



CONTENTS

Agenda item 93: Financial emergency of the United Nations: report of the Negotiating Committee on the Financial Emergency of the United Nations Report of the Fifth Committee	
Agenda item 94: Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency: (a) Administrative budgets of the specialized agencies and of the International Atomic Energy Agency: report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions; (b) Impact of inflation on the budgets of the organizations of the United Nations system: report of the Secretary-General Report of the Fifth Committee	1535
Agenda item 95: Joint Inspection Unit: reports of the Joint Inspection Unit Report of the Fifth Committee	
Agenda item 101: Financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East (<i>continued</i>): (b) United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon: report of the Secretary-General Report of the Fifth Committee (Part II)	
Agenda item 17: Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (<i>continued</i>): (h) Appointment of a member of the Joint Inspection Unit	1537
Agenda item 20: Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea	1537
Agenda item 26: The situation in the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General (<i>continued</i>)	1539
Agenda item 23: Question of Cyprus: report of the Secretary-General ..	1546
Agenda item 24: Question of Palestine: report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (<i>continued</i>)	1546

President: Mr. Rüdiger von WECHMAR
(Federal Republic of Germany).

AGENDA ITEM 93

Financial emergency of the United Nations: report of the Negotiating Committee on the Financial Emergency of the United Nations

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/35/722)

AGENDA ITEM 94

Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency:

- (a) **Administrative budgets of the specialized agencies and of the International Atomic Energy Agency: report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions;**
- (b) **Impact of inflation on the budgets of the organizations of the United Nations system: report of the Secretary-General**

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/35/621)

AGENDA ITEM 95

Joint Inspection Unit: reports of the Joint Inspection Unit

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/35/723)

AGENDA ITEM 101

Financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East (*continued*)*:

- (b) **United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon: report of the Secretary-General**

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (PART II) [A/35/667/Add.1]

1. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee: I have the honour of introducing the reports of the Fifth Committee on agenda items 93, 94, 95 and 101.

2. The first concerns item 93, on the financial emergency of the United Nations [A/35/722]. In paragraph 6 of the report the Committee recommends a draft resolution for adoption by the General Assembly.

3. The second report concerns agenda item 94, on administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and IAEA [A/35/621]. The recommendations of the Committee are contained in paragraphs 8 and 9 of that document, which include respectively a draft resolution and a draft decision.

4. The third report that I have the honour of presenting is that related to agenda item 95, on the Joint Inspection Unit [A/35/723]; paragraph 5 contains a recommendation for the adoption of a draft decision.

5. Finally, I have the honour of presenting part II of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 101, dealing with the financing of UNIFIL [A/35/667/Add.1]; the

* Resumed from the 76th meeting.

recommendation of the Committee is contained in paragraph 7.

Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Fifth Committee.

6. The PRESIDENT: The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the Fifth Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

7. I would remind members that, under decision 34/101, the General Assembly agreed that when the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee. I would also remind members that, in accordance with decision 34/401, explanations of vote should not exceed 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

8. We shall consider the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 93, on the financial emergency of the United Nations.

9. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 6 of its report [A/35/722]. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chad, China, Congo, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United States of America, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Mozambique, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution was adopted by 64 votes to 8, with 9 abstentions (resolution 35/113).^{1 2}

¹ The delegations of Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Burma, Central African Republic, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Iran, Ireland, Lesotho, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Peru, Qatar, Sierra Leone, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay and Venezuela subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

² The delegation of Bulgaria subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been against the draft resolution.

10. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 94, concerning administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and IAEA [A/35/621].

11. I now put before the Assembly the draft resolution recommended by the Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. That draft resolution was adopted without objection in the Committee. May I take it that the General Assembly also adopts it without objection?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 35/114).

12. The PRESIDENT: May I also take it that the Assembly adopts the draft decision contained in paragraph 9 of the report of the Fifth Committee [A/35/621]?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 35/426).

13. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 95, on the Joint Inspection Unit [A/35/723].

14. The Assembly will take a decision on the draft decision recommended by the Committee in paragraph 5 of that report. The Committee adopted the draft decision without objection. May I consider that the General Assembly also adopts it without objection?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 35/427).

15. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now consider the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 101 (b), concerning the financing of UNIFIL [A/35/667/Add.1].

16. The Assembly will take a decision on the two draft resolutions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. First I put to the vote draft resolution A. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Congo.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 89 votes to 12, with 1 abstention (resolution 35/115 A).^{2, 3}

17. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution B contained in document A/35/667/Add.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Congo, Romania.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 88 votes to 12, with 2 abstentions (resolution 35/115 B).^{2, 3}

AGENDA ITEM 17

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments (continued):*

(h) Appointment of a member of the Joint Inspection Unit

18. The PRESIDENT: As a result of consultations, including consultations with the President of the Economic and Social Council and with the Secretary-General in his capacity as Chairman of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, I submit to the General Assembly the following candidates for appointment as members of the Joint Inspection Unit for a five-year term beginning on 1 January 1981: Mr. Moustapha Ould Khalifa (Mauritania) and Mr. Miljenko Vuković (Yugoslavia). May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to appoint those candidates?

It was so decided (decision 35/317).

³ The delegations of Bangladesh, Central African Republic, Egypt, Fiji, Lebanon, Lesotho, Mali, Morocco, Qatar, Sierra Leone and Uruguay subsequently advised the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

* Resumed from the 44th meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 20

Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea

19. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of Mexico who will introduce the draft resolution on agenda item 20.

20. Miss CABRERA (Mexico) [*interpretation from Spanish*]: The delegation of Mexico has the honour of introducing on behalf of Bulgaria, Honduras, India, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Singapore, Thailand, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania and on its own behalf draft resolution A/35/L.30/Rev.1 and Add.1, on the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

21. The progress achieved at the ninth session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, which took place in July and August of this year, is recorded in document A/CONF.62/WP.10/Rev.3 of 22 September 1980. The efforts that were made at that session and the very clear political will that was displayed by various groups of interest made it possible to reach agreement on difficulties that in the past appeared to be virtually insurmountable. For that reason the Conference now has before it a draft Convention, and it is nearing the final stages of its work. It is now necessary to preserve that political will and to redouble our efforts in order to achieve the goal we all so ardently desire.

22. The draft resolution is a procedural one. It is intended to approve the convening of the tenth session of the Conference and the holding of an inter-sessional meeting of the Drafting Committee on the basis of the recommendations of the Conference concerning the dates of the session, its length and venue. Operative paragraphs 2 and 3 apply in this respect.

23. The Group of 77, as previously, will meet three days before the tenth session opens. Therefore, in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution we recommend that the Secretary-General should provide the necessary facilities for meetings of that Group as well as for those of other groups which may desire to have informal consultations.

24. In operative paragraph 5, the Assembly requests the Secretary-General to prepare a study identifying the future functions of the Secretary-General under the draft convention and the needs of countries, especially developing countries, for information, advice and assistance under the new legal régime, that study to be submitted to the tenth session of the Conference. As this paragraph indicates, the study in question, the purpose of which is to provide the Conference with relevant information, will have to be considered by the Conference itself, and the Conference will take any decision it deems fit on the basis of the information that study contains.

25. In operative paragraph 6 the Assembly suggests to the Secretary-General that special efforts be made to promote the widest possible public awareness of the achievements of the Conference. This is of extreme importance in view of the progress that has been achieved and the possible adoption in the near future of the draft Convention.

26. Finally, in operative paragraph 7 the Assembly authorizes the Secretary-General to make the necessary arrangements in accordance with the invitation extended by the Government of Venezuela for the holding of the final session of the Conference in Caracas, should the Conference decide, in consultation with that Government, to hold the final session prior to the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

27. On behalf of the sponsors, the Mexican delegation expresses the conviction that the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus. We shall thus have displayed once again the interest of Governments in negotiations aimed at drawing up a new legal régime for the sea, the importance of which is obvious to everyone.

28. We cannot conclude without expressing our deep distress at the passing of Mr. Hamilton Shirley Amerasinghe, who had been President of the Conference since the beginning of its work. The qualities that we all admired in him—his flexibility, his mental agility, his experience of people and the world, his very restrained and subtle approach, his courage—made him a modern knight errant, if you will, and he won the affection of everyone. He certainly carried out the duties entrusted to him very successfully. His name will be intimately connected with the legal order that will govern the sea, which will be a permanent monument to him. Indeed, we can say of him that the entire earth, the seas and the oceans will be the monument to his illustrious person.

29. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/35/L.30/Rev.1 and Add.1. I shall first call upon those representatives who wish to explain their position before the vote.

30. Mr. BODDENS HOSANG (Netherlands): Let me begin by expressing the deep sorrow and grief of my delegation at the passing of the President of the Conference on the Law of the Sea. His leadership was outstanding, and his presence will be deeply missed as we near the end of the Conference.

31. It is a source of great satisfaction to my delegation that the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, has, after many years of intensive negotiations, entered into its final and decisive stage. Never before has the international community been so close to the completion of such an elaborate and many-sided piece of international legislation. In this respect I should like to observe that it is of great importance that the concept of the "common heritage of mankind" with respect to the exploration and exploitation of the deep sea-bed has been embedded in a clear way, albeit not in the best possible way, in the draft convention.

32. A few thorny questions remain to be solved at the tenth session of the Conference, next year. As in the past, the Netherlands is prepared to co-operate in a constructive manner in the search for generally acceptable solutions in order that the convention on the law of the sea may be signed in Caracas in the autumn of next year.

33. But we should not focus our attention only on the completion of the negotiations and the adoption of the text of the convention. At this time it would seem wise to start preparations for the period between

the adoption of the text of the convention and its entry into force.

34. This concerns particularly the preparations for the establishment of the International Sea-bed Authority and the Enterprise. In this respect we can agree with operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution before us, in which the Assembly requests the Secretary-General to submit a study on his future functions under the draft Convention, as well as on the needs of countries, especially developing countries, for information, advice and assistance under the new legal régime.

35. My delegation hopes that States which sign the Convention will soon thereafter proceed to its ratification and that the Convention will enter into force at an early date. My delegation would therefore like to endorse the words of the indefatigable late President of the Law of the Sea Conference, Mr. Hamilton Shirley Amerasinghe, at the end of his letter to the President of the General Assembly, when he expressed the view that

"in recognition of the scope and complexity of the new Convention and of its importance for national development and international relations, a special effort should be made by the public information services of the United Nations, particularly in connexion with the adoption of the Convention, to promote the widest possible public awareness of the achievements of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea." [See A/35/500.]

36. I wish to conclude by expressing the firm conviction of my Government that the adoption of the Convention on the Law of the Sea and its speedy entry into force will be to the benefit of all mankind.

37. Mr. ZAKI (Maldives): I have the honour to propose an amendment [A/35/L.44] to draft resolution A/35/L.30/Rev.1 and Add.1. It consists of a completely new operative paragraph which I suggest should be inserted immediately after the present operative paragraph 1 as operative paragraph 2, with the remaining operative paragraphs being renumbered accordingly.

38. The amendment reads:

"Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session on the question of awarding a memorial fellowship or scholarship in the field of the law of the sea and related matters in recognition of the unique contribution made by Mr. Hamilton Shirley Amerasinghe to the work of the Conference".

That is my amendment to the draft resolution which is now before us.

39. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Maldives for introducing the amendment [A/35/L.44] to draft resolution A/35/L.30/Rev.1 and Add.1. May I take it that there is no objection to the adoption of that amendment?

The amendment was adopted.

40. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the draft resolution as just amended. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of this text is contained in document A/35/718, and Members will have discovered from

reading the amendment introduced by the representative of the Maldives that any financial implications it has will not be taken up until the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution A/35/L.30/Rev.1 and Add.1, as amended?

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted (resolution 35/116).

41. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their positions.

42. Mr. SEALY (Trinidad and Tobago): If there had been a separate vote on what has become, by virtue of the amendment introduced by the representative of the Maldives, operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution which has just been adopted by consensus, the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago would have abstained.

43. The delegation of Trinidad and Tobago is firmly of the opinion that the directive to the Secretary-General, in his capacity as Secretary-General of the Law of the Sea Conference, to undertake the study referred to in that paragraph should have been based more properly on a decision of the Conference to that effect or, as a minimum, on a discussion of a proposal for such a study at the Conference either at the level of its main organs or at the level of recognized interest groups. No such discussion or decision took place at any of those levels.

44. For those reasons, as well as because there was no agreement—again at the level of the Conference, since there was no discussion—on the general approach of the study and its structure and scope, the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago has taken the position which I have just outlined.

45. Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire) [*interpretation from French*]: I merely wish to say that we still have reservations with regard to certain parts of the draft Convention on the law of the sea, but notwithstanding those reservations we joined in the consensus on the draft resolution. We shall speak later on regarding those parts of the draft Convention on the law of the sea with which we do not agree.

46. Had there been a general debate, I would have done this before, but since there was none I merely wished to make this comment.

47. We thus joined in the consensus on the draft resolution which we see as purely procedural, although we have certain reservations regarding certain parts of the draft Convention.

AGENDA ITEM 26

The situation in the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*)

48. Mr. OURABAH (Algeria) [*interpretation from French*]: Of all the hotbeds of tension in the world, the Middle East has all the features of a microcosm containing flagrant attacks upon the very foundations of international society. This constantly deteriorating state of crisis carries within it the seeds of a conflagration which threatens international peace and security.

49. Having arisen from the denial of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and inde-

pendence, the crisis in the Middle East has taken on a fresh dimension with the occupation and annexation of territories of sovereign States by force, in contempt of the principles and norms of international law. Thus, there has been grafted on to the case of the resistance of a people which has been deprived of its fatherland a crisis enveloping the entire region, because both of the imperialist interests which are served by the Zionist entity and of the latter's flexing of its muscles.

50. In the face of this crisis, the United Nations, which played a decisive role in engendering it, has for many years confined its interest to developments resulting from the expansionist thrusts which are constantly being made by the Zionist entity, thus casting a heavy veil over the root cause of the conflict.

51. Rather than tackling with the necessary energy the matter of the satisfaction of the national rights of the Palestinian people and, consequently, making amends for the historic injustice for which the United Nations is responsible, the international community has with a greater or lesser degree of determination devoted itself to merely considering the consequences of the faits accomplis of the Zionist entity. At this point, the approach of the international community has become permanently marked by the flaw of fragmentation and, hence, of ineffectiveness.

52. The historical and political facts of the matter and the strategic interests involved are sufficiently well known for me not to have to expatiate on them here. The debates in this same body a few days ago on the question of Palestine once again not only indicated the need to restore the national and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people as a prerequisite for any solution intended to be just and lasting, but also revealed the underlying motives of the imperialist-Zionist policy in the region. For it is that policy which maintains and worsens the crisis in the Middle East by means of an institutionalized machinery of aggression which serves the purposes of subjugating peoples.

53. Based on racism and harbouring desires for hegemony and conquest, the Zionist entity can quite simply be defined as anti-Palestine. Whereas the long history of Palestine bears witness to a perfect symbiosis among the various communities whose very genius fertilized a land generously open to all religions, the Zionist entity has turned the land of Palestine into a totalitarian universe. A negation of Palestine and a negation of its tolerant and peaceful traditions, the Zionist entity is the negation of the Palestinian people itself, a people which has been banished from its lands, dispersed and pursued, and whose sons are now doomed to the condition of exile or of second-class citizenship. It is thus that an implacable process of Zionization of all of Palestine has been implemented by establishing a growing number of settlements, by transforming the historical, geographical and demographic features of Palestine, and by the annexation of the Holy City of Al Quds, with the avowed desire to annex further occupied Arab territories.

54. The repression practised against the population of the occupied territories has been compounded by constant acts of aggression against Lebanon for the threefold purpose of breaking Palestinian resistance, destroying the natural solidarity between the two

fraternal Palestinian and Lebanese peoples and of dismembering the territory of Lebanon. Moulded by a long tradition of concord and solidarity that bears witness to its national unity, and nourished by its faith in the common destiny that unites it with the Palestinian people, the Lebanese people have resisted aggression and have provided an excellent example of self-sacrifice in order that law may triumph.

55. All these things are typical violations of the norms of international law that our Organization has continually denounced. However, in spite of the repeated appeals of the United Nations to abandon its practice of creating *faits accomplis* in Palestine and in the Middle East generally, the Zionist entity persists in its policy of defiance and escalating aggression. The fact is that because of its geographical and strategic importance in the region the Zionist entity enjoys the protection and support of imperialism, which guarantees its impunity while strengthening its aggressive potential.

56. By that policy imperialism is attempting to hold back and contain the vast Arab national liberation movement, to preserve and consolidate the structures for dominating and exploiting the populations and to control a nerve centre in the world. That is the true mission that the Zionist entity, the bridgehead of imperialism in the region, is carrying out in the Middle East.

57. It is this link between the imperialist interests and the designs of Zionist ideology in the region that is sustaining the crisis and frustrating any effective United Nations action to impose on the aggressor the enforcement measures provided for in the Charter. Furthermore, imperialism, while impeding efforts to find a just and lasting solution within the framework of the United Nations by restoring the national rights of the Palestinian people and by unconditional withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories, has also contrived a false solution made possible by the collaboration of the Egyptian régime. By rewarding the aggressor with the fruits of its aggression, the Camp David accords and the Washington treaty of 1979 have forced the victim to make concession after concession and compromise after compromise.

58. Negotiated under the auspices of a Power acting as both judge and judged, fundamentally invalidated by the status of their signatories, drawn up under the influence of a relationship of force, deliberately ignoring the main point at issue and confined to secondary matters, the Camp David accords quickly revealed their inability to cope with the crisis. When the effect of the surprise had faded, the international community came to discover the full extent of the trick it was being called upon to applaud. When the noisy publicity organized by the mass information media had died down, the mask concealing the nature of those accords, their true purpose and their hitherto unavowed objective fell away once and for all. Concluded in the first instance between two parties that were not qualified to settle a problem primarily of concern to the Palestinian people and its sole legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO], the Camp David accords inevitably gave rise to a vast wave of disapproval. It could not be otherwise, since their basic premise represented a flagrant violation of the fundamental principles of the inter-

national community, more specifically those concerning the right to self-determination and independence and the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. Based on a power relationship representing a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and international law, the Camp David accords could not serve as a basis for peace. Furthermore, because they neglected the core element of the Middle East crisis, the need to restore to the Palestinian people their universally recognized inalienable national rights, the accords could lay no claim to validity.

59. The Camp David accords and the Washington treaty in the end do no more than confirm a *fait accompli*. The legitimization of a situation created by force is capitulation exacted by military power. By giving a super-Power the task of guaranteeing the implementation of those accords, that false solution aims to bring the entire region under the domination of the imperialists, whereas non-alignment is the best way to achieve the social and economic development of the Arab peoples and is an important contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security.

60. Having just emerged from the darkness of colonialism, the peoples of the Middle East have been faced with a new challenge, of which the Palestinian people continue to be the main victim. A vast plan has been conceived and implemented in the Middle East over the last 30 years. Its aim is to dominate all the peoples in the region by the subjugation of Palestine. The hotbeds of tension that are deliberately created and maintained on the periphery of the central issue of Palestine are merely elements of that plan designed to undermine the foundation of the unity of the Arab peoples while at the same time acting as diversionary tactics to sap their energies and divert their efforts from the just cause of Palestine.

61. Thus it is that the policy of escalation creates a diversion: every *fait accompli* is simply a prelude to a further one the next day, the fruits of aggression being the trump card of the aggressor, while the cutting of the Gordian knot of the crisis—the restoration of the rights of the Palestinians—is held up indefinitely.

62. Strong in their own capabilities, which can be gauged by their determination to bring about genuine peace in an atmosphere of freedom and justice, the Arab peoples, which stand solidly behind the Palestinians, are resolved to meet the challenge. Their struggle is one of those whose outcome is guaranteed by the inexorable tide of history.

63. The international community, for its part, must be aware that universal peace cannot be achieved in the absence of a just and final settlement to the Middle East crisis, which necessarily involves the exercise of the national rights of the Palestinian people and the unconditional evacuation of all occupied Arab territories.

64. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): The General Assembly's consideration of the Middle East question has at its origin one of the gravest acts of injustice that mankind has ever known: the expulsion of almost an entire nation from the land of its ancestors and its condemnation to a life of exile. The passage of time has only served to sharpen our feeling of pain and suffering at the tragedy that has befallen the Palestinian people, who are the victims of this massive

injustice, and to heighten our sense of indignation and outrage at the determination of Israel to frustrate every effort of the international community to correct the great wrong that has been done to the Palestinian people. We, as an international Organization, feel this indignation and outrage all the more keenly in the light of our own role in contributing to the Palestinian tragedy. So long as the Organization fails to put an end to this tragedy by restoring the national rights of the Palestinian people, we will continue to feel humbled by our betrayal of a trust and by our failure to discharge a sacred responsibility.

65. Since the Assembly last discussed this question, developments in the area have placed in even sharper relief the fragile stability and the volatility of the Middle East area and the great threat that region holds for international peace and security. The danger comes in part from outside pressures exerted by those who view the region as an arena for great-Power rivalry at the service of narrowly defined political, strategic, military and economic goals. In this clash of interests, the region's priorities become confused and the fierce competition to stake out spheres of influence takes precedence over the need to make honest and determined efforts to address the problems facing the region. The result is increasing tension.

66. But the danger to international peace and security in the region also resides in forces within the region. I am referring, for example, to the State of Israel, whose actions in the last year, consistent with what they have been in the past, have done nothing but aggravate the tensions in the region, tensions that are ever ready to explode into global hostilities. Israel has done nothing over the last year to advance the cause of peace in the Middle East. Instead, it has created more obstacles to the peace process. Indeed, as it continues to reject any initiative for a comprehensive peace settlement, it has gone beyond mere defiance of the will of the international community; it has taunted the international community with the casualness with which it can adopt provocative, far-reaching measures in the occupied territories, in spite of universal condemnation and opposition.

67. The efforts of the United Nations to deal with the arrogant and extremist policies of the Israeli occupying Power are detailed in the Secretary-General's report now before the Assembly [A/35/563-S/14234]. This report indicates the intensive efforts involved in meeting the challenge posed to the Organization by the marked aggressiveness with which Israel has trampled on the rights of the people living in the occupied territories.

68. Israel has continued its settlement policies designed to bring about changes in the demographic and ethnic character of the occupied areas. It has persecuted and expelled prominent Palestinian nationals. It has turned a blind eye to the stepped-up activities of paramilitary forces, which led to the assassination attempts on the lives of the Mayors of Nablus, Ramallah and El Bireh. Israel continues its repressive measures against Palestinian students protesting peacefully. What is perhaps most serious is Israel's defiance of international public opinion in declaring the Holy City of Jerusalem to be its capital. There are reports now that Israel intends yet

another act of defiance in the form of the annexation of the occupied Syrian Golan Heights. The pattern has been a consistent one of consolidating the Israeli presence and of refusing to be any part of a comprehensive peace process, with complete indifference to the frightening consequences of this attitude for global peace and security.

69. While seeking to make its presence firm and permanent in the lands under occupation, Israel's strategy has been to exploit and prolong the Middle East stalemate by encouraging negotiating procedures that are partial and temporizing. This is in line with Israel's futile determination to exclude the acknowledged representatives of the Palestinian people, the PLO, from participating in and influencing the outcome of any negotiations for resolving the Middle East conflict. Recent experience has shown the uselessness of such a tactic. In national liberation struggles, no settlement can be reached without the involvement of national liberation leaders. To ignore this historical reality is simply to prolong and intensify conflicts and to postpone unnecessarily their inevitable final settlement.

70. Comprehensive negotiations on a Middle East peace settlement are widely regarded as the only practical way of resolving this continuing conflict. Also widely recognized is the fact that, given the centrality of the Palestine question in the Middle East conflict, the PLO must be an active participant, on behalf of the Palestinian people, in the search for an over-all settlement. Similar wide recognition has been given to the principles that must form the basis for resolving the conflict. These principles require the restoration of the national right of the Palestinian people to their own independent State, the withdrawal of Israel from all occupied territories and recognition of the right of all States in the area to live within secure and universally recognized boundaries. It is only within this framework that a just and lasting peace can come to the Middle East.

71. It is paradoxical indeed that the Middle East stalemate should drag on and on, given the length of time this framework has existed and the degree of popular support it commands. But the continuing impasse is more a reflexion of the present capacity of the aggressor to challenge the international community than it is a reflexion of any flaw in this carefully balanced framework. In successfully maintaining this attitude of defiance, Israel has been, and continues to be, aided by the inaction to which some members of the Security Council have reduced that body in respect of the Middle East question.

72. My delegation sincerely hopes that the Security Council will very soon be allowed to move in step with the General Assembly in clearing the path towards a Middle East solution. Time does not serve the cause of peace in the Middle East. Let us by our decisions and our actions seek to promote the cause of a true, just and lasting peace. Failing that, the present situation of no peace, no war will surely be the prelude to yet more war.

73. Mr. LEUWAILA (Botswana): Let me suggest at the outset that there is no need for us to go back into the far reaches of antiquity in the history of the Middle East to understand why that troubled area has expe-

rienced four wars in the past 32 years and remains dangerously poised on the edge of a precipice. The Middle East with which we are dealing today is not the Middle East of 2,000 or 3,000 years ago; it is the Middle East of the twentieth century. Its challenges and crises are contemporary and immediate, and they are real and serious.

74. The facts are clear to all who can see and understand them. They may be bitter facts to some, yet mere fiction to others. Let us take the creation of the State of Israel in 1948 as our point of departure. The State of Israel was created by this very United Nations in a humanitarian response to the sad tragedy that had befallen the Jews in Nazi Germany and elsewhere. No one in this august Assembly doubts that the United Nations acted in good faith in making it possible for the persecuted Jews of the Diaspora to have a home of their own in Palestine. Unfortunately, the creation of the State of Israel led to the creation of refugee camps for the Palestinians. In other words, the Palestinians ceased to have a home that they could call their own because the Israelis were given a home that they could call their own. Obviously that was not the intention of the United Nations. It was simply a question of the Palestinians feeling—and rightly so—that the creation of the State of Israel in Palestine was an imposition that they could not live with. They were therefore forced to take their turn to be dispersed into the Diaspora, where they still are to this day living the life of exiles in squalid refugee camps. They have no home that they can call their own other than the Palestine of their dreams and the refugee camps.

75. Thus, by an unfortunate twist of fate, today it is the Palestinians who are crying to heaven for justice. Indeed, they have every reason to cry to heaven for justice. They have every reason to struggle for liberation by whatever means are available to them—for, let us face the facts, Israel has acted in bad faith in stubbornly refusing to accept and recognize the aspirations of the Palestinian people. Botswana has never wavered in its conviction that Israel has the right to exist. But Israel's right to exist has never been construed as precluding the right of the Palestinians to exist in a State of their own. No people, however tragic its past history might be, has any right to enjoy nationhood and freedom at the expense of the nationhood and freedom of others. I would therefore suggest that the only threat to the continued existence of Israel is not the revolutionary struggle that is being waged by the PLO against it or the utterances of those who call for the creation of a Palestinian State in the West Bank, but Israel itself.

76. Israel threatens its own existence and peace in the Middle East by denying the Palestinians their right to self-determination. And by refusing to withdraw from occupied Arab territories, Israel is in fact suggesting that it is not even content with its pre-1967 borders. By force of arms it has conquered and occupied one Arab territory after another; and to add arrogance to defiance, it has spread Jewish settlements in those conquered territories and by so doing has shown nothing but bad faith.

77. And yet cynics will argue that peace in the Middle East does not hinge on the resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict. They will tell us that even if Israel were to agree to the creation of a Palestinian State,

even if Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX) were implemented, the Arabs would still find something about which to quarrel amongst themselves or with Israel. We will be told that the unfortunate conflict between Iran and Iraq, the misunderstandings between the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and Syria, and the isolation from the Arab world of the sister State of Egypt are phenomena so peculiar to the area that whatever happens in the Arab-Israeli conflict will not create an atmosphere of peace in the Middle East. We are in effect being made to believe that conflict and war in the Middle are so endemic and so natural that we must learn to accept the Arab-Israeli conflict as a permanent and natural condition about which we can do absolutely nothing. Such an argument is not only spurious it is also dangerous.

78. Most of the conflicts in the Middle East today have their roots in the conflict between the Arabs and the Israelis. Almost all of them are caused by disagreements or disputes among the Arab countries on a common policy vis-à-vis Israel and the problem of the Palestinians.

79. Of course no one can deny that if the Arab-Israel conflict is resolved inter-Arab conflicts may still erupt once in a while. Conflicts among nations can never be ruled out. Even in our own continent of Africa there are conflicts which periodically escalate into open confrontation; but they have not made us lose sight of a bigger and more dangerous conflict in southern Africa, namely, the conflict between free Africa and the *apartheid* régime in South Africa. We cannot therefore accept the argument that we should not condemn *apartheid* as vehemently as we have always done simply because there are conflicts in other parts of free Africa which must be addressed. In the same way, Israel's expansionist policies in the Middle East must be condemned whether or not there are wars elsewhere in the area.

80. No, we want Israel to exist in peace with its neighbours; but for peace to prevail in the area Israel will have to rise above the ethnocentric politics of exclusivism and accept that its own future and security in the Middle East lie not in the monolithic ideology of Zionism but in the recognition and acceptance of the aspirations of the Palestinian people.

81. The choice for Israel is, in our view, between the perpetuation of a state of conflict in the Middle East and the creation of a Palestinian State in the area, a State which will have to commit itself to peaceful coexistence with Israel, just as Israel would have to commit itself to peaceful coexistence with that State. The Camp David peace accord might have been a step in the right direction, but so far it has left the Palestinian question virtually untouched. It is clear that the Palestinian people are not interested in half-solutions to their problem. They want a home of their own and they want to exercise their right to self-determination, not as an appendage of another State, but in a State of their own in which they will be able to decide their own future in peace and freedom.

82. The people of Israel are reputed to have an acute sense of history. The sad memories of their recent past could not have vanished so quickly. Is it not the Jewish people that, like the African people,

more than anybody else ought to appreciate the value of human freedom and justice, the pain of persecution and misery and the pride of nationhood? Should the injustices that have been done to the Jews throughout history now be visited upon the Palestinian people, without any sign of sympathy on the part of the Jews, who know only too well what persecution and suffering mean?

83. As recently as July this year the seventh emergency special session was convened to consider the question of Palestine. Members of the Assembly voted overwhelmingly for resolution ES-7/2 calling on Israel to withdraw from occupied Arab territories not later than 15 November 1980. Several other resolutions have been adopted in the past on the question and have all disappeared in the ever-thickening forest of United Nations documents. Israel is still ensconced in Arab territories, unperturbed and unaffected by the rising crescendo of condemnations, because Israel, though a creation of the United Nations, has convinced itself, not without justification, that the United Nations is powerless. Meanwhile the prospects of peace in the Middle East are becoming gloomier and bleaker every day. The fact is that the Arab countries are not prepared to donate their occupied territories to Israel. On the contrary, they are being forced to continue to resort to arms to liberate those territories, to the detriment of peace in the Middle East.

84. The security of Israel lies not in the sands of Gaza or the Golan Heights but in pre-1967 Israel; it lies not in the continuance of Israeli colonialism in the West Bank but in the liberation of the people of Palestine, so that they can have a country of their own, from which they would have no reason to threaten the existence of the State of Israel. At present the Palestinians, supported by their Arab brothers, have every reason to threaten the very existence of Israel because, like the Jews before 1948, they long for their freedom and independence, which are being denied them by Israel.

85. Mr. AL-HAMZAH (Democratic Yemen) [*interpretation from Arabic*]: The situation in the Middle East, of which the question of Palestine is the main and basic aspect, is one of the most important matters that the General Assembly discusses year in and year out without any solution being reached, because of Israel's obstinacy and the protection it is given by imperialists throughout the world and particularly by the United States, which encourages Israel to continue its acts of aggression and expansion, deny the Palestinian people the enjoyment of their inalienable national rights and refuse to submit to the will of the international community or to implement United Nations resolutions.

86. In reviewing Israel's recent actions, we note how far it has gone in its racist and expansionist policies. Israel has recently intensified its oppression and persecution of the Palestinian people; it has killed the mayors of Palestinian towns and terrorized the people and thrown them into prison; it has expelled thousands of Palestinians and has built new settlements; it recently proclaimed the annexation of Jerusalem as its capital, notwithstanding the condemnation of its actions in resolutions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and other international bodies.

87. The situation in the Middle East continues to deteriorate because of the new reactionary imperialist-Zionist alliance concluded after the signing of the Camp David agreements, which in fact was only a plot under the guise of so-called United States participation in the peace process. The agreements are but pretexts that the United States has used in order to impose its domination on the area, threatening the stability and security of the people and further plundering their national resources.

88. It is difficult to believe in the neutrality of the United States, which has become a direct party to the conflict. The imperialist United States has increased its interference in the affairs of the area and stepped up its military presence, established new bases, obtained new facilities for its Navy and subjected the Middle East to acts of aggression and domination, thereby completing the Camp David process. This situation represents another obstacle to any further positive developments.

89. Stability in the area cannot be achieved without a comprehensive and just settlement of the problem of the Palestinian people, the complete and unconditional withdrawal of the Zionist occupation forces from all occupied Arab Palestinian territories, including Jerusalem, and recognition of the inalienable right of the Palestinian Arabs to return to their lands, to exercise self-determination and to create an independent national State under the leadership of the PLO, its sole legitimate representative, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX), adopted in 1974.

90. The imperialists have tried to infiltrate the area and consolidate their bases. They plan to create instability and tension in the area, to maintain and consolidate an imperialist presence and infiltrate the Middle East in new ways and by new means. The imperialists have encouraged Israel's militaristic and aggressive tendencies by arranging for the Camp David agreements and increasing the United States military presence by sending in aircraft carriers and establishing an espionage network. The United States has recently carried out military manoeuvres, encouraged wars and set peoples against one another. It has escalated the conflict in southern Lebanon and encouraged the separatist tendencies in Lebanon, violating its unity, sovereignty and Arab character. Furthermore, the imperialists and their leader, the United States, are trying to exploit the problems between Iran and Iraq. The United States has created hotbeds of tension, threatening the peace and stability of those two countries and in the entire world.

91. In my country we have complete faith in the struggle of our people against the dangers of Zionism and reaction. That struggle is part of the world-wide struggle for peace. We are convinced that, with their will and determination, the peoples of the world will be able to cope with the imperialist forces. We are convinced that the Palestinian people will win a final victory over racism, occupation and Zionist expansionism and against the plot that goes by the name of "autonomy", as well as other forms of collusion.

92. In conclusion, while we support the efforts of the United Nations and the non-aligned countries to reduce tension, support the just cause of the Pales-

tinian Arab people and strengthen their struggle against Israel and its allies and against expansionism, we hope that the present session of the General Assembly will adopt a more effective resolution reaffirming its support for the noble objective we have set for ourselves, the strengthening of peace and international security.

93. Mr. OTUNNU (Uganda): Last week we debated at length the question of Palestine. Today we are discussing the related issue of the situation in the Middle East. My delegation stated in that earlier debate [80th meeting, paras. 151-168], and I must repeat it for the sake of clarification and emphasis, that the two issues are organically linked and cannot be separated.

94. The other conflicts in the Middle East, no matter what dimensions they may assume from time to time, have their origins in the struggle for Palestine. Once this link is appreciated it becomes clear that no meaningful peace formula for the Middle East can be contemplated outside the context of Palestinian rights.

95. A lasting solution to the situation in the Middle East must be both just and comprehensive. It can only be just if it restores the rights of the Palestinian people. It can only be comprehensive if it takes into account all the factors in the situation, through participation in the peace process by all the parties concerned.

96. Therefore, the following requirements are indispensable to peace in the Middle East: first, Israeli withdrawal from all Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including the city of Jerusalem; secondly, the establishment of an independent Palestinian State in Palestine; thirdly, the direct and equal participation of the PLO, as the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, in any peace process; and fourthly, that any negotiations for peace should be conducted under the auspices of the United Nations.

97. It is a matter of great concern to my delegation that, even as we discuss in this Assembly the possibilities of peace the war drums are beating in the Middle East. Israel continues to commit aggression against Lebanon, killing in the process Palestinian refugees as well as Lebanese citizens. As Moshe Sharett, a former Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Israel, makes plain in his diary, Israeli activities in Lebanon are part of an old Zionist design to destabilize and eventually to dismember that country. Meanwhile, there is open talk of plans to annex the Golan Heights.

98. It is the duty of the United Nations to prevent the dismemberment of Lebanon and the annexation of the Golan Heights. In this connexion I wish to record the appreciation of my delegation for the very important work being done in very difficult circumstances by UNTSO, UNDOF and UNIFIL. With regard to UNIFIL, the Secretary-General's report states that

“Despite all the difficulties it faces, UNIFIL is performing an indispensable service to peace, not only in Lebanon, but also in the Middle East as a whole. While continuing to strive to fulfil all the terms of its mandate, UNIFIL provides a vital mechanism for conflict control in an extremely volatile situation.” [See A/35/563-S/14234, para. 10.]

99. The present situation in the Middle East is indeed too volatile for comfort. But the hope of peace will remain remote unless Israel realizes that it cannot claim security for itself while occupying Palestinian and other Arab territories; that its talk of secure borders rings hollow while it continues to commit aggression against its neighbours; and that it will forever remain a garrison State, with its citizens seeking in vain a normal life of peace, unless it agrees to restore the rights of the Palestinian people. We are convinced that only then can there be a realistic hope for peace in the Middle East.

100. Mr. KIRCA (Turkey): Any debate on the situation in the Middle East inevitably reflects the anxiety felt over a conflict which has provoked four tragic wars in a time span of over 30 years, a conflict which still constitutes today the most serious danger for peace and security in the region as well as in the world. The Middle East problem should certainly not be considered just as a regional problem. The tension in the Middle East could easily spill over the confines of the Middle East and thus turn a regional conflict into a major international catastrophe. To promote a convergence of efforts towards a just and lasting comprehensive solution to the Middle East problem in conformity with the principles laid down in the basic United Nations resolutions as well as the principles enunciated in the Charter of the United Nations should, therefore, be the task of the Assembly.

101. As a country situated in the area, Turkey is deeply concerned with the peace and tranquillity of the Middle East, which has always been a very important strategic area where different interests have been in conflict. As I stated only a few days ago, on 3 December 1980, during the discussion of the question of Palestine in the Assembly [80th meeting, paras. 177-189], that being the general setting, it is not difficult to understand the added complexities surrounding the problems in the region. Some recent developments have aggravated the tension and instability already existing in the area, thus causing the attention of the whole world to be focused still more intensely on the Middle East. Parallel to those developments, the situation in the Middle East has considerably deteriorated over the year under review as the continued policies and practices of Israel have increasingly darkened the prospects for peace and stability.

102. In his annual report on the work of the Organization [A/35/1], the Secretary-General has also underscored this grim reality by devoting a full chapter to the Middle East problem and emphasizing that the situation in the Middle East “continues to dominate the affairs of the international community and remains central to the political and economic stability of the world” [see A/35/1, sect. IV]. Furthermore, it certainly is no coincidence that the international community has been constantly occupied by a series of Security Council meetings dealing with one or another aspect of the Middle East question as well as by the seventh emergency special session of the Assembly, on the question of Palestine—once again, all in the course of the year under review.

103. My Government's position, as has been stated on several previous occasions in several different organs of the Organization—the last of which being only a few days ago, on 3 December—remains un-

changed regarding the elements of a just and lasting comprehensive solution and the procedure for negotiations.

104. During the discussion of the question of Palestine, which we consider to be the essence of the Middle East conflict, I expressed in detail our well-known views on that subject as well as other aspects of the Middle East question, so it will suffice here to recall only the basic principles underlying our policy in this regard.

105. We have always been strongly opposed to the acquisition of territory by force, and in our view the evacuation of all the territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem, is one of the fundamental prerequisites in that regard. We strongly reject unilateral measures continuously being taken by Israel in the occupied Arab territories in flagrant violation of all the United Nations resolutions.

106. In this connexion I should like to make a special mention of the latest report of the Commission established under Security Council resolution 446 (1970)⁴, composed of the representatives of Bolivia and Zambia under the able leadership of Mr. Mathias of Portugal, which provides irrefutable evidence of the intransigence and contempt with which the Israeli authorities have been treating several appeals, decisions and resolutions of this Organization which call upon them to rescind those measures. I should like to seize this opportunity to express our growing concern over the recent decision of the Israeli Government that confirmed the decision concerning the expulsion of the Mayors of Hebron and Halhoul, who were expelled in May last, and who appealed that decision.

107. Furthermore we firmly believe that a just and lasting solution to the Middle East question can be found only by taking into consideration the legitimate national rights of the Arab Palestinian people, including their right to have a State of their own. We recognize the PLO as the only legitimate representative of the people of Palestine, and we believe that it must participate actively in any meaningful negotiation on an equal footing with the other parties concerned for the achievement of a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East.

108. Finally, it has been our constant belief that an over-all solution to the problem of the Middle East should imply respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of all the States of the region and for their right to live in peace within secure and recognized borders. Turkey supports and will continue to support and welcome any peace initiative which conforms with those principles.

109. Before I conclude I should like briefly to dwell on the question of Lebanon, which is another source of deep concern for my delegation in the Middle East. The events of recent years have caused great sufferings in that country and have put in jeopardy its independence and territorial integrity. The situation in Lebanon is in itself inextricably linked with the over-all problem of the Middle East. Not only have the intensified armed incursions by Israeli forces into Lebanon under the pretext of the so-called self-

defence requirement further aggravated the already fragile stability of that country, but repeated acts of violence and harassment against the members of UNIFIL have rendered the Force almost incapable of fulfilling its mandate. Therefore we urge all the parties involved in Lebanon to show the utmost restraint and co-operation so that the current efforts will succeed in achieving stability and tranquillity in that country based on the principle of respect for its sovereignty and territorial integrity and will also pave the way for an over-all peaceful solution of the Middle East question as a whole.

110. The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item. The representative of Israel wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I call upon him.

111. Mr. BLUM (Israel): In my remarks at the opening of this debate [86th meeting], I addressed myself to the real dimensions of the manifold conflicts throughout the Middle East and to their implications for international peace and security. I pointed briefly to a number of the most serious trouble-spots, including the war in the Persian Gulf between Iraq and Iran, the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, the military stand-off between Syria and Jordan, the disruptive effects of domestic instability on the external behaviour of States in the region, the destabilizing effect of a certain super-Power seeking to advance its imperialistic aims in the region, and the reckless conduct of Arab petro-hegemonists who parlay their oil wealth for arms, which in turn are used against other States both within the region and beyond it. I also observed that there could be no serious discussion of the Middle East without consideration of those aspects, and invited the Assembly to rise to the occasion instead of letting this debate become another pretext for another concerted attack on my country.

112. The ensuing deliberations were dominated by speakers who, in a grotesque manner, deliberately ignored the situation in the Middle East in its full and proper sense. In fact, we were treated to a parody of a debate on the subject so frivolous that it scarcely merits a response.

113. My own remarks were immediately followed by a representative who apparently saw fit simply to recite the summary of his country's statement in the debate held last week on the question of the Palestinian Arabs. And that, with minor changes of nuance and emphasis, was the way it was throughout virtually the whole of the present debate. All the real problems of the Middle East were simply shoved under the carpet, or, if I may change my metaphor, were left as inconvenient and embarrassing skeletons in the closet.

114. There is, however, one aspect of this debate that I must address myself to, and that is the crudely anti-Semitic tone which pervaded a number of the statements made. The crudest anti-Semitic slanders were uttered by the representative of the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan. This of course is by no means the first time that Mr. Nuseibeh has revealed his warped mentality and embarrassed the Assembly by drawing almost word for word from such notoriously anti-Semitic works as the so-called *Protocols of the Learned*

⁴ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1980*, document S/14268.

Elders of Zion, a scurrilous fabrication published in Tsarist Russia at the turn of the century.

115. According to Mr. Nuseibeh, there is a Jewish cabal "which controls, manipulates and exploits the rest of humanity by controlling the money and wealth of the world" [86th meeting, para. 93]. According to this petty bigot: "People like Lord Rothschild every day, in iron-clad secrecy, decide and flash round the world how high the price of gold should be." [Ibid.] In the United States, what Mr. Nuseibeh terms "the Zionists own a lion's share" of the wealth of America while "millions of hard-working God-fearing Americans are unemployed" [ibid., para. 94].

116. Again, according to this same petty bigot "It is a well-known fact that the Zionists are the richest people in the world and control much of its destiny". [Ibid., para. 93.] And again, "The Zionists want all the money to be assembled in their coffers...". [Ibid., para. 98.] Those odious charges are nothing but out-and-out anti-Semitism of the worst and most virulent kind. If the Assembly were to stop playing at being a mock parliament and were to introduce some real parliamentary rules and ethics such calumnies would have long been ruled out of order. But by a curious paradox, representatives in the Organization enjoy an immunity to spread anti-Semitic invective with an openness and in a way which would not be tolerated in any decent society.

117. We shall probably be treated again to the ridiculous argument that Mr. Nuseibeh and his ilk cannot be anti-Semites since Arabs are themselves Semites. We have, of course, been through those semantic gimmicks before. They scarcely deserve a reply. Suffice it to say that anti-Semites around the world will readily oblige Mr. Nuseibeh and inform him who the targets of anti-Semitic hatred, bigotry and prejudice are.

118. I have warned of the danger of the Organization's becoming a world centre for anti-Semitism on a number of occasions, most recently at the 64th meeting of the Third Committee, on 21 November of this year. Nowadays, it is fashionable to avoid direct attacks on Jews and the Jewish people. Instead, anti-Semites now attack Zionism and Zionists. In the Organization, a new code word—anti-Zionism—has gained currency. But anti-Semites throughout the world understand its meaning full well, and the attempt in the Organization to bestow respectability upon "anti-Zionism" has in practice only encouraged anti-Semitism in various parts of the world, including the so-called enlightened countries, as the events of the last few years—indeed, months—have clearly shown.

119. There used to be a time when some representatives here claimed that they were not anti-Jewish, but merely anti-Zionist. That cover has long been blown by the statements of the Nuseibehs and their ilk—to the lasting shame of the Organization.

AGENDA ITEM 23

Question of Cyprus: report of the Secretary-General

120. The PRESIDENT: It is my understanding, on the basis of consultations with all concerned, that,

in view of the constructive course of intercommunal talks which are being held under the Secretary-General's auspices in Nicosia, there is now a general feeling that it would be desirable to defer the consideration of the question of Cyprus to the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

121. I am convinced that I reflect the feelings of the Assembly when I express the hope that the intercommunal talks will continue in the same constructive spirit with a view to reaching a solution satisfactory to all. May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to defer consideration of that item and to include it in the provisional agenda of the thirty-sixth General Assembly?

It was so decided (decision 35/428).

AGENDA ITEM 24

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

122. The PRESIDENT: We shall now resume our consideration of agenda item 24, relating to the question of Palestine. Members will recall that the debate on this item was concluded at the 80th plenary meeting. There are five draft resolutions which have been submitted under this item, namely, A/35/L.38 to A/35/L.42.

123. I call on the representative of Senegal, who wishes to introduce those draft resolutions.

124. Mr. SARRE (Senegal) [*interpretation from French*]: I should like, on behalf of the sponsors, to introduce the draft resolutions contained in documents A/35/L.38 to A/35/L.42.

125. Draft resolution A/35/L.38 deals with the substance of the Palestine question. It is in all respects a follow-up to Assembly resolution ES-7/2. The preamble reaffirms the basic resolutions on the question of Palestine, including resolutions 181 (II) and 194 (III) which, as members are all aware, are fundamental texts on the question of Palestine. The sponsors feel that they are completely valid and of great usefulness in the search for a solution to the question of Palestine. In the operative part of this draft resolution the Assembly expresses its concern that no solution to the problem of Palestine has been achieved and reaffirms the fact that the solution of this problem will require, *inter alia*, the attainment of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. It also reaffirms the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and endorses the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. The draft resolution condemns Israel for its non-compliance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution ES-7/2 and requests the Security Council to convene in order to consider the situation and the adoption of effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. The sponsors were led to recommend this provision in view of the impasse in the Council regarding the implementation of the rights of the Palestinian people.

* Resumed from the 80th meeting.

126. Draft resolution A/35/L.39 reaffirms a view already expressed by the General Assembly in a number of its resolutions, to the effect that all partial agreements and separate treaties which do not take fully into account the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, the principles of the Charter, and the resolutions adopted in the various international forums on the Palestinian issue have no validity in so far as they purport to determine the future of the Palestinian people without its full participation. As can be seen, this paragraph is not a blanket condemnation of the results of the ongoing talks on the question of Palestine. Rather, the purpose is to reaffirm the sovereign right of any people to participate fully in determining its future, as well as the need for all States that are negotiating treaties to ensure that they are in conformity with the principles of the Charter. The sponsors also wished to draw attention to the ineffectiveness of agreements concluded without the participation or the consent of the principal parties concerned. The settlement of the Zimbabwe question is a case in point worthy of consideration.

127. Draft resolution A/34/L.40 deals with the work of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. It expresses the appreciation of the Assembly to the Committee for its remarkable and fruitful efforts and authorizes it to continue all efforts to promote the rights of the Palestinian people, in full conformity with the Charter of the United Nations. The sponsors believe that the Committee has demonstrated its usefulness to everyone, and as long as its purposes have not been achieved the Committee's mandate should be renewed.

128. Draft resolution A/35/L.41 refers to the activities of the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights. It requests the Secretary-General to ensure that the Special Unit continues to discharge the tasks detailed in General Assembly resolutions 32/40 B and 34/65 D. The Special Unit, which has worked with dedication in assisting the Committee in its task, should, in the opinion of the sponsors, continue its mission. Contrary to certain criticisms, the Special Unit has done very useful and serious work, which has afforded a large sector of world public opinion a broader awareness of the question of Palestine.

129. Draft resolution A/35/L.42 deals with the city of Jerusalem. The international community as a whole rejected the enactment by Israel of the basic law on Jerusalem and in that regard the Security Council has adopted resolutions 465 (1980), 476 (1980) and 478 (1980) censuring Israeli action in the occupied territories, including Jerusalem. The draft resolution reaffirms the resolutions previously adopted by the Security Council and also affirms that the enactment of the basic law by Israel constitutes a violation of international law. In operative paragraph 3, the Assembly declares that legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel which have altered or purport to alter the character and status of Jerusalem are null and void and must be rescinded forthwith. It should be recalled on this occasion that the international status of Jerusalem is defined in resolution 181 (II), which declares the Holy City a *corpus separatum*. If it has not been possible to apply that status, it is because of the attitude of Israel since 1967,

at which time Jerusalem was occupied as a result of the six-day War. The interest of the international community in Jerusalem was the main reason which prompted the sponsors to introduce this draft resolution. It is motivated by the concern on the question of Jerusalem expressed by the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the Vatican, the non-aligned countries and other countries.

130. As members will have noticed, all these draft resolutions are in conformity with the spirit of the Charter and the pertinent resolutions of the Organization on this matter. Their purpose is to restore peace and stability to that region. That is why the sponsors feel that their adoption would mark an important step in the search for a just, comprehensive and lasting solution to the question of Palestine.

131. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Malta, who wishes to introduce an amendment to draft resolution A/35/L.38.

132. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): Several delegations have made representations to me, as Rapporteur of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, with regard to some of the provisions of the draft resolution on the question of Palestine, which has just been so ably introduced by the representative of Senegal. These observations relate in particular to operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/35/L.38.

133. It is felt that that paragraph requires some further clarification. I realize that time is pressing and that this is a delicate matter, but I feel that the sense and purport of that paragraph would be clarified further if after the words "22 November 1967" we were to replace the present text by the following:

"does not provide for the future and the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, the attainment of which is the essential prerequisite for a just solution of the question of Palestine".

I have taken the liberty of giving the text to the secretariat.

134. I have the text of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) before me and, without diminishing its importance, its value, its timeliness and its relevance, I believe it is clear and generally recognized that in fact it does not provide adequately for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. In that sense, therefore, the addition that I am proposing is justified and puts matters in their proper perspective.

135. I consequently trust that the sponsors of the draft resolution and the members of the Assembly may be disposed to consider favourably the amendment that I have proposed, and in these circumstances it would perhaps be useful to consider a postponement of the vote in order to allow for the necessary consultations to take place and for delegations to receive the necessary instructions in time.

136. I believe that on the question of Palestine it is essential that the quasi-unanimous consensus on the rights of the Palestinian people should be adequately reflected in the vote this year.

137. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Malta has introduced an amendment to operative

paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/35/L.38 and has, as a consequence of that amendment and its consideration by delegations, suggested that the Assembly might wish to decide to postpone the voting on the five draft resolutions. If I hear no objections to that

suggestion to postpone the voting, I will take it that it is the Assembly's wish to proceed accordingly.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.