

UN 1980/12

1980, 31 July



UNITED NATIONS UN/SA COLLECTION

PROVISIONAL

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



A/ES-7/PV.11

30 July 1980

ENGLISH

Seventh emergency special session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ELEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 29 July 1980, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania)
later: Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia)
(Vice-President)

- Credentials of representatives to the seventh emergency special session of the General Assembly: /3/ (continued)
 - (a) Report of the Credentials Committee
- Question of Palestine /5/ (continued)
- Statement by the President

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 3 (continued)

CREDENTIALS OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE SEVENTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY:

(b) REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE (A/ES-7/13)

The PRESIDENT: The draft resolution recommended by the Credentials Committee, in paragraph 13 of its report, was adopted without a vote in the Committee. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution ES-7/1).

Mr. HA VAN LAU (Viet Nam) (interpretation from French): Thank you, Mr. President, for affording me the opportunity to speak on the credentials of the so-called Democratic Kampuchean representative. My delegation fully supports the message dated 22 July 1980 addressed to the Secretary-General from Mr. Hun Sen, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea (A/ES-7/7, annex), in which he states that the so-called representative of Democratic Kampuchea, whose Government was justly overthrown by the Kampuchean people in 1979, no longer represents anyone in Kampuchea. These genocidal criminals were unanimously condemned therefore by the people in Kampuchea and by the whole world. That clique is now being used by the expansionist Powers.

At the present time, the People's Revolutionary Council of the People's Republic of Kampuchea is in full control of the whole country, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kampuchea should be allowed to occupy the seat of Kampuchea in the United Nations and other international organizations. Consequently, my delegation would like to express its formal reservations on the presence of the representative of Democratic Kampuchea at this seventh emergency special session of the General Assembly and I should like my statement to be fully reflected in the records of the General Assembly.

Mr. SOUTHICHAK (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from French): The Lao People's Democratic Republic, while supporting the General Assembly's adoption of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 13 of the Credential Committee's report, would none the less like to indicate that the representative of Kampuchea who has been empowered to serve as the representative at this emergency special session or to any other organization or body should be that of the People's Revolutionary Council of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, the only legitimate representative of the people of Kampuchea.

Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR and the delegations of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia would also like to make the following statement in connexion with the report of the Credentials Committee.

Our delegations believe that the sole legitimate Government in Kampuchea is that of the People's Revolutionary Council of the People's Republic of Kampuchea. No one else is entitled to speak on behalf of the Kampuchean people in the United Nations, as well as in other international organizations. With respect to those individuals in the United Nations who are posing as representatives of the people of Kampuchea and claiming the right to participate in this session, as is well known, they represent no one at all other than the clique that was overthrown by the Kampuchean people for the atrocities committed against their own people.

Mr. THIOUNN (Democratic Kampuchea) (interpretation from French): It is most unfortunate that the representative of the Vietnamese expansionist hegemonists has made a statement at this emergency special session devoted to the question of Palestine. The delegation of Democratic Kampuchea would like to express its formal objections to the presence of Viet Nam in the United Nations and in all related bodies. My delegation energetically opposes the presence in this Assembly of the representatives of the greatest violators of the principles of the United Nations Charter of non-alignment and of international law. These are the representatives of the greatest war criminals which have already killed more than 2 million Kampucheans in mass massacres and by toxic chemicals

(Mr. Thiounn, Democratic Kampuchea)

and by deliberately spreading famine throughout the country. These Vietnamese regional expansionists must fully apply General Assembly resolution 34/22, which calls for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Kampuchea, thus enabling the people of Kampuchea to decide their own future and destiny free from outside interference.

As long as they fail to implement that resolution, their presence in the United Nations will imperil the prestige of this international Organization and constitute encouragement to violate the Charter, aggression and armed interference in the domestic affairs of Member States of the United Nations, the occupation of territories by foreign forces and regional and world expansionism, which now and in the future constitutes the greatest danger to the independence of all States and nations and to international peace and security.

By boosting the Vietnamese Government in Phnom Penh with arrogance and cynicism, the Vietnamese representative is only reminding the Assembly that the Hanoi Government is continuing to flout resolution 34/22 adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session and has been pursuing its war of aggression and racial extermination against Democratic Kampuchea and the Kampuchean people.

If the Vietnamese régime at Phnom Penh truly enjoys the support of the Kampuchean people, it is legitimate to ask why the Vietnamese regional expansionists have not withdrawn the 250,000 Vietnamese soldiers and the 30 or 40,000 Vietnamese advisers from Kampuchea. The hard truth is that the Vietnamese invaders are being attacked everywhere by the Kampuchean people and are now bogged down in their war of aggression in Kampuchea; but they are able to continue their acts of aggression only because of the \$3 million a day in aid that they are receiving from the Soviet Union. Without that criminal aid and without the 300,000 Vietnamese soldiers and advisers, the Vietnamese régime in Phnom Penh would obviously collapse like a house of cards.

There is only one way out for the Vietnamese regional expansionists and that is for them to renounce gangsterism and the law of the jungle that they have adopted as their code of conduct in their international relations and fully to implement resolution 34/22 of the General Assembly.

AGENDA ITEM 5 (continued)

QUESTION OF PALESTINE: DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/ES-7/L.1 and Corr.1, A/ES-7/L.2)

The PRESIDENT: I should like to announce that the following countries have become sponsors of draft resolutions. In respect of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1 and Corr.1: Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Jamaica, Lebanon and Saudi Arabia. In respect of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.2: Afghanistan, Cape Verde, Guyana and Jamaica.

Mr. CORADIN (Haiti)(interpretation from French): Having been recently appointed my country's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, I have not had the opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your election as President of the thirty-fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly. It is my pleasure to do so today and to pay a tribute to the fraternal country you represent and with which my own is united by bonds of race and common interests in the struggle for a free and independent Africa. Your vast experience in multilateral diplomacy and your thorough knowledge of international problems allow us to hope that the work of this emergency special session of the General Assembly will be guided successfully and competently.

I should also like to transmit to our Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, my Government's appreciation of the tireless efforts he is making in the service of the Organization and for the cause of world peace. He is giving the best of himself to those efforts - his devotion, his patience, his sense of initiative and his talents as a negotiator.

The question before the seventh emergency special session of the General Assembly is not, unfortunately, a new one. It is an integral part of the tortured, violent and tragic history of the Middle East. It is a question whose origin goes back to the First World War, but one concerning which no fundamental disagreement existed among the permanent members of the Security Council until 1948. However, when the interplay of Power interests was translated into a balance of forces, the Middle East region became an arena for confrontation. Since that time, the international community has been dealing with this situation - with all the injustices, violence and armed conflicts it entails - without being able to find a solution to it that could satisfy the parties involved. Numerous resolutions have been adopted in the Security Council and in the General Assembly. Alas, they have not achieved a settlement of the conflict.

(Mr. Coradin, Haiti)

The seventh emergency special session of the General Assembly, the third to have been seized of the situation in the Middle East, has for over five days been devoted to seeking a solution to the extremely complex and difficult question of Palestine.

The position of Haiti results from the relations of friendship, understanding and co-operation it enjoys with all the countries parties to the conflict. Thus it views with considerable concern the fact that the problems facing them have not yet been solved, and it therefore considers itself in duty bound to make its modest contribution to the search for peace in that part of the world.

For my delegation, this is an opportunity to reiterate the Haitian Government's support for the principles of the Charter and to renew its confidence in the United Nations, which has demonstrated its competence in solving the problems facing the international community. My Government remains convinced that the measures implemented by the Organization are effective for combating underdevelopment, racial discrimination, violations of human rights and threats to peace and international security.

Within this context, my delegation stands ready to support any peace initiatives, from whatever country or group, so long as they are positive and are undertaken with the single purpose of promoting a just and definitive settlement of the situation in the Middle East.

Indeed, during the past two decades, peace initiatives have been undertaken by the United Nations and by the United States of America. Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in our view represents the principal basis upon which a plan for settlement of the Israeli-Arab conflict can be constructed. The Camp David accords would have been a noteworthy peace effort had they continued to maintain the understanding between Egypt and Israel. That, is not the case, but however that may be, the idea should be retained. The accords would have been a milestone along the road towards a final settlement of the conflict.

The Haitian Government, whose foreign policy is based on the historical traditions of the Haitian people, supports in principle all liberation struggles. Those traditions have been formed by the heavy sacrifices we ourselves have made in achieving our own independence. We can therefore understand and

(Mr. Coradin, Haiti)

share the sufferings being endured by the people of the Middle East who have been face to face with violence for far too many years.

The Haitian people is a freedom-loving and peace-loving people. My Government will never stray from these basic principles. The harmonious relations my country maintains with the majority of the other members of the international community reflect a desire for understanding and co-operation. As a member of the United Nations, Haiti has never failed to shoulder its responsibilities. Its delegation has always attempted to act in accordance with this policy, whether with regard to such questions as apartheid and racial discrimination, respect for human rights and the rights of peoples to self-determination.

It is for this reason that the Haitian Government, basing itself on the principles of the United Nations Charter and the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on the situation in the Middle East, clearly and unambiguously stated its position on the question of Palestine during the thirty-fourth session.

In principle - and here we are expressing a widely shared opinion - all the peoples in the region have the right to exist and the right to live in peace within secure and recognized borders. Although the Israeli-Arab conflict arises out of parallel positions, the following points must be included in the framework of any settlement to the problem: the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and independence must be recognized, and the existence of the State of Israel must be guaranteed and it must be provided with secure borders. By basing itself on these points, the international community will be acting with wisdom. They will provide a just and equitable solution to this conflict that is responsible for the loss of so many human lives.

My delegation has had occasion to examine the draft resolutions distributed to members of the Assembly. However, they do not fully

(Mr. Coradin, Haiti)

correspond to our view with regard to the settlement of the conflict, nor do they correspond to the spirit of tolerance and understanding that has always characterized the positions we have taken on the international scene.

For this reason, my delegation once more requests the members of this Assembly to reaffirm their support for the principles of the Charter in order to arrive at a peaceful, just and equitable solution to a situation that has gone on for far too long. Palestinians and Israelis must enter into a dialogue; they must sit down together at the same conference table to discuss their problems together, for this emergency special session can have no concrete result if the parties concerned do not settle their differences face to face. The goal we are all pursuing is to see peace restored in every Israeli and Palestinian home, to enable the Israelis to live in confidence within their borders, and to ensure that the tragic Diaspora outside the borders of Gaza, Judea and Samaria can re-enter its lost Palestine.

Mr. LOBO (Mozambique): First of all, my delegation would like to express sincere satisfaction on this occasion for having you, Mr. President, a son of Tanzania, a front-line sister State, to preside over this emergency special session on Palestine. The commitment of your country to the just causes of peace, justice and liberty, and the wisdom and impartiality with which you conducted the previous sessions, are a guarantee to us that this session will achieve success and constitute an important historical milestone in the just struggle of the Palestinian people. We are confident that the results of this session will contribute in a very positive manner to the solution of the Palestinian problem.

(Mr. Lobo, Mozambique)

Once again the General Assembly is deliberating on the tragedy of the Palestinian people. Again the Assembly is confronted by the arrogance of Israel and its disrespect for the resolutions of this body. For three decades now the question of Palestine has been the subject of extensive debates and numerous resolutions. It is imperative, therefore, that this emergency session guarantee to the Palestinian people its inalienable rights. The United Nations will not be fulfilling its duties if adequate measures to find a just solution to the Palestinian problem are not taken.

The convening of this emergency session to consider the question of Palestine demonstrates the concern of the international community at the deteriorating situation in the Middle East. In fact, that situation is daily becoming more complex and it threatens peace and security in the area and throughout the world.

It is evident to all of us that this session has been convened owing to the failure of the Security Council to take adequate measures to safeguard the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Every time the Security Council makes a positive move, it is unable to accomplish its goals due to the misuse of veto power by some permanent members. In fact, this is what happened on 30 April 1980, when the United States of America vetoed a draft resolution that reaffirmed the rights of the Palestinian people.

It is also known to all of us that Israel would not be defying the international community so consistently and arrogantly without the diplomatic, military, economic and moral support extended to it by the United States of America.

Besides continuing to occupy Arab territories, the Israeli authorities are also intensifying their policy of aggression, expansion and annexation. They have not only refused to dismantle the established settlements but, instead, have decided to intensify the expropriation of land and to establish more settlements in the Arab territories occupied by force and have repeatedly declared that they will never make any concessions and will oppose the creation of a Palestinian State.

The frequent and criminal acts of aggression against defenceless civilians in Lebanon, with great losses of human lives and destruction of property, the deportation of mayors, the aggressive practices within the occupied territories, the annexation of

(Mr. Lobo, Mozambique)

Jerusalem and making it the capital of Israel - all those examples are clear evidence of Israel's intentions in perpetuating its occupation of Arab territories and its persistent denial of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people in flagrant violation of the Charter of our Organization and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

My country, the People's Republic of Mozambique, believes that the question of Palestine is the key to the solution of the Middle East problem and that that solution must be based on the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. There cannot be a substitute solution to the Middle East problem without Israel's withdrawal from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967. Therefore, the Palestinian people must be allowed to exercise their inalienable rights - the right to return to their land, the right to self-determination without any external interference and the right to establish an independent State in Palestine.

Nevertheless, it is encouraging to note that today the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people are gaining widespread recognition.

If we say that we believe that the question of Palestine is the key to the Middle East problem, it is because any initiative or effort towards resolving this problem must include the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. The participation of the PLO on an equal footing with the other parties in the negotiations is vital for the achievement of a just and lasting solution and the restoration of peace in the area. The Palestinian people has by various means repeatedly expressed that the PLO is its sole legitimate representative, and that has been accepted by the majority of the international community. Any initiative that does not take account of that aspect will be as big a bluff as the Camp David accords.

In no way can we accept accords signed by parties which were not mandated by the Palestinian people to speak on its behalf. The Camp David accords not only deny the Palestinian people's rights but also divide that people. Partial accords cannot contribute to a just and comprehensive solution.

The United Nations must ensure that any solution to the question of Palestine takes these fundamental issues into account.

(Mr. Lobo, Mozambique)

The Israeli authorities must realize that Israel's security and independence will never be ensured so long as they do not respect the independence of others and so long as they do not recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

Before concluding, I should like once more to reiterate that the People's Republic of Mozambique fully supports the legitimate demands of the Palestinian people for their inalienable rights, and we want to assure this Assembly that the People's Republic of Mozambique will spare no effort in supporting any initiative to bring a just and comprehensive solution in the Middle East.

A luta continua.

Mr. FUTSCHER PEREIRA (Portugal): The situation fraught with danger prevailing in the Middle East today constitutes perhaps the most serious threat to the peace and security of the world that we have to face in our time. Since it has in recent years become increasingly clear that the question of Palestine lies at its very core, it seems justified that the international community, and in particular this Organization, should give it its closest attention, with the aim of further clarifying the issue and in the hope of contributing to its solution, which is each day more necessary and more urgent.

The very character of this session, the participation in the debate of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of a large number of States and the scope which it assumed from the outset led to many hopes and expectations being placed in this emergency session, which is now about to come to a close.

Have we matched those expectations and hopes? Will we be entitled at the end of this session to say that, thanks to the work we have accomplished, we have come close to finding a lasting solution to the problem?

Many will tend to answer affirmatively. The Portuguese delegation, for its part, not only has doubts on the subject but also believes that these doubts are shared by many in this hall.

For several years now, and whenever the problem of the Middle East has been discussed in various forums of the United Nations, the Portuguese delegation has made its position absolutely clear.

(Mr. Futscher Pereira, Portugal)

In the view of the Portuguese delegation, peace in the Middle East implies the fulfilment of two main complementary aims: first, the recognition by Israel that there is a Palestinian problem that has not been solved with the existence and independence of Jordan - Israel's assertions to the contrary notwithstanding - a problem which requires the recognition of the right of the Palestinians sovereignly to determine their political future; secondly, the recognition by the Palestinians, as well as by all Arab States, of the fact that Israel also has the right to exist and to live in peace and security within its recognized boundaries.

In the view of my Government, the achievement of those aims implies full respect for three principles, which have been continually restated by the international community and thus seem to be the basis for a major consensus among the Members of this Organization.

Those principles are; first, the total withdrawal of Israel from all Palestinian and Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Arab Jerusalem; secondly, the recognition of the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to determine their future political status, with all its consequences, and the right to return to their homes if they so wish; thirdly, respect for the right to existence and security of all States in the area, including Israel.

As those are the basic principles without respect for which no peace will ever be possible in the Middle East, my country has always supported them consistently and strongly.

But while those seem to be the basic co-ordinates that might lead to a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict, it would however be unrealistic to expect them to be accepted as a point of departure for negotiations. Yet, without negotiations - be they direct or indirect - no peace will ever be achieved in the area, since it is difficult to see how the United Nations could ever enforce any possible plan for the solution of the conflict or do more than recommend conciliation or condemn aggression and take measures against the latter - even then without any guarantee, as recent examples show, that such measures would be effective.

That is why from the outset Portugal has always supported the Camp David negotiations as a first step - limited in its scope though it may be - towards a global solution of the conflict.

It is every day more evident that any lasting solution to a problem of the magnitude and complexity of this one will only be achieved through a patient, long, persevering and at times even painful process of dialogue, leading to a broad agreement freely accepted by all the parties involved in the conflict.

Before the opening of this Assembly we were all of us far from having created at the United Nations a mood of conciliation conducive to those indispensable negotiations and I am afraid that those who have followed the current session will concur that we still remain far from that goal.

It has rightly been said during the course of this debate that the failure of the United Nations to cope with the conflict in the Middle East is basically due to the circumstance that:

"Resolutions that do not take into account the legitimate rights and concerns of both sides will not be accepted by them and cannot therefore be the basis for negotiations."

As that would appear to be the case, I make so bold as to ask the Assembly whether the present session has indeed matched the hopes and expectations that it had justly raised?

Have we advanced along the road to peace? Have we in any measure contributed to the establishment of an atmosphere conducive to the indispensable negotiating process among all the parties involved? Have we been able to convince those parties that their inflexibility and extremism are the most serious obstacle to peace and that, no matter how complex or difficult the problems might be, none is insoluble if the parties are prepared to understand and respect one another's legitimate aspirations and anxieties?

I should like to conclude by expressing the hope of the Government and people of my country that the initiative of the nine member countries of the European Economic Community (EEC), recently announced from this rostrum by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Luxembourg, Mr. Gaston Thorn, in his capacity as current President of the European Communities, will be crowned with all the success it deserves.

(Mr. Futscher Pereira, Portugal)

My delegation entirely shares the point of view of the Nine that only through negotiations will it be possible to restore peace in the Middle East. The task is an immense one, for the establishment of negotiations - let alone their success - implies the creation of a climate of confidence, which means the renunciation of all forms of extremism.

For our part we should like to express our full support for that initiative and our readiness fully to co-operate with it.

Mr. DE FIGUEIREDO (Angola): Mr. President, on behalf of my Government and delegation please accept our fraternal congratulations on your continued presidency of the General Assembly.

Mr. President, through you I should like to convey to the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) the revolutionary greetings of President José Eduardo dos Santos of the MPLA-Workers' Party and the Central Committee of the MPLA-Workers' Party. Similarly, all the revolutionary militants of Angola salute their comrades, the people of Palestine.

Each revolution has its own peculiarities, a set of unique conditions which give shape and form to a revolutionary struggle and determine the course of that revolution. But it is also true that each revolution has its universal aspects and is bound up with many questions of our historical epoch.

Therefore the struggle for the liberation of Palestine is a microcosm of all the liberation struggles that have taken place and are still in progress. Bound up in the issue of Palestine are all the ingredients of oppression, all the principles and practices of imperialism, all the strategies of colonialism and all the manifestations of racism.

Oppression, imperialism, colonialism and racism are no strangers to us. They are in fact uninvited and unwelcome intrusions into our national and regional lives. Africa is intimately familiar with those phenomena, as familiar as a victim can be with an oppressor.

We salute the people of Palestine who have refused the status of "assimilated refugees" and are engaged in a struggle to retrieve their occupied homeland.

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

Successive imperialist doctrines have victimized the people of Palestine. from 1948, when international zionism partitioned the land of Palestine, to the Nixon doctrine which amounted to having Asians fight Asians, Africans fight Africans and Arabs fight Arabs, and right down to the present, when a bogus accord has been set in motion, imperialist circles have created their own foreign affairs crises as a pretext for implementing major alterations in policy with apparent impunity.

The latest manoeuvre in the arsenal of imperialism is a jingoistic foreign policy in some Western capitals, designed to hold the world hostage.

The creation of the rapid deployment force and the dispatch of a new assault force of amphibious warships into the Indian Ocean last week are all part of imperialism's renewed confrontation policy.

The United Nations of 1948 was the vehicle for the creation of the Palestine issue. It now devolves upon the United Nations to be the vehicle for a just solution. Each nation is individually and collectively a part of history. Our struggle is an important part of history and we should judge, condemn and convict imperialism and award compensation to the victim so as to redress the wrongs of more than three decades.

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

The Government of the People's Republic of Angola fully supports the non-aligned initiative at the present session. We stand firmly behind the people of Palestine, led by their representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization. The two bastions of imperialism in southern Africa and the Middle East, with their bilateral ties and with their similar links to Western imperialism, as well as their identical role in the imperialist network, must not be allowed to impede the march to freedom and independence of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa and Palestine.

The Palestine Liberation Organization has been engaged in the struggle on all fronts - diplomatic, political, economic and military. It has displayed the principles and practices of responsible statehood in its dealings with the third world and the Non-Aligned Movement as well as with international entities and other States. Therefore, if the soil of Palestine is the scene of one of the fiercest wars of liberation that will be because all political and diplomatic channels have been exhausted, and not for lack of effort on the part of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Yes, there is an emergency, an emergency that started when an entire people was uprooted from its homes and driven off its land, an emergency that has lasted while generations have been born in exile, an emergency that will last until the flag of Palestine flies outside this hall.

The Palestine Liberation Organization made a stirring appeal to the international community in 1974. The olive branch is still being held out. The international community has the responsibility to reciprocate, to reach out and take that olive branch, that ageless symbol of negotiation and peace. The olive branch does not mean defeat and capitulation; it does not mean a forced peace imposed by outside parties. It means a just, fair and honourable peace arrived at by negotiation with the participation of the people directly concerned - in this case, the people of Palestine, represented by the Palestine Liberation Organization.

The war started in Palestine; peace too must begin there, if there is to be peace in the Middle East. The victims must be made partners for any peace to last. The Palestinians must have their independent State before the Middle East can consider itself to be on the road to peace.

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

Palestine is the core of the problem of the Middle East; therefore it has to be at the heart of any solution. Peace must come to Palestine before peace can come to the Middle East. And peace must come to the Middle East if that half of the world is not to be a tinder-box. There can be no contained wars any longer. What happens in one part of the world has a profound effect in distant corners.

In solidarity with their Palestinian comrades, the people of Angola declare "Thawra haiyyun nasr" - revolution until victory. And we say to them "Until final victory, a luta continua".

The PRESIDENT: We have now concluded the debate on the item entitled "Question of Palestine".

Before I call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the vote, I should like to draw attention to the letter from the Charges d'Affaires ad interim of Chad annexed to document A/ES-7/6 and the letter from the Permanent Representative of Nicaragua annexed to document A/ES-7/6/Add.1.

In the light of the second sentence of Article 19 of the Charter, whereby the General Assembly may permit a Member to vote if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the Member, may I take it that the General Assembly agrees to the requests of Chad and Nicaragua and authorizes them to participate in the vote?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to consideration of draft resolutions A/ES-7/L.1 and A/ES-7/L.2/Rev.1.

I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote. In this connexion may I remind Members that at its thirty-fourth session the General Assembly decided that explanations of vote should be limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Ecuador will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/ES-7/L.1 and A/ES-7/L.2. In this connexion it wishes to reiterate its position in support of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, the cessation of the occupation of Arab territories and recognition of the right to existence and security of the States of the region, including Israel.

Mr. BHATT (Nepal): The position of my delegation on the question of Palestine and the situation in the Middle East in general is well known. It is our firm conviction that, the question of Palestine being crucial to the Middle East problem, a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the region cannot be achieved without a peaceful solution of this question. We have in the past supported, and we do so again, the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, independence and statehood. The draft resolution contained in document A/ES-7/L.1 reaffirms that right and we shall therefore vote in favour of it. However, we wish to make the following observations on the text before us.

Operative paragraph 1 of the text recalls and reaffirms relevant United Nations resolutions which, as we understand it, include also Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which call for a negotiated settlement on the basis of certain principles.

It is our understanding that the withdrawal of Israel from territories occupied since June 1967 will pave the way for peaceful negotiations to establish an independent sovereign State of the Palestinian people.

In operative paragraph 12, it would have been more appropriate for the request addressed to the Security Council not to specify Chapter VII and only to mention "necessary measures", as it is the prerogative of the Security Council to adopt what measures it deems necessary.

Mr. KAMANDA WA KAMANDA (Zaire) (interpretation from French):

To give truly historic scope to the seventh emergency special session on Palestine, the delegation of Zaire would have liked the Assembly's work to culminate in a draft resolution that was more courageous and less timid, one that would unambiguously and unanimously recognize the legitimate right of the Palestinian people and the Arab people of Palestine and the Jewish people of Palestine each to have a State and a homeland and to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, which would undoubtedly pave the way towards arrangements for a final settlement of the thorny question of Palestine.

(Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda, Zaire)

In other words, we should have liked a unanimous decision on the recognition of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all States in the area, including a sovereign, independent Palestinian State and Israel, and of their right to live in peace within secure and recognized borders.*

Unfortunately, our session has not succeeded in dislodging the blocks on one side and the other and the draft resolution which has resulted from our labours therefore do not come up to our hopes. In the end I do not know whether the General Assembly, convened under the rubric of "uniting for peace", has succeeded, where it appeared the Security Council could not, in promoting the search for a solution of the serious conflict in the Middle East. In fact we shall no doubt find ourselves once again meeting in the Security Council.

Nevertheless, draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1 affirms the principles that we have always affirmed and defended. We shall therefore vote in favour of that draft resolution in order once again to demonstrate our support for the cause of the Arab people of Palestine.

However, in so doing, we are convinced that that draft resolution is a supplement to Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, which remains the fundamental basis of an over-all, just and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict. It is therefore out of the question, in our view, that the adoption of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1 should be construed as in any way a rejection of resolution 242 (1967).

With regard to draft resolution A/ES-7/L.2, we shall abstain in that vote because the draft resolution does embody ambiguous, equivocal and imprecise elements.

We thank Ambassador Falilou Kane for the efforts he made in drafting a text which could command unanimous support but even before this session we thought that the reasons for Israel's refusal to implement United Nations resolutions were well known to all. Now we learn that those reasons are unknown and that they must be further studied. Although we do not share that view, in order to show goodwill, we shall merely abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/ES-7/L.2.

* Mr. Ibrahim (Ethiopia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

Mr. AASEN (Norway): The Norwegian Government holds the view that there can be no solution of the over-all Middle East problem unless a solution is found for the Palestinian problem.

A solution of the Palestinian problem can be found only through the recognition and the implementation of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination.

That right to self-determination should find its expression, at the present stage, in the involvement of representatives of the Palestinian people in negotiations aimed at resolving the Palestinian problem in all its aspects.

The question of Palestinian participation in such negotiations, of course, raises the question of the role of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). In the view of my Government no other Palestinian organization, group or individual can claim to be more representative than the PLO.

Those aspects of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1 can thus be supported by my Government.

Norway is also on record, in the Security Council, as stating that the Israeli settlements policy on the West Bank is illegal and an obstacle to peace, as are the unilateral and unacceptable actions taken or contemplated by Israel to alter the status and character of Jerusalem.

The main responsibility resting with the parties involved, and with all of us, is now to steer the peace efforts in a direction which, in a constructive way, will ensure a just, lasting and comprehensive solution, acceptable to all the parties involved.

We have on previous occasions expressed the view - which my delegation finds it necessary to repeat today - that restraint and mutual concessions are imperative in order for that over-all objective to be reached.

Draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1 leaves much to be desired in that regard. We deeply regret that the draft resolution leaves out such imperative elements of an over-all peace settlement as those contained in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). In my Government's view those principles remain indispensable to any resolution of the Middle East conflict.

Norway cannot support any resolution which does not explicitly confirm the right of all States in the area, Israel among them, to exist in peace within secure and internationally recognized boundaries.

(Mr. Aasen, Norway)

In its present form draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1 detracts from that essential element of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which enjoy the full support of my Government. Furthermore, the draft resolution prejudices a number of difficult issues which, in our view, should be solved through negotiations involving all the parties concerned.

My delegation is thus left with no choice but to cast a negative vote on draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1.

Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Panama would like to explain its vote in favour of the joint draft resolution on the question of Palestine, which has constituted the primary concern of this seventh emergency special session of the General Assembly convened under the worthy presidency of Ambassador Salim.

The position of Panama on that question not only has been set forth in United Nations forums but was also defined in great detail in a document on the fundamental principles of the foreign policy of the Republic of Panama, which was circulated on an official basis by the Panamanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs at the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Belgrade in 1978.

With regard to the Middle East, including the question of Palestine, the Panamanian Government described its position in the following terms:

"In regard to the crises in the Middle East, Panama considers that a solution should be found within the context of the United Nations. The parties should abide by the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, particularly Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). A just and lasting solution, in the view of Panama, should include: first; the withdrawal of Israel from all occupied Arab territories; secondly, respect for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people; and, thirdly, the right of Israel and the States and peoples of the region to live in peace, within secure and recognized borders.

"Panama recognizes the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to its own independent State.

(Mr. Illueca, Panama)

"With regard to Jerusalem, the Government of Panama agrees with the consensus reached in the Security Council of the United Nations on 11 November 1976, with the assent of its permanent members, the United States, the Soviet Union, England, France and China, in which it was decided, inter alia, that all measures taken by Israel which tended to change the status of Jerusalem were invalid and could not change that status. Like the Vatican, Panama does not recognize the annexation of Jerusalem and will urge the internationalization of its Holy Places."

(Mr. Illueca, Panama)

The consensus to which we refer was expressed in a decision adopted by the Council and contained in the statement made by the Panamanian representative in his capacity as President of the Security Council at that time.

The Republic of Panama, in consonance with the principles of its foreign policy and those contained in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), will work both for respect for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, represented by the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), and for recognition of the rights of Israel and other States and peoples of the region to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

My country would have wished the joint draft resolution to include those basic factors for the achievement of a peaceful settlement of the question, thereby ensuring tangible progress in the efforts that are being made in that direction.

The Panamanian Government considers that the parties to the conflict must face these realities and accept these facts, which cannot be ignored, so as to clear the way to productive negotiations leading to the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the region. This would provide a basis for hopes that the three religious communities which are so important to mankind - Christian, Jewish and Moslem - will be able to work together, united by the traditions of their monotheistic faith, to decide the future of Jerusalem. We trust that some day Jerusalem will no longer be a source of dispute but, rather, in the words of the HolySee,

"... a place for meeting and fraternity among peoples and the believers of the three religions, as well as a commitment to friendship among peoples, which see in Jerusalem something that is part of their own spirit."

Mr. DUPUY (Canada): The Arab-Israeli dispute has resulted in disruption and the uprooting of peoples. It has brought about an immense and wasteful diversion of scarce resources to military expenditures. It has caused great suffering to all those involved. It is a serious source of world tension and uncertainty. It carries the threat of wider conflict which could engulf the entire international community. A just and equitable resolution of this conflict must, therefore, be a prime objective of the community of nations.

To this end, my Government continues to believe that Security Council resolution 242 (1967) should remain the cornerstone of a comprehensive solution to the Arab-Israeli dispute. It imposes an equitable balance of obligations on the parties involved. It recognizes the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and calls for Israeli withdrawal from occupied territories. It calls for respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and the independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries. Without these elements there cannot be a just peace.

My Government also believes that a just solution to the future of the Palestinian people is essential to the achievement of that same peace. Unless account is taken of the existence of a Palestinian national consciousness, and unless there is recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, peace will not prevail.

In the view of my Government, the Palestinians, like other peoples, are entitled to political self-expression in a defined territory. Negotiations must, among other things, determine the precise nature of this territorial settlement for the Palestinians, including the geographical extent of the territory, its status, and its relationship to its neighbours. Canada has supported the Camp David process as the best basis on which to bring about these negotiations and to work towards a just peace. We recognize that there are serious doubts about this

(Mr. Dupuy, Canada)

process among many represented here. We recognize that there are fundamental issues still to be negotiated successfully. However, my Government continues to believe the process can be viable and effective. It therefore urges the parties to these negotiations to early decisions, no matter how difficult they might now seem.

If these negotiations are to be successful it is essential that the Palestinians join them. To do this they themselves must be given reason to believe they will have very substantial control over their own affairs during the interim period preparatory to the negotiation of the final status of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. As we have indicated previously, Canada is therefore concerned by the establishment of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories. This discourages the Palestinians from the belief that even their most minimal requirements can be met. Consequently the settlements policy hinders the search for peace.

Canada is equally concerned about measures taken unilaterally which attempt to alter the situation in East Jerusalem. This extremely sensitive issue can be resolved only through negotiations.

The principles and considerations I have outlined have determined Canada's approach to resolutions in this Assembly. On this basis my Government cannot support the resolution before us today, despite our support for Israeli withdrawal from occupied territories, despite our support for legitimate Palestinian rights and despite our opposition to Israeli violations of the Fourth Geneva Convention.

The resolution before us, A/ES-7/L.1, is not a balanced one. It nowhere acknowledges the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the States of the area. It prejudices the outcome of negotiations. It establishes a timetable for withdrawal from territories, which under present circumstances is clearly unrealistic. It demands of Israel immediate action which it could not reasonably be expected to undertake unilaterally. It attempts to supplant negotiations currently under way which have already proved their potential for solving difficult problems.

(Mr. Dupuy, Canada)

For these reasons the Canadian delegation cannot support this draft resolution and will vote against it. And for the same reasons Canada will also oppose draft resolution A/ES-7/L.2 on the work of the Committee on the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

My Government regrets that these draft resolutions do so little to promote understanding and dialogue between the parties, when to facilitate such understanding and dialogue should be the goal of this Assembly. Such a dialogue should be based specifically on the principles of resolution 242 (1967) and on the legitimate rights and concerns of both sides, on acceptance of the fact that a just and lasting peace cannot be imposed but must be negotiated, and on a renunciation by both sides of unilateral moves and violent acts. These elements are essential if meaningful progress towards a solution of the Arab-Israeli dispute is to be achieved.

Mr. KLESTIL (Austria): The Austrian position on the question of Palestine and the situation on the Middle East, as well as the principles which govern our policy in this matter, was clearly expressed in the course of the general debate. I wish, however, to comment briefly on the draft resolution before this Assembly.

In our view, the essential elements for any solution to the Middle East conflict are: recognition of the right of Israel - and indeed of all States in the area - to exist within safe and secure boundaries, recognition of the national rights of the Palestinian people, recognition of the PLO as the representative of the Palestinian people, and the withdrawal of Israel from the territories occupied in 1967.

Though the draft resolution before us does justice to the second part, it neglects the right of Israel to exist within safe boundaries and therefore lacks the balance on which any constructive step towards peace in the Middle East will have to be based. Furthermore, certain elements have been introduced into the draft resolution, which in our view do not adequately reflect the spirit of our deliberations and will not be conducive to the search for a just and equitable solution.

For that reason, Austria will have to abstain in the voting.

Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): As I speak today in explaining my support for the draft resolution before us, I feel in duty bound to leave with this Assembly some basic thoughts, so that we do not confuse the forest with the trees. I do so with a heavy heart, for there instantly flash into my mind memories of a country and its people - hardworking, hopeful, peaceful, serene and secure in the sanctity of their homes and their ancestral homeland, until catastrophe struck, in a similar special session in 1947. That catastrophe dismantled their country, destroyed their lives, uprooted them from their homes and left them in dispersal - refugees displaced, occupied, unidentified, unrecognized and alas, even castigated for enduring their ordeal for so long, demanding restoration and restitution and refusing to fade away.

Where else in the world could we conceive of, let alone witness, a tragedy of even remotely parallel proportions? The majority of the States Members of our world body have, in many forms and at various times, fallen victim to terrible wars, colonialism, oppression, exploitation, hunger and all the other woes which stem from man's inhumanity, folly and greed. But most of those gruesome wars have been transient and rectified. And above all, they did not include the denial of a people's right to live, to die and to be buried in their homeland.

What the Palestinian people are being confronted with is a unique and incomparably combination of those calamities inflicted concurrently against their very existence as a people in their ancestral homeland: conquest, occupation, brutal oppression, colonialism, colonization, uprooting, confiscation, alienation, a devouring of their land, properties and resources, and not least a self-proclaimed, self-confessed determination on the part of their Zionist tormentors to pursue a ruthless and calculated process designed to achieve the national obliteration of Palestine. This is no longer a well-kept secret, a conspiracy; it is an avowed objective, systematically implemented without apology or remorse, thanks to the prodigious support of one of the super-Powers, the United States, whose scale of assistance to 3 million Israelis exceeds its total assistance to hundreds of millions of people throughout the third world, and even to many states in the Union.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

That is, indeed, an unparalleled, all-out onslaught against a small people who have never in the past had any enmity or quarrel with the Government or people of the United States, nor with the adherents of the Judaic faith. That unfair challenge can be responded to only by concerted, affirmative and serious action taken by the community of nations universally represented at the United Nations. The fate of a small people and its destiny is not, and should never be, a pawn in global rivalries. There should never be trading or rivalry in human destiny. It stands on its own volition, and its motto is justice, survival and freedom.

The present emergency session can be as momentous in its short and long-term consequences as the special session of November 1947, when the General Assembly, with a mere one third of its present membership and with all manner of arm-twisting and coercion - as General Romulo will confirm or President Truman could have confirmed - adopted a resolution that represented acquiescence in the dismemberment of Palestine and the creation therein of two States - a Palestine Arab State along with a Jewish State, and an interim international corpus separatum for Jerusalem and its environs. I should add here that the unlawful donor of the Balfour Declaration, Lord Balfour, representing Britain, was not entitled to make that donation because Britain did not then have sovereignty over Palestine. The same donor excluded Jordan in 1922 from the application of the Balfour Declaration, with the consent and agreement of the League of Nations. I should further add that, even though the Palestinian leadership and people were disenchanted as a result of the dismemberment of their country in 1947, it was the Israeli military machine which, a few days after the resolution was adopted, launched a full-fledged attack on the disarmed Palestinian people.

That momentous resolution and subsequent General Assembly resolutions, in particular resolution 194 (III) on the right of return, have never been invalidated by any General Assembly resolution or by Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) or 338 (1973), or by the Permanent Armistice Agreement of 1949, which specifically stated that nothing therein should prejudice the final solution of the question of Palestine.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

The Parliamentary Act of Unity of 1950 between the East Bank and the West Bank of Jordan was equally explicit to the effect that unity would in no way prejudice the final solution of the problem of Palestine and that the people on both banks would work hand in hand towards restoring full Palestinian rights, in accordance with national goals and the norms of international justice and law.

Security Council resolution 242 (1967) was designed to deal with the consequences of the 1967 war. Jordan supported it over the past 13 years, but in vain. It does not address itself to the core of the Middle East conflict, namely, Palestinian national rights. No less importantly, it is being vitiated on the ground by fundamental territorial changes through extensive colonization so as to wither it and render it hollow. Moreover, the Camp David accords, while claiming to be based on Security Council resolution 242 (1967), fundamentally altered its premises by acquiescing specifically in the perpetuation of Israeli military occupation of the occupied territories under the term "relocation of forces", in addition to reducing Palestinian national rights to the point of indescribable "self-rule".

The Partition resolution of 1947 set in motion a haunting process, which culminated in a premeditated uprooting of the majority of the indigenous and lawful citizens, who owned 94 per cent of the land in Palestine, and supplanted them with immigrants from every corner of the globe. It likewise resulted in the establishment of a Zionist State over four fifths of Mandated Palestine even before the Mandate was ended, while not redeeming or implementing the other part of the deal, namely, the creation of a Palestinian Arab State. The Mandatory Power and its successor, the United Nations, failed in their sacred duty to preserve or redeem for the Palestinian people that part of Palestine which the General Assembly had delineated in mass and detail and had resolved should remain theirs, without a single Palestinian being rendered a refugee or a displaced person in either State, the Arab or the Jewish.

(Mr. Nuseibeh, Jordan)

This was stated in General Assembly resolution 194 (III) and has been reaffirmed every year for the past three decades. It is unconscionable and inconceivable that our great bastion of legality, morality and justice, represented in this hall, would do less than ensure that the agony of the Palestinian people would not continue indefinitely, and act to restore that people's inalienable and elemental rights.

It is a heavy moral imperative upon the United Nations to live up to its own resolutions - I repeat: its own resolutions; we did not write them - and see to it that they are implemented. If it fails to do that, even though it has all the means, spelled out in Chapter VII of the Charter, then such a failure would for ever remain an unforgivable blot on the otherwise glorious record of the United Nations.

Meanwhile, the Palestinian people will continue to endure their suffering, undeterred by injustice, unintimidated by oppression, uncompromised by temporary adversity. Has anyone forgotten, or will anyone ever forget, that they have hailed from the hallowed soil of Palestine, which has given to the world over millennia the ultimate in suffering, in nobility of purpose, and where the human and the divine are inextricably intertwined?

Mr. TOMA (Samoa): The Samoan delegation is in complete sympathy with the Palestinians in their most unfortunate situation. There is no doubt in our minds that they are entitled to establish a sovereign State of their own and that they are being prevented by present circumstances from exercising their legitimate rights. There is no doubt in our minds, either, that the Palestine Liberation Organization is the appropriate body with which to negotiate a settlement of the Palestinian problem. We cannot for one moment accept that any rights over the occupied territories can accrue to Israel. Along with the majority of the international community, we regard Israeli actions in the occupied territories, including Israel's recent unilateral decision with regard to Jerusalem, as illegal and high-handed.

(Mr. Toma, Samoa)

We believe that there are serious short-comings in Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and that these should be remedied. Draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1, now before the General Assembly, attempts to address itself to these short-comings. In short, we agree completely with all the specific provisions of that draft resolution.

It is a fact of life, however, that there are two sides to every problem. A perception, no matter how clear, of the rights of one side alone does not in itself solve problems.

The legitimate concerns of Israel must also be taken into account. Everyone readily acknowledges the complexity of the Middle East situation. Yet there seems to be a general reluctance in the United Nations to come to grips with all of the major factors of the problem. We all know that the basic problem in the Middle East has to do with old attitudes, mistrust and well-entrenched animosities which can be resolved only by the parties themselves, with courage, wisdom and goodwill.

While, therefore, we view the draft resolution as a fair enumeration of Palestinian rights and justified expectations, as a formula for a just and lasting peace, it is inadequate and falls short of what we would expect in a "uniting for peace" resolution.

Hence, Samoa will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1.

Mr. YANGO (Philippines): In the context of the statement made by my delegation during the debate, and after a close study of all other statements that have been made, we would now wish briefly to express our position on the draft resolutions before us.

The Philippines gave its concurrence to the holding of this emergency special session in the sincere belief that something useful could emerge from the deliberations that would contribute to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Our statement specifically enumerated the elements which we believe now exist and are necessary for a just and comprehensive peace. These elements are embodied in various General Assembly and

(Mr. Yango, Philippines)

Security Council resolutions adopted since the United Nations was seized of the question of Palestine. But, most importantly, we underlined the need on the part of both sides of such elements as understanding, trust, confidence and co-operation in order to achieve a lasting and just solution.

It is in that sense that we view the two draft resolutions before us. To our minds, they are fresh initiatives which identify new ideas that could be added to others that have been explored in the past by the United Nations.

I would refer first to draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1, which in its operative paragraph 10 requests and authorizes the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, to take the necessary measures towards the implementation of the Committee's recommendations as a basis for the solution of the question of Palestine. The Secretary-General is fully cognizant of the many difficulties and obstacles in the path of finding a solution to the problem. But my delegation is hopeful that at this time something concrete and positive will be undertaken by the Secretary-General.

The other draft resolution - A/ES-7/L.2/Rev.1 - provides for a thorough study of the reasons for the refusal of Israel to comply with the various United Nations resolutions. We believe that such a study could lead us to ways and means by which that refusal could be overcome.

The President of this emergency special session, in his statement before the debate began, set the tone of our endeavours when he said:

"It must be the aim of this session to strive for the scrupulous application of the principle of the non-admissibility of the occupation of territory by force and, consequently, to strive for the total withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied Arab territories. It must also be the objective of this session to work for the creation of conditions whereby all States of the area will be guaranteed their independence." (A/ES-7/PV.1, p. 13)

(Mr. Yango, Philippines)

The Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, in a most comprehensive and illuminating opening statement, said:

"Today everybody is in agreement in recognizing that the question of Palestine lies at the core of the Middle East conflict. Without a solution of the Palestinian problem, no solution of the Middle East problem is possible. Therefore, a resolution that would supplement resolution 242 (1967) should in the view of our Committee include, inter alia, the rights that the General Assembly has recognized as belonging to the Palestinian people - that is, the right to self-determination, national independence and the creation of a sovereign State in Palestine, and the right of the refugees to return to their country." (ibid. p. 23)

(Mr. Yango, Philippines)

Mr. Kaddoumi, of the Palestine Liberation Organization, for his part, said the following:

"The Palestinian people and the PLO have carried both the olive branch and the gun. In spite of the lessons learned from over 50 years of experience that what has been taken by force can be regained only by force; in spite of the continued attempts to make us despair of political and diplomatic struggle; and in spite of the oppression, terror and genocide we face in our homeland and in involuntary exile, we have not let the olive branch fall from our hands - this olive branch that we have carried along with the gun of the revolution.

"Therefore, we are here not to reaffirm our intentions and our aspirations to peace and stability in our homeland and in the region as a whole, but rather to call upon the Assembly to mobilize in an effort to realize that noble, human goal." (A/ES-7/PV.1, page 59-60)

These statements I have quoted are self-evident and need no further elucidation. My delegation sees this emergency special session as an opportunity indeed to achieve something to further the cause of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. It is our view that these statements counterbalance any deficiencies some believe to exist in the draft resolutions. My delegation has therefore decided to support and to vote in favour of the two draft resolutions before us, upon which action will shortly be taken by the General Assembly.

Mr. CASTILLO-ARRIOLA (Guatemala)(interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Guatemala has attended this emergency special session of the General Assembly with the conviction that, above and beyond the Security Council, the Assembly too bears responsibilities that it must discharge in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations in order to maintain international peace and security, which are continuously being threatened in the Middle East.

(Mr. Castillo-Arriola, Guatemala)

However, far from leading to a reconciliation and a just, equitable and permanent solution among all the parties involved, with no exception whatsoever, thereby making it possible for all the States in the area to have a secure existence, the general debate has rather given rise to a further complex confrontation that imperils the initial steps that have already been taken in negotiations, negotiations that we consider to be the only way to solve all the problems of the area.

At the issue of the general debate, in which Guatemala did not participate, draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1 on the question of Palestine was submitted. This would lead the General Assembly to impose a unilateral and partial solution that relates to only one aspect of the conflict, which is made up of other essential elements that clearly call for dialogue and joint negotiations.

For this reason, we are not in a position to support the draft that has been submitted to us for our consideration, although we might agree with some of its basic assumptions. We consider that draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1 does not take into consideration Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which was unanimously adopted and which entailed the recognition of Israel within secure, recognized and permanent borders, a resolution that would serve as a secure basis for any solution to the Middle East question.

Security Council resolution 242 (1967) is based upon the resolution on partition (181 (II)) adopted by the General Assembly on 24 November 1947, which through an irreversible juridical decision of the international community created a new State thirty-two years ago. My Government is aware that disputes can be settled only by peaceful means, and in particular by direct, bilateral or multilateral negotiations among the parties involved, and that such negotiations will lead to an effective and permanent solution to the question that is under consideration. In addition, we hope that there will be a lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East, one that can only be based on a broad understanding founded on justice and good-neighbourliness, and because we consider that draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1

(Mr. Castillo-Arriola, Guatemala)

which is about to be put to the vote makes no positive contribution to that problem in any way whatsoever, we shall vote against it.

Mr. THAMAE (Lesotho): It has always been the position of my Government that a lasting peace in the Middle East can be achieved only through negotiations. It is therefore not possible for my delegation to support operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1, which calls for the unconditional withdrawal by Israel from occupied Arab territories.

We do not consider the application of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter against Israel to be necessary or even helpful to the search for peace in the Middle East.

Notwithstanding these objections, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1. Before concluding, however, I must state for the record that Lesotho is strongly opposed to any unilateral steps taken to alter the status of Jerusalem. We consider that the action planned by Israel to annex Jerusalem and make the Holy City its capital is unhelpful, and we regard this step as one aimed at prejudging the outcome of future negotiations on the status of the Holy City. It is my Government's view that peoples of all faiths should have free and unobstructed access to the Holy City.

Mr. THUNBORG (Sweden): Sweden will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1. It is a matter of regret and concern to us that the draft resolution should be so markedly lacking in balance.

(Mr. Thunborg, Sweden)

A settlement of the Middle East conflict and the question of Palestine must, in our view, satisfy two central requirements. One is for Israel's right to continued existence within secure and recognized borders; the other is the recognition of the Palestinians' legitimate national rights. These include the right of the Palestinians, if they so wish, to establish a State of their own, living in peace side by side with Israel.

In accordance with these principles, the Palestinians must also recognize the right of Israel to exist, as Israel must recognize the right of the Palestinians to self-determination.

Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), although incomplete, must continue to be the foundation for a peaceful settlement.

Mr. AUGUSTE (Saint Lucia): The objective of this session is to attempt to break the impasse of escalating violence in which the Middle East still finds itself, notwithstanding the legal mandates of the Security Council resolutions or the numerous General Assembly resolutions or the individual or collective attempts at mediation or the multilateral processes, such as the initiative of the European Economic Community (EEC), and so on. They all in turn deserve some salutary commendation; but they must not be dismissed or referred to in a derisory fashion simply because they have not brought about the required solution.

As long as there is a belief that dialogue and proper procedure will eventually produce a solution, it behoves this Assembly to move in every possible direction in continuing its efforts in this regard through dialogue and conciliation.

The rights of the Palestinian people to live in peace, to set up a Government and to exist as a society within the framework of a nation-State is indisputable. No force on this earth has the right to deny this position. No third State should consider itself untouched by these circumstances. Every State, within the concepts of self-determination and the inalienable rights of peoples, has a duty to assist the Palestinian people to set up its own State and to establish adequate conditions for promoting the economic development of its people and arrest the measures that undeservedly now drain their resources.

(Mr. Auguste, Saint Lucia)

Equally, every State has the right to exist. This right to exist must be reflected in the final formula for peace in the region. The question of self-determination is not dependent on and does not require the obliteration of any society and/or its right to exist. These two principles must coexist and continue to coexist, as within their context is to be found the germ that may lead to a solution of the problem.

The delegation of Saint Lucia views the efforts of the General Assembly in this emergency special session as a necessary and effective measure to diminish and, it is to be hoped, to eradicate the possibilities of conflict in the Middle East and to ensure proper, legitimate and righteous progress towards an everlasting peace.

For those reasons, the delegation of Saint Lucia will support both draft resolutions.

Mr. vanden HEUVEL (United States of America): As set forth in my statement to this Assembly on 24 July, the United States Government believes the draft resolution before us fails to take into account the legitimate rights and security concerns of all parties in the Middle East. Neither is it founded upon United Nations Security Council resolution 242 (1967), the one agreed basis for a comprehensive settlement. The draft resolution ignores one of the basic principles of resolution 242 (1967), which is that establishment of a just and lasting peace should include

"Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area...".

By calling on Israel to withdraw "unconditionally" from the territories occupied since 1967, this draft resolution contradicts and seeks to undermine resolution 242 (1967), one of whose essential principles is the right of Israel and its Arab neighbours to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries. In addition, I wish to note specifically that the recommendations in paragraphs 59 to 72 of the report (A/31/35) to the thirty-first session of the General Assembly of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which are cited in the present draft resolution, are as unrealistic and impractical as the draft resolution in its entirety.

(Mr. vanden Heuvel, United States)

In brief, the draft resolution cannot serve as a basis for negotiations which can advance just, comprehensive and durable arrangements for peace. Resolutions that do not take into account the legitimate rights and concerns of both sides will not be accepted by both sides and, therefore, cannot be the basis for negotiations. And without negotiations, we cannot advance towards peace.

My delegation will therefore vote against draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1 and, in view to our opposition to the work of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, we shall also vote against draft resolution A/ES-7/L.2.

Mr. BLUM (Israel): It was obvious from the outset that this session has been both illegal and preposterous.

It violated the rules of procedure and made a mockery not only of them but also of the Assembly itself. If nothing else, the way this event was rigged to coincide with a premeditated and non-existent "emergency" has made a farce of its proceedings. While it has not advanced the cause of peace, it can only deal yet another blow to what remains of the United Nations prestige and moral authority.

A certain sensitivity to the illegality of the Assembly's proceedings was shown even by the drafters of the draft resolutions now before the Assembly. Thus, for example, the first of the draft resolutions has been stripped of the references contained in the various working papers to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and to General Assembly resolution 377 A (V), known as the Uniting for Peace resolution. These deletions are certainly in order, because what has taken place here over the last few days has not been a uniting for peace but, rather, the uniting against peace.

But this does not mean that the draft resolution has been stripped of its other irregular provisions and is free of attempts to ascribe to the General Assembly powers which it does not have, calling for action which is ultra vires in terms of the United Nations Charter. These calls are admittedly veiled, but no one familiar with the relevant documentation can be deceived. For example, operative paragraph 10 of the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-7/L.1 "authorizes" the Secretary-General to take the "necessary measures" to implement the recommendations contained in paragraphs 59 to 72 of document A/31/35.*

* The President resumed the Chair.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

Anyone who has taken the trouble to refresh his memory will have noted that the recommendations in these paragraphs are designed to bypass the authority of the Security Council and its resolution 242 (1967), which is the only agreed basis for a negotiated settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict in all its aspects. Consequently, the draft resolution contains none of the elements of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), makes no mention of Israel's right to live within secure and recognized boundaries and makes no reference to the need for a negotiated peace, or indeed peace of any kind, in the Middle East. Instead, it makes demands on Israel which deliberately run counter to the provisions of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and seek to undermine that resolution.

Draft resolution A/ES-7/L/2 is a further example of the efforts which have been made through this Assembly to abuse the means and machinery of the United Nations, and even harness the Secretariat, with a view to exploiting the whole United Nations system in the relentless Arab campaign of political warfare against Israel. That draft resolution commends the efforts of the "Palestine Committee", many of whose members regard themselves as being in a state of war with my country, to work against Israel, a Member State of this Organization.

It also praises the "Palestinian Unit" in the Secretariat for preparing and disseminating a series of pseudo-scientific "studies", propagating a spurious version of history and specious doctrines of international law. Of all things, it now goes on to charge that Unit with the preparation of a further "study" of the same kind.

The world is in a sorry state. There are countless wars, some of them of major proportions. International tensions run high and one super-Power continues to demonstrate that it is prepared to use naked force to occupy and suppress formerly independent States. Poverty and persecution, disease and degradation prevail. The international community is frustrated. But it will serve no useful purpose for it to vent its frustrations on Israel. It will not solve its problems by indulging an obsession with Israel. There is no panacea to the world's ills to be found in adopting endless one-sided, hostile and biased resolutions against my country. I should like to challenge every representative in this Assembly and ask how they would react to similar resolutions aimed at the dismantlement of the State which they represent. To the best of my knowledge, international law and practice impose no obligations on sovereign States to lend a hand to their own dissolution.

(Mr. Blum, Israel)

This session may have given some satisfaction to those who wish to exacerbate tension and friction in the Middle East, with a view to obstructing the ongoing peace efforts. It may also have been convenient for a number of States which seek to take advantage of occasions such as this for reasons of political expediency and of their own self-interest, without reference to the issues being discussed, and still less to the draft resolutions before them. It certainly may have been convenient to the Soviet Union as a diversionary tactic to draw attention away from the major offensive it has just launched in Afghanistan. Such postures may be commonplace in the game of international politics, but they certainly do not advance the cause of peace one iota.

We are well aware that others in this Assembly have adopted positions with a view to appeasing the Arab petro-hegemonists, in the vain belief that the oil gods can be supplicated and the oil blackmailers can be bought off. Whatever the dubious results of capitulating to such pressures may be, their effect in the present context is to add a further taint to such resolutions as may be adopted here today, since it is patently clear that they will be adopted in no small part under duress and as a result of coercion.

No one can entertain any illusions that the initiators of this session have the cause of peace at heart. Their real purpose was the very opposite. It was to try to frustrate and, if at all possible, to subvert the ongoing peace process in the Middle East. That object is beyond their grasp. For the peace process will go on despite the efforts to torpedo it. And the reason for this is very simple. The peace process does not depend on Governments and States bent on destabilization and destruction. The quest for peace and its eventual inevitable attainment flow from the desire of ordinary people - men, women, and I dare say children, on both sides of the Arab-Israeli conflict, to give up war and live at peace. No majority in this Assembly and no illegal, tainted resolutions adopted by it can prevent that inexorable process.

Israel will vote against these draft resolutions. In so doing, we shall give expression to our total rejection both of the specific provisions contained in the drafts and also of this illegal session itself. This session and such resolutions as it adopts are tainted ab initio.

Mr. AL-ZAHAWIE (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): The discussion that has taken place at this emergency special session has helped us to unmask Zionism and its aggressive ambitions in Palestine, just as it has revealed the nature of the force called "peace negotiations" within the nature of the Camp David framework.

The delegation of Iraq will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/ES-7/L.1 although we do not believe that draft resolution to be up to the level of the seriousness of the situation in Palestine and in the entire Arab area.

During this emergency special session, the General Assembly should have at least adopted the necessary measures to impose sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter against the Zionist entity, because of its intransigence and stubbornness in pursuing its aggression and its annexation of the Arab territories.

I should also like to mention operative paragraph 7, which calls on the aggressor to withdraw from the Arab territories occupied since 1967. This does not mean that its occupation of the territories by force in 1948 and 1949 was legitimate. The principle of the inadmissibility of annexing territories by force applies to all the Arab territories occupied since 1948. It is up to the international community to be keenly aware that any ambiguity or hesitation in the application of that principle, in all cases of occupation of territories by force will encourage the aggressor to be intransigent in its refusal to withdraw from the territories occupied in 1967. If that principle were not applied in all cases involving the annexation of territories by force, that would mean its selective and haphazard application, which would weaken the whole principle and encourage the aggressor to annex the territories it has occupied by force.

(Mr. Al-Zahawie, Iraq)

This draft resolution does not contain any reference to "secure and recognized boundaries". Is it possible, is it logical, for the international community to talk about the legitimate rights and security of an aggressor? Can one speak about the security of the racist entity in South Africa and its legitimate rights in Namibia for example? And there is the fact that the aggressor itself has refused all borders for its entity. Similarly, it is continuing its plans for annexation by force, and the imposition of a fait accompli on the whole of the region and on the international community. Thus it would be better to call upon the aggressor to withdraw and to comply with the United Nations resolutions before speaking about its security of the aggressor and the recognition of its boundaries, which have never been clearly stated.

The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the vote.

I now call upon the representative of Senegal, who wishes to make a statement on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1.

I call upon the representative of Israel, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. BLUM (Israel): Under rule 88 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly,

"After the President has announced the beginning of voting, no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connexion with the actual conduct of the voting."

The voting process has begun with the explanations of vote. That also is clear from rule 88. The representative of Senegal being one of the sponsors, he is not permitted to participate in this stage of our deliberations in explanation of vote. I would invite you, with all due respect, Mr. President, to rule accordingly.

The PRESIDENT: It is not my understanding that the representative of Senegal wishes to explain his vote before the vote. It is my understanding that he wishes to make a statement that will help the the conduct of the voting, and until I have heard what the representative of Senegal has to say it is of course very difficult for me to rule that what he has to say is out of order. Accordingly, I call upon the representative of Senegal.

Mr. KANE (Senegal) (interpretation from French): I have little to add to what you have just said, Mr. President, except to say that, as is customary, the representative of Israel is assuming a position without even knowing what this Assembly is going to do or say. He has already granted an interview stating that he will attach no importance whatsoever to any resolution to be adopted by this Assembly.

As a sponsor, I am able to read the rules of procedure. I am not speaking in explanation of vote. I am speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the text --

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

Mr. BLUM (Israel): We have been given to understand that the representative of Senegal wishes to make a statement in connexion with the conduct of the voting. His remarks so far have had nothing to do with the conduct of the voting, and I would ask you, Mr. President, to remind him of that.

The PRESIDENT: I think it would be wiser to allow the representative of Senegal to conclude his statement. I call upon him.

Mr. KANE (Senegal) (interpretation from French): In our country we have a proverb that says "A drowning man will grab a crocodile by the tail."

I should like to say that, following consultations among the sponsors of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1 and other delegations, we have an addition to make, a new operative paragraph 9. I have the text in English. It is now being translated and typed, and it is to be distributed. The text reads as follows:

(spoke in English)

"Further demands that Israel should fully comply with all United Nations resolutions relevant to the preservation of the historic character of the Holy City of Jerusalem, in particular Security Council resolution 476 (1980) of 30 June 1980".

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

Mr. BLUM (Israel): It has now become abundantly clear that what the representative of Senegal proposes to do is not to make a statement in relation to the conduct of the voting. What he is trying to do is to introduce an oral amendment to the draft resolution before the General Assembly. Having regard to rule 88 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, to which I have already referred, it is also patently obvious that that attempt is in violation of rule 88. I would therefore request you, Mr. President, to rule accordingly.

The PRESIDENT: It seems to me that we are caught up in a situation that is not all that clear. It is true that rule 88 of the rules of procedure clearly stipulates that the President shall not permit the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment. But it is not my understanding that the representative of Senegal is explaining his vote on the proposed addition. What he is doing is introducing an oral revision to the draft resolution. The question arises whether the representative can introduce an oral revision. I am afraid that there is nothing in the rules, as I understand them, that clearly stipulates that that cannot be done. According to rule 78,

"Proposals and amendments shall normally be submitted in writing to the Secretary-General, who shall circulate copies to the delegations. As a general rule, no proposal shall be discussed or put to the vote at any meeting of the General Assembly unless copies of it have been circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting. The President may, however, permit the discussion and consideration of amendments, or of motions as to procedure, even though such amendments and motions have not been circulated or have only been circulated the same day."

With respect to the interpretation of those two provisions of the rules of procedure, I think the best way to approach this problem would be for the Assembly itself to decide whether the Assembly is in agreement -

I call on the representative of Senegal on a point of order.

Mr. KANE (Senegal) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, before you put this question to the General Assembly I should like to say that the amendment has already been submitted. You can ask the Secretariat; I am sure that it will confirm that. It simply has to be typed and translated. I thought it was a good idea for the Assembly to know that, so that it might realize that we are not now trying to introduce an oral amendment but rather that a written amendment is in the hands of the Secretariat.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Israel on a point of order.

Mr. BLUM (Israel): The first time that this Assembly was told of the existence of such an amendment was in the statement of the representative of Senegal. No document to that effect was circulated before that.

With all due respect, the situation here is clearly governed by rule 88 of the rules of procedure, which provides:

"After the President has announced the beginning of voting, no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connexion with the actual conduct of the voting."

It is also clear from the rest of rule 88 that once the explanations of vote have started the voting procedure has started, and it is therefore out of order for anyone to submit amendments of any kind to the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT: I think I have already stated that the interpretation of rule 88 in this respect can be fairly flexible.

By introducing an oral addition which has already been submitted to the Secretariat, the representative of Senegal is in fact helping the Assembly in the voting procedure. However since, as I said, this is a rule that is quite ambiguous, I think that whenever there is a conflict as to the interpretation of a rule the best judge is the Assembly itself.

Clearly, if the representative of Israel, or any other representative, feels that, in the light of the fact that the addition which is being introduced by the representative of Senegal is now being introduced during the process of voting and that there is the need for some time before the voting can take place, the Assembly could decide, for example, to delay the vote for the next 24 hours before proceeding to the vote. That is one option.

The Assembly could clearly also decide to proceed right away with the voting.

But as I said, in the conduct of the voting in this particular case, when that particular provision of the rules of procedure is read, it would seem to allow for the statement made by the representative of Senegal. Consequently, if the representative of Israel continues to take the position that the representative of Senegal is not entitled to introduce this addition at this point, I shall put the question to the Assembly for decision.

Mr. BLUM (Israel): That, indeed, is my position, Mr. President. But I have not asked for a vote, in full awareness of the constellation prevailing in this body.

The PRESIDENT: Since, as the representative of Israel knows, I am guided only by the wishes of the Assembly, the only course open to me is to be guided by the Assembly in this matter. Accordingly, I invite the representative of Senegal to conclude his statement.

Mr. KANE (Senegal) (interpretation from French): I have already stated the essence of what I intended to say, but I should like to add that the paragraph in question is not a new one. It had already been contained in Security Council resolution 476 (1980). Since some delegations may not have that resolution before them, I shall read out the relevant paragraphs. In operative paragraph 2 of its resolution 476 (1980) adopted on 30 June 1980, the Security Council:

"Strongly deplores the continued refusal of Israel, the occupying Power, to comply with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly." (Security Council resolution 476 (1980), para. 2)
In operative paragraph 3, the Council:

"Reconfirms that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel, the occupying Power, which purport to alter the character and status of the Holy City of Jerusalem have no legal validity and constitute a flagrant violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and also constitute a serious obstruction to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East"; (ibid., para. 3)
and in operative paragraph 4, it

"Reiterates that all such measures which have altered the geographic, demographic and historical character and status of the Holy City of Jerusalem are null and void and must be rescinded in compliance with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council". (ibid., para. 4)

Here I shall stop because that gives the essential. The Security Council, to which so many delegations refer, saying that it is the only body empowered by the Charter to adopt certain decisions, did state on 30 June precisely what I have indicated. It noted that flagrant violation and reiterated that the

(Mr. Kane, Senegal)

measures either envisaged or in effect were null and void. What we are asking is the addition of the proposed paragraph, so as to repeat precisely what was stated by the Security Council, above all in view of the fact that, as everyone is aware, there is a bill currently being considered by the Israeli Parliament that would constitute an additional violation of the historical character of the Holy City of Jerusalem.

In conclusion, I should like to state that the sponsors of the draft resolution took into consideration the statements made by most of our colleagues from Latin America. We also took into account the advice and suggestions we were given. That is why we agreed to the inclusion of the new paragraph that I have just read out.

That paragraph is being typed and translated, as I said, and will surely be distributed before the vote takes place or, if the Assembly agrees, it could at least be approved before the meeting is adjourned.

The PRESIDENT: Members have heard the statement by the representative proposing the insertion of a new operative paragraph 9 in draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1. In order to ensure that every delegation is aware of the proposal by the representative of Senegal, I wish to read out the operative paragraph suggested by that representative as a new operative paragraph 9:

"Further demands that Israel should fully comply with all United Nations resolutions relevant to the historic character of the Holy City of Jerusalem, in particular Security Council resolution 476 (1980) of 30 June 1980".

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution, as revised, at this time.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-7/L.1/Rev.1.

Mr. AL-ZAHAWIE (Iraq): My delegation would like to request that a roll-call vote be taken on the draft resolution in question.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Oman, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

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

Against: Australia, Canada, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Israel, Norway, United States of America

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Burma, Denmark, Fiji,
Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti,
Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liberia,
Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Paraguay,
Portugal, Samoa, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain
and Northern Ireland

The draft resolution was adopted by 112 votes to 7, with 24 abstentions
(resolution ES-7/2).

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to the consideration of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.2/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: Australia, Canada, Guatemala, Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Burma, Denmark,
Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France,
Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Honduras,
Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia,
Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway,
Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain
and Northern Ireland, Zaire

The draft resolution was adopted by 112 votes to 5, with 26 abstentions.
(resolution ES-7/3).

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes after the vote.

Mr. FIGUEROA (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): In voting in favour of the resolution just adopted by this Assembly, my delegation was expressing its support for the tireless international efforts over many years to find a just, lasting and comprehensive peace which would allow all parties to enjoy the benefits of security.

As the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People said when he introduced the draft resolution, it was the result of a compromise; hence in order fully to reflect my country's position, it should be noted for the record that Argentina believes that a comprehensive solution to the conflict involves the right of all States in the region to exist within secure and mutually recognized boundaries.

Similarly, in our statement in this Assembly we declared that the Palestinians and Israelis must recognize each other's rights, just as they must recognize each other's existence and make every effort to live in peace, rejecting violence and terrorism.

Moreover, we construe the resolution just adopted to mean that the Palestinian and other occupied Arab territories are specifically those occupied since the June 1967 war. Similarly, my delegation's statement contained an extensive exposition of our views on the situation which should prevail in the Holy City of Jerusalem; accordingly, we consider all references to Jerusalem in the framework of those views.

We wish the Secretary-General every success in the discharge of the difficult mandate entrusted to him under this resolution. However, we believe that his task would have been facilitated if the terms of the mandate contained in the text had been more realistic and more in keeping with the actual circumstances of the question of Palestine.

Mr. PETERS (Luxembourg) (interpretation from French): Only a few days ago Mr. Gaston Thorn set forth the position of the Nine, and in particular the general criteria laid down in the Venice Declaration of 18 June 1980 as being necessary to bring about a comprehensive, just and equitable peace in the Middle East to which the European Community countries attach primary importance.

Because of certain elements in the resolutions and also because of certain omissions which are inconsistent with the Venice Declaration and resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council, they naturally cannot be accepted in their present form by the Governments of the Nine.

The Europe of the Nine wishes to bring its full weight to bear in this difficult matter, and it feels that its traditional bonds of friendship with all the countries in the Middle East justified an initiative on its part. The nine member countries of the European Community did not wish to prejudge in any way the contacts they will be making in the near future under their present Chairman.

If the Nine abstained in the voting, it was because they did not wish to take up a position as to the substance of the resolutions. Their position, I should like to repeat, has been set forth in the Venice Declaration. By their vote they wished also to express their determination not to take a stand just before the friendly and in-depth talks which their chief is shortly to be holding with both sides.

Mr. DIEZ (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): The Chilean delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution because we firmly believe that the resolution just adopted includes all the principles of the Charter and of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council on this issue, including the means for finding a peaceful settlement to the dispute and the right of all States in the region - which logically include Israel - to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

We would have preferred the resolution to have been more explicit, quoting the Charter of the Organization and all the relevant resolutions of the United Nations in its operative part; however, the clear reference made to them by the representative of Senegal when he introduced the draft resolution dissipated our doubts on that point.

(Mr. Diez, Chile)

As we stated in the general debate, it is only the political will to find a just solution and the subsequent negotiations that can bring peace, which will be brought closer in so far as each of the parties shows a broad understanding and does not consider only its own interests but also the interests of all the peoples in the region and of the world with regard to this Holy Land, with which we are all so closely bound by spiritual and religious links.

Mr. PETROPOULOS (Greece): In voting in favour of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1 and Corr.1, my delegation wishes to emphasize both its solidarity with the Palestinian people in the pursuit of their national rights and its earnest desire for a peaceful solution of the Palestinian problem.

In this context, we note with satisfaction that the representative of Senegal, in introducing the draft resolution, has stated that the principles mentioned in the text as a basis for a just solution of the Palestinian problem actually include an additional principle which, although not explicitly mentioned in the resolution, is clearly implied through the reference to the United Nations resolutions that contain it.

It is the principle of respect for the sovereignty and independence of all the States of the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, to which my country subscribes along with all the other principles stated in the resolution.

Mr. BALETA (Albania) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Albania voted in favour of both draft resolutions. With its affirmative vote our delegation wished to express its support of the Palestinian cause. But we should like to stress that our delegation is not entirely satisfied with the text of the resolutions that have just been adopted and that we do have certain reservations.

In our view, the text should contain some very important essential elements, which are now missing. This emergency special session should condemn in its final document the causes and factors that stand in the way of a settlement of the question of Palestine, namely, the continued aggression of the Israeli Zionists, the many forms of assistance constantly given to the Israeli Zionists by the American imperialists and the aggressive and hegemonistic policies and the

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

plots of the two super-Powers in the Middle East. The resolutions adopted refer, furthermore, to different documents that have been already adopted by the United Nations. The Socialist People's Republic of Albania has in the past expressed reservations regarding some of those documents. The Albanian delegation would like once again to say that it maintains all those reservations.

Miss VALERE (Trinidad and Tobago): The delegation of Trinidad and Tobago voted in favour of the draft resolution on the question of Palestine contained in document A/ES-7/L.1. My delegation would like to reiterate, however, that any lasting solution of the problem in the Middle East must include the following elements, that is, recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, independence and sovereignty in Palestine; recognition of the right of all States in the region to live in peace and within secure and recognized boundaries; participation of all parties, including the representatives of the Palestine Liberation Organization, in the peace negotiations; and the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force; determination that all measures taken by Israel to change the physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure or status of the Palestinian or other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, or any part thereof, have no legal validity and that Israel's policy and practise of settling parts of its population and new immigrants in those territories constitute a flagrant violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and also constitute a serious obstruction to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East, as stated in operative paragraph 5 of Security Council resolution 465 (1980).

While the draft resolution adopted contains some of these basic elements, it nevertheless presents a certain imbalance which we would have preferred to see corrected. My delegation's vote in favour of the resolution should therefore be interpreted in that light.

Mr. NISIBORI (Japan): Japan's basic position regarding the question of Palestine was made clear in my statement before this body on 23 July. My delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolutions before us because some paragraphs contained elements that were inconsistent with Japan's basic position.

However, I should like to emphasize that our abstention in no way contradicts the various principles which we believe are essential for a just and lasting solution of the Middle East problem, namely, the exercise of the right to self-determination by the Palestinian people; Israel's withdrawal from all territories it has occupied since June 1967, including East Jerusalem; and the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization in the peace process.

Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): In view of the fact that the main preoccupation of this emergency special session has been with the rights of the Palestinian people, and in view of my delegation's support of those rights as recognized by relevant United Nations resolutions, the delegation of Thailand was able to vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-7/L.1/Rev.1, just adopted by this Assembly. Nevertheless, my delegation is not entirely happy with some parts of the resolution, and its vote should be seen in the following light.

It remains my delegation's position that the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area, and its right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force, must be acknowledged and respected. In this regard, it is my delegation's understanding that operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1/Rev.1 refers also to Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

At the same time as the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people are recognized, including the right to statehood, the legitimate right of the State of Israel to exist within secure and recognized borders must also be recognized. Such a basis is deemed by my delegation to be essential for any real prospect of a just and lasting solution to the conflict in the Middle East.

Miss MENON (Singapore): The Singapore delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/ES-7/L.1/Rev.1, just adopted by the General Assembly. It wishes, however, to place on record its position on certain elements of the draft resolution.

First, Singapore wishes to reiterate its belief that United Nations Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) form a reasonable basis for a peaceful solution of the Palestinian question.

Secondly, our support for this draft resolution on the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people is on the clear understanding that the State of Israel has the right to exist as a sovereign and independent State within safe and secure boundaries.

(Miss Menon, Singapore)

Thirdly, the references in the draft resolution to the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories, including Jerusalem, are understood to mean only those Arab territories occupied by Israel after the June 1967 war.

Mr. LINDENBERG SETTE (Brazil): In my delegation's statement during the present emergency special session, I said that one of the basic conditions for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East is the right of all States in the region to exist within recognized boundaries. In this connexion, we have taken note of the statement of the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, made to this Assembly on 28 July at the ninth meeting of this session, when he introduced the draft resolution in document A/ES-7/L.1.

Mr. ZAVALA (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/ES-7/L.1/Rev.1. We should like, however, to express some reservations on paragraphs 2, 7 and 12 of the draft resolution, because we consider that some of their provisions affect the spirit of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which clearly establishes the coexistence of Arabs and Israelis in what used to be Palestine. Furthermore, we believe that the time-limit mentioned by the draft resolution - that is, 15 November 1980 - is too short and its application could lead to a renewal of warlike actions, which it is the duty of the United Nations to prevent by all means. Furthermore, my Government feels that the application of measures under Chapter VII of the Charter is more a matter for the Security Council of this world Organization.

Mr. TOUSSAINT (Haiti) (interpretation from French): As my delegation stated in the general debate on the question of Palestine, a just and lasting settlement of the conflict should highlight the spirit of understanding and conciliation that would make it possible for the parties involved to settle through negotiations a dispute that has lasted far too long.

We abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/ES-7/L.1/Rev.1 because we believe that the recommendations in paragraphs 7, 8 and 12 are couched in too peremptory tones and hence take the parties farther away from the road of peaceful negotiations.

We abstained also in the vote on draft resolution A/ES-7/L.2/Rev.1, because it contains some obscure points, particularly in regard to the Committee's study of the reasons for Israel's refusal to comply with the relevant United Nations resolutions. My delegation does not see exactly what the sponsors of the draft resolution have in mind. The paragraph in question does not seem clear. That is why we abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

Mr. NARANCIO (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): Our votes during this emergency special session of the General Assembly should be viewed in the context of the position taken by Uruguay during the deliberations at earlier sessions and on the resolutions previously adopted.

On 29 September 1977, at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, Mr. Alejandro Rovira, who was then our Minister for Foreign Affairs, said:

"The difficult situation in the Middle East is a matter of special concern to my Government, as its prolongation threatens peace and international security.

"My delegation has taken the opportunity of expressing Uruguay's views on this problem during other sessions of the General Assembly, and I should like to repeat them today.

(Mr. Narancio, Uruguay)

"From a purely legal point of view, it is clear that military victory confers no rights, still less territorial rights. Accordingly, the community of nations accepts the principle that each State has the right to live in peace, within secure and recognized borders, enjoying respect for its existence, sovereignty, integrity and independence.

"In any examination of the over-all problem of the Middle East, account must be taken, both on political and on human grounds, of the fate of the Palestinian people, and formulas must be found within the framework of the peace negotiations which will secure their legitimate aspirations.

"We believe that those directly interested should, as soon as possible, negotiate appropriate and just understandings based on the principles of international law, with a view to finding a comprehensive solution to this question, so that finally a fully adequate peace agreement can be achieved in this area." (A/32/PV.13, p. 84-85)

At the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, Foreign Minister Adolfo Folle Martinez said the following:

"The delegation of Uruguay has argued, and still argues, that all conflicts can and should be resolved through dialogue and negotiation, in the light of the principles of justice and the precepts of the Charter.

"We consider that Israel, born as a State through a resolution of our Organization, is an irreversible reality and that its right to exist as such demands the recognition of safe and secure borders.

"My delegation also considers, in accordance with the principles guiding the thought and philosophy of Uruguay, that the Palestinian people have a right to self-determination, namely, to the recognition of their individuality and autonomy in the international arena, and consequently to form a free and sovereign State.

"It is because of all the foregoing that Uruguay views with satisfaction the steps taken and the ones being taken in this direction and enthusiastically supports the efforts being made in the international arena to bring the parties involved closer to a fruitful understanding which will put an end to this situation." (A/33/PV.15, p. 32)

(Mr. Narancio, Uruguay)

More recently, at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, the same Foreign Secretary, Mr. Folle Martinez, repeated the same ideas. On the basis of these very fundamental principles, my Government, taking into account all factors that affect the situation in the Middle East as duly analysed by our Foreign Ministry, decided to vote in favour of the resolutions which have just been approved. Our vote is based on Uruguay's traditional position of supporting and contributing to peaceful and just ways and means of finding a solution to the question of Palestine and of ensuring the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, the possession of a national territory and the establishment of a State. If all aspects of the problem are not considered, however, there can be no final solution. Nonetheless, we can move towards agreement by using some of the measures contained in this resolution.

We should like to state our position on the following reservations. Firstly, we supported the resolution on the understanding that the existence of Israel is recognized as irreversible, including its right to existence within secure and recognized borders, in keeping with Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

Secondly, it is understood that the objective of the resolution is Israel's withdrawal from all Palestinian and Arab territories occupied in June 1967.

Thirdly, with regard to Jerusalem, the Government of Uruguay believes that Jerusalem is a Holy City and that it should have a special régime, as decided by the General Assembly in resolutions 181 (II) and 303 (IV). Moreover, we share the concern expressed by His Holiness Pope John Paul II in this connexion.

Fourthly, with regard to operative paragraph 5, we understand that the PLO may be regarded provisionally as the spokesman for the Palestinian people in international bodies dealing with the fate of

(Mr. Narancio, Uruguay)

that people, but only until the Palestinian people are able freely to exercise their right to self-determination and consequently are able to decide who will be their legitimate representative.

The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the vote.

The observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization has asked to be given the opportunity to make a statement. I have noted that on several occasions in the past, the Assembly deemed it appropriate to allow the observer to speak on this item after delegations had spoken in explanation of vote.

In accordance with such precedents, I call on Mr. Farouk Kaddoumi, Head of the Political Department of the Palestine Liberation Organization, to make a brief statement.

Mr. KALDOUMI (Palestine Liberation Organization) (interpretation from Arabic): The General Assembly is now on the point of closing this emergency special session. At this point, I would like, on behalf of the Palestine Liberation Organization, to express my great appreciation to you, Mr. President, for the praiseworthy efforts that you have exerted in order to ensure that this session is a successful one. I should also like to express our appreciation to you for the wisdom and know-how you have demonstrated which reflect your vast experience and knowledge of procedure. You also revealed the friendly spirit of your country, which has constantly supported all causes of liberation and human progress.

I should also like to express our appreciation to Dr. Kurt Waldheim, our esteemed Secretary-General, and I should like to thank him for his integrity, his courage, his patience in directing the world Organization among all the conflicting political currents.

(Mr. Kaddoumi, Palestine
Liberation Organization)

If any body deserves our profound thanks and appreciation, it is of course the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which has worked extremely hard to help our people to exercise its right to return to its homeland, its right to self-determination, and to establish its own independent State. These rights have been established and reaffirmed by this Assembly, which represents the will of the entire international community. We would also therefore address our thanks to the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Mr. Kane, for his intensive efforts and for his high resolve and great determination to continue with his work despite the tremendous difficulty of the task and the many obstacles with which the Committee has been faced.

I should not fail to emphasize what has become clear to us, during this session, namely, that the peoples of the world which aspire to peace and justice are now giving their full support to our just cause because they are aware of the importance and gravity of this issue.

This has been evidenced by the very high level of participation of many friendly States in the work of this session. These countries have thus expressed their support for the rights of the Palestinians and Arabs. They have expressed their rejection of the false pretenses of the Zionists and their supporters and all attitudes supporting such pretenses. To all members and heads of delegations that have spoken up for the cause of peace and justice, we express the gratitude and appreciation of our people and its leadership.

For more than one week this emergency special session of the General Assembly has heard one delegation after another speak of our inalienable national rights. We felt confident and optimistic and could expect the inevitable triumph of our just struggle while listening to their statements expressing the voice and conscience of their peoples in supporting our cause.

(Mr. Kaddoumi, Palestine
Liberation Organization)

Our delegation has also witnessed at the same time the attitude of the delegations of the Government of the United States of America and its ally, Israel, in defying this international meeting and their persistence in going against the international consensus. They have continued to go against the course of history. They are thus going against the spirit of the times and violating the rights of the peoples to live in freedom, security and peace.

What is ridiculous is the American Administration's persistent, arrogant stubbornness in refusing to learn the lessons of the very recent past, when the peoples of Viet Nam, Iran, Nicaragua and Zimbabwe imposed their will in the face of imperialism, which is still betting on dictatorships and racist régimes like that of the Zionists.

(Mr. Kaddoumi, Palestine Liberation Organization)

Will the United States Government not learn the lesson and halt its support for the Zionist and racist régime, which is violating the rights of the Arab indigenous population and desecrating places holy to hundreds of millions in the world?

We should like to refer to the position taken by the European Community. The countries of that Community have taken a negative attitude by abstaining in the vote on a resolution containing the fundamental rights of the Palestinian people, which are provided for in the United Nations Charter and which have been reconfirmed by resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. Those who have talked of balance in resolutions themselves lack balance in their own logic. At a time when they insist on the right of all in the region to live in security and peace they are denying that right to our people, through non-recognition of our right to build a national independent State in our homeland, under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). We know that the States of Western Europe, which play an effective and, indeed, influential role in world politics, bear responsibility for their negative attitude regarding the cause of the just peace in the Middle East.

This morning my attention was caught by an article in The New York Times which referred to the gravity of the measure taken by Begin's Government to move its headquarters to occupied Jerusalem. Now, if the American Administration is concerned about this move, then what can be the position of the Arab States and the non-aligned States on this extremely dangerous act of provocation? This once again shows that Israel is simply continuing to flout the international position and Security Council resolutions and that it is fully responsible for all the resulting explosive tension in our region.

We now go back to our people, after having gained your sympathy and support. This has been expressed in the resolution that has just been adopted by the Assembly. However, at the same time, we feel that we still have a long, long road ahead and that a great deal of sacrifice will still be required. Further support is needed from the Assembly to ensure that we can triumph over the intransigence and arrogance of the Zionist entity, which is continuing

(Mr. Kaddoumi, Palestine Liberation Organization)

to establish settlements right in the middle of our land and driving out our citizens from their homes. Israel's intransigence is made manifest by its policy in the occupied territories and also in Lebanon, which will lead the area to more suffering and bloodshed, violence and tension. However, we have every reason to believe that our firm struggle, the determination of our people and the Assembly's support for our cause will ensure our triumph over aggression, so that the way can be open for the just peace to which the whole world aspires.

In speaking of our hope for victory, I must emphasize the historic event of the independence of the people of Zimbabwe won over the Rhodesian racist régime. I pay a tribute to that valiant people of Zimbabwe and to the friendly Government of Zimbabwe. Their victory is the victory of all peoples struggling and fighting against racism and aspiring to liberation and independence. I take this opportunity to address to them and the other African States, our most sincere congratulations on Zimbabwe's forthcoming admission to membership of the United Nations, which will allow it to take its place alongside the other peoples of the world.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: We have had a week of intensive debate in which more than 100 Member States have taken part. This highly impressive number of participants, coupled with the significant presence of so many Ministers here in New York for the consideration of the item, is in itself clear testimony to the seriousness and urgency with which the international community considers the question of Palestine.

The discussion has been serious and constructive. In it we have witnessed an unmitigated expression of the profound concern shared by all that the critical situation prevailing in the Middle East seriously threatens the peace and security not only of the region itself but also of the world at large.

(The President)

From the extensive debate and prolonged consultations we have held, it is evident that there has emerged a growing conviction that the continued denial to the people of Palestine of their legitimate right is contrary to the very principles on which this Organization is founded. It has repeatedly been emphasized that our failure to adopt, within the shortest possible period of time, effective measures to redress this anomaly will not only constitute a failure of the Organization as an effective guardian of peace, justice and freedom for all but also result in further escalation of the conflict with serious consequences for the peoples of both the region and the world community as a whole.

Equally manifest throughout our debate was the irrevocable commitment and express readiness of the entire membership to work diligently and ceaselessly, jointly and individually, towards securing as speedily as possible conditions of harmony, stability and security for the region and for all its peoples. In so expressing themselves, a large number of Members made a continued pressing call for intensified involvement of the United Nations as a whole in all phases of the related processes.

At the outset of this emergency special session, I observed that this session could make an important contribution if it advanced positively and constructively the international consensus in support of Palestinian inalienable rights, thus building a solid foundation for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

(The President)

As the culmination of our joint endeavours during this emergency session, the Assembly thus adopted a while ago a series of recommendations designed to bring about the results sought after by all concerned with this question over the past three decades.

Let us earnestly hope that, given the necessary co-operation, dedication and understanding on the part of all concerned, the faithful observance of the aims and purposes underlying those recommendations will further enhance our ability to put an end to the misery and suffering that have afflicted the Palestinian people and to restore to them their legitimate and inherent rights and that they will, at the same time, create conditions for peace and security for all the peoples and States of the region.

I cannot conclude my remarks without expressing my deep gratitude and appreciation for the exemplary co-operation and assistance extended to me so abundantly by all of you. I should also like to thank the Secretary-General, the Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs and all the members of the Secretariat for all they have done in ensuring the efficient conclusion of this session.

Before adjourning, I should like to take this opportunity, if I may, to join the Secretary-General and the Chairman of the Special Committee of 24 in extending warm congratulations to the Government and the people of the new-born nation of the Independent Republic of Vanuatu, the former Non-Self-Governing Territory of the New Hebrides, upon its accession today to full and sovereign nationhood.

I am sure I am reflecting the general sentiments of the entire membership of this Organization when I express our satisfaction at the achievement by another former colonial territory of the objectives of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

In accordance with resolution ES-7/2 adopted at the present meeting, the seventh emergency special session of the General Assembly is temporarily adjourned.

The meeting rose at 2.25 p.m.