all the genuine national liberation movements in the present century.

173. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization has asked to speak and I now call upon him.

174. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): This is a glorious result: the Council, by a vote of 10 to 1, has voted in favour of the right of the Palestinian people to exercise its inalienable rights in its own country. The United States has chosen to single itself out and it stands in a minority of one.

175. We are grateful. My people will appreciate, through history, the position of those 10 States that voted in favour of and in support of our rights. As to the States that abstained, we can understand but we cannot find any legitimacy in their reasoning or rationale for delaying a vote on the destiny of a people. Because the best time to vote and to act on the destiny of a people is now—and not in a month or two months.

176. The current debate on the attainment and exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people has demonstrated the overwhelming support of our rights by the international community. The United States has chosen to be singled out in the Council as an obstacle to peace and as an enemy of the principles of the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly—but primarily as an obstacle to peace and to the attainment of international security.

177. At the beginning of the current debate, the Palestine Liberation Organization made it clear that the aim of the so-called framework for peace is to nullify the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. The veto just cast by the United States confirms our reading of that framework and its ramifications. It is

strange that as long ago as 1947 the Government of the United States voted in favour of a Palestinian Arab State in Palestine. Today it uses the tyrannical power of the veto to deny the Palestinian people its inalienable right to self-determination and national independence.

178. The struggle for freedom and the movement for national liberation are not regressive. They are progressive by nature, inspiration and outlook. The Administration of the United States cannot stop the march of time. It cannot order history to "advance counter-clockwise". The writing is on the wall and Washington cannot remain—indeed it cannot afford to remain—illiterate. The lesson of Zimbabwe should be recalled. The Government of the United States is voluntarily blinding itself to the realities of the situation in the Middle East. Need I cite the developments in Iran and the resolution of the Iranian people? But the United States still prefers to ignore the fact that there are peoples in this world, and that electronic devices are no substitute for the will-power of human beings. The United States continues to ignore the human element, it continues to ignore human rights and the aspirations of peoples.

179. Seeing all its ill-fated attempts and acts of aggression, the Government of the United States cannot and must not—indeed it had better not—attempt to perpetuate the bloodshed, misery and turmoil in the Middle East.

180. The veto cast by the United States is no surprise. The current President of the United States is banking on a chip—"no national independence and no self-determination for the Palestinian people". He was reported to have said on 24 March: "We oppose the creation of a Palestinian State". The destiny of a people is not a game of blackjack or of dice. The destiny of a people is decided by that people and the support it gets from the rest of the world. And we did get overwhelming support today.

181. Our people is also determined to continue and to escalate its struggle, including its struggle in this chamber, in all the organs and agencies of the United Nations and in all other international forums, be it the non-aligned movement, the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the Organization of African Unity—to which the PLO has been invited in the capacity of observer—or the League of Arab States. Our struggle also takes shape in other legitimate means against the forces of occupation and foreign domination. We shall maintain and escalate our struggle until we have attained and exercised our inalienable national rights in our own country, in particular those rights affirmed in General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX). That is our will and that is the will of the international community.

182. In its policy against the rights of the Palestinian people the United States Government has remained

consistent. But those who design that policy have in the past advocated a contradictory policy. When they are "intellectuals", university professors or frustrated kindergarten teachers, they teach and say one thing, but when they advance to become presidential advisers on national security, they change. Is there a spell in the White House or the Rose Garden? I shall just cite one example—the case of Mr. Zbigniew Brzezinski. When Mr. Brzezinski was a professor, in the summer of 1975, he wrote an article that appeared in the summer issue of the magazine *Foreign Policy*, from which I shall quote the following:

"Accordingly, the United States should announce its conviction that the only settlement which can be sustained is one which respects the security and right to self-determination of both the Israelis and the Palestinians in their different parts of the old mandate territory. . . . This might not have immediate effect on Israeli policy, and Israel would no doubt do all it could through the United States Congress to change that policy, but a public United States posture in favour of such a settlement would exert powerful influence and would probably gain both domestic and international support.

"There are obviously difficulties with such a policy. It will certainly be argued that it goes too far and that it puts pressure on Israel when it is Israel's life, not that of the United States, which is at stake. It can also be argued that it does not go far enough: it would not of itself put immediate pressure on Israel to change course and might be constantly under fire from Congress. . . . The United States, as the only Power with the capacity to give long-term solidarity to coexistence within the old Palestine between a Jewish and an Arab State, must not take the initiative for an international settlement.

" . . . The Israelis fear that acceptance of a Palestinian State is tantamount to acquiescing in the potential destruction of Israel. But if Israel continues to ignore this problem or to insist that only it can choose the Palestinians with whom to negotiate, it will condemn itself to living perpetually at war and bring about the very danger that the refusal to speak to the PLO is designed to avoid."

Those are the words of Mr. Brzezinski. Yet when Mr. Brzezinski is in power, he seems to forget or not to know whether Gaza is Palestinian, Arab or what, and he says, "Bye, bye, PLO".

183. I shall cite another example. We were told in the Council on 1 March that the United States recognized that there would be no comprehensive peace in the Middle East until the problem of Palestine in all its aspects had been solved. Today the United States has vetoed a constructive approach to bringing about a peaceful and global or comprehensive solution that would be conducive to peace. I do not want to question the credibility of the United States here, but these are just some comments that come to mind.

184. But the current debate in the Council has really served its purpose. It has provided a historic opportunity for a renewal and a reaffirmation of support for the cause and the struggle of the Palestinian people. Veto or no veto, the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people are a fact and the full attainment and exercise of those rights in our own country are also an inevitable historic fact.

185. The Council went through a similar exercise that was aborted by the United States way back in January 1976. Mr. Khaddoumi was heading the delegation of the PLO then, and I should like to quote the following short paragraph from his statement:

"Where do we go from here? As you are fully aware, the PLO is a liberation movement engaged in combating—militarily, politically, economically and culturally—the Zionist occupation of our homeland. We take pride in the fact that our just aspirations and our armed struggle brought so much international support and recognition for the national rights of the people of Palestine and for the PLO." [1879th meeting, para. 203.]

186. In its resolution 34/65 A, the General Assembly had naturally anticipated this aborting of the Council's action by the Government of the United States and its obstruction of the peace efforts, and had authorized and requested the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People

"in the event of the Security Council failing to consider or to take a decision on those recommendations by 31 March 1980, to consider that situation and to make the suggestions it deems appropriate".

So we have not reached a dead end. The Committee will, I am sure, take up this matter again to decide on the course to be followed.

187. Before I conclude, I should like to make a few remarks in reply to the statement of the representative of the United States. He said: "We recognize that the approach we have taken has generated disagreement among some in the Middle East" [para. 144 above]. In the Balfour Declaration there is a reference to the Jewish population and the non-Jewish population of Palestine, and the Jewish population was 8 per cent; the majority was referred to by the expression "non-minority". Today the United States chose to use a different expression—"some". But the "some" are the principal party to the conflict; they are the Palestinian people, and should not be referred to as "some". They are the principal party to the issue. That is only an attempt at insulting the intelligence of the people.

188. The United States representative also said: "No one has been able to come up with a workable alternative" [ibid.]. Is he not aware of the General Assembly resolutions in which the Secretary-General

has been asked to undertake endeavours for a comprehensive peace in a conference in which the Soviet Union and the United States would act as co-chairmen, and that all parties to the conflict, including the PLO, would participate in the conference on the basis of the rights of the Palestinian people? Somebody in the United States administration should read those Assembly resolutions. They cannot hold these resolutions as things for their archives. These are resolutions of the international will.

189. We were then told that "the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza [will be permitted] to participate in the determination of their own future while preserving the security of all the parties" [para. 148 above]. That is something new—that a people should be permitted to participate with others in its self-determination. "Self-determination" is just that. We are not going to a party or to a football game. There is a national right called the right to self-determination.

190. He then told us to judge them on the results they obtain from Camp David. Of course, one of the results is that Sadat permitted his country to be used as a base for the C-130s that invaded Iran the other day. Is that what the Camp David or the framework accords are meant to do?

191. Finally, I repeat our thanks to those who supported the draft resolution and those who abstained in the vote on it, because judging by the statements made by them in explanation of vote, we still feel that there is no difference on the substance. It is either a question of timing or some other marginal consideration, not the substance.

192. For you, Mr. President, this has been a very long month. We are proud of your perseverance; we are proud of your endeavours and of your prudence. Our trust in you has proved legitimate. Even though the Council has been prevented from discharging its duty, I would say that it has done its best, but for the tyrannical vote of the United States.

193. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): There are no further speakers on my list. The Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 8.10 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 35.*

² A/34/542, annex, sect. I, para. 133.

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.
