



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 101: Financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East:	
(a) United Nations Disengagement Observer Force: report of the Secretary-General;	
(c) Review of the rates of reimbursement to the Govern- ments of troop-contributing States: report of the Secretary-General	
Report of the Fifth Committee (Part I)	1289
Agenda item 24: Question of Palestine: report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (continued)	1291

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

AGENDA ITEM 101

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

- (a) **United Nations Disengagement Observer Force:
report of the Secretary-General;**
- (c) **Review of the rates of reimbursement to the Govern-
ments of troop-contributing States: report of the
Secretary-General**

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (PART I)
(A/35/667)

1. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee: I have the honour to introduce the part I of the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 101 [A/35/667] which deals with subitems (a) and (c).

2. In paragraph 10 of the report, the Fifth Committee recommends the adoption of draft resolution I entitled "Review of the rates of reimbursement to the Governments of troop-contributing States; as well as draft resolutions II A and B entitled "Financing of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force".

3. Finally, I would invite the attention of the General Assembly to paragraph 11 of the report, in which a draft decision is recommended for adoption, dealing with the special financial period of UNDOF.

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

4. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolutions recommended by the Fifth Committee. I would 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. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting.

5. Mr. ALAKWAA (Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Because of certain circumstances my delegation voted erroneously in the Fifth Committee during the vote on the draft resolutions relating to the financing of United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East, and my delegation would like to state its basic position on this subject.

6. We object to any measure resulting in the United Nations budget bearing the costs of United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East because we feel that the aggressor should pay the costs of his aggression. Thus we reaffirm our objection to the utilization of United Nations forces for the consolidation of aggression and to make possible the continuance of the forcible occupation of the territory of others. The forces are not being used to put an end to Israeli occupation of Arab territories or to prevent Israeli aggression against the Palestinian Arab people or the Arab peoples of the countries adjoining occupied Palestine. They have been used strictly for the purpose of ensuring disengagement of the parties to the conflict.

7. For that reason, if there is a vote on the draft resolutions, we shall abstain.

8. Mr. ALLAFI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation has already explained its position on this question on many occasions in the Security Council and in the General Assembly. That position is based on Libya's non-recognition—as a matter of principle—of the resolutions by which the Forces were established. We should like to reaffirm at this time that, in view of that and in accordance with our position of principle, my delegation will not participate in the vote on the draft resolutions which have been recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 10 of its report.

9. Mr. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): In conformity with its traditional position, the delegation of the People's Republic of Benin will not participate in the vote on the draft resolutions we are considering. We would like this position of the People's Republic of Benin to be reflected in the record of this meeting.

10. The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to the vote. The recommendation of the Fifth Committee is contained in paragraph 10 of its report [A/35/667].

11. We shall first vote on draft resolution I, entitled "Review of the rates of reimbursement to the Governments of troop-contributing States". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, 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, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Algeria, Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Tunisia, Yemen.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 89 votes to 13, with 10 abstentions (resolution 35/44).^{1, 2}

12. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II, entitled "Financing of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force", consists of parts A and B.

13. We shall first vote on draft resolution II A. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, 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

¹ The delegations of Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Malawi, Mali, Sri Lanka and Trinidad and Tobago 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 Democratic Yemen subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as an abstention.

America, Uper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Albania, Angola, Grenada, Iraq, Syrian Arab Republic.

Abstaining: Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Malawi, Maldives, Mongolia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen.

Draft resolution II A was adopted by 93 votes to 5, with 15 abstentions (resolution 35/45 A).^{3, 4}

14. The PRESIDENT: We shall vote next on draft resolution II B. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, 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, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Albania, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Hungary, Iraq, Mongolia, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Algeria, Congo, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Malawi, Maldives, Romania, Yemen.

Draft resolution II B was adopted by 91 votes to 14, with 8 abstentions (resolution 35/45 B).³

15. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to paragraph 11 of the report of the Fifth Committee [A/35/667], in which the Committee recommends the adoption of a draft decision entitled "Special financial period of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force". May I take it that the General Assembly adopts that draft decision?

The draft decision was adopted (decision 35/416).

16. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Albania, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote.

³ The delegations of Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Malawi and Mali subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

⁴ The delegation of Angola subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as an abstention.

17. Mr. RIZO (Albania): For reasons which we have made known and explained on many previous occasions, whenever a vote has been taken concerning the financing of United Nations forces in the Middle East, the delegation of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania reiterates once again that it will not take part in the financing of the UNDOF. Thus, the Albanian delegation voted against the draft resolutions just adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 24

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

18. Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): During the two last sessions of the General Assembly, my delegation was right in affirming unequivocally that the Camp David agreements would lead to an impasse because they were based on the denial of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to its country and its homeland, on pressure on Arab sovereignty, and on contempt for the international community and its laws and organizations.

19. It is plain for all to see today that the Camp David path has led us to an impasse because the Arab-Zionist conflict has not been resolved and the rights of the Palestinian people have not been guaranteed. On the contrary, the struggle in the Middle East has become more complex and tense than it ever has been in the past as a result of the consolidation of the expansionist aggressive tendency of the Zionists, who consider those agreements as a recognition of and support for that expansionist aggressive tendency.

20. The fact that President Sadat of Egypt should have committed himself by signing the two agreements with the United States and the Zionist entity, has turned aside international and regional efforts to achieve genuine peace and restore to the Palestinian people its soil and its homeland. The question of Palestine has thus been relegated to the background. This is tantamount to a denial of the existence of a Palestinian people and the fact that the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO] is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. That has also led to the annexation of Arab Jerusalem by the Zionist entity and to an increase in the number of settlements in the occupied Arab territories. The Zionist entity has resorted to terrorizing and assassinating Palestinian citizens and their legitimate representatives in the occupied Arab territories, as was the case with mayors of the West Bank.

21. We had expected that reaction and we had affirmed that that would be the natural consequence of the Camp David agreements. At that time, it was normal to expect those two agreements to lead us to an impasse, for this alleged treatment has become a venom poisoning the wounds.

22. We wish to note here that President Carter of the United States, who planned these agreements and worked for their signature, was trying to achieve certain goals, including his own re-election. We now see that he himself has reached an impasse since the American people have refused to re-elect him. Although we do not wish here to speak about the internal

affairs of the United States, it is important to reaffirm that Mr. Carter's failure represents for us an important indication, because that failure in one of its aspects reflects the American people's awareness of the danger of his foreign policy, which is based upon adventures weakening American interests. Perhaps one of those most aware of President Carter's failure is President Sadat because he announced recently that he was concerned at this state of affairs. Sadat has discovered that Carter's failure reflects the crisis in which the Camp David agreements find themselves and a collapse of the plot to eliminate the Palestinian entity and to deny the Palestinians their inalienable rights.

23. We therefore believe that any continuation of American policy in the Middle East not based on total respect for the inalienable rights of the Arabs and not recognizing the rights of the Palestinian people is doomed to failure, just as were the efforts of President Carter and his predecessors.

24. It may perhaps be useful here to recall to the international community Iraq's position with regard to the solutions that have been put forward or those which will be proposed, because we feel that the Middle East has come to a critical and decisive stage of its history whose effects will be felt more and more throughout the world, perhaps even in the months to come. In our statement at the previous session,⁵ we said that our position on the Arab-Zionist conflict and on the question of Palestine was governed by the following principles: first, the aggressor must not be rewarded for his aggression; secondly, the indigenous Palestinian inhabitants must not be deprived of their national and historical right to a homeland, Palestine; thirdly, the problems of the Jews of the world must not be resolved to the detriment of the Arabs, their rights and their existence; fourthly, international policy must not be based on concessions from only one party, the Arab party, but national rights must be taken into account, as must the established facts relating to the question which prove that Palestine was for thousands of years the homeland of the Palestinian Arabs and that the Jews have lived there but for a short time and only in a small area through the use of force against the indigenous inhabitants; fifthly, the solution of the Palestinian problem must not be part of an international plot aimed at dividing the Arab world and exploiting it in international conflicts.

25. While it appreciates and is in favour of the positive trends in international public opinion, in particular the position of the nine countries of the European Community, with regard to the Palestinian cause and the situation in the Middle East, Iraq reaffirms the need for words to be accompanied by deeds; the Arabs cannot be satisfied by mere words and postures. Positive and specific steps must be taken to induce the Zionist entity to abandon its policy of aggression and expansion.

26. We request the General Assembly to adopt a resolution that would impose a military and economic blockade against the Zionist entity because of its policy of annexation of the occupied Arab territories and its violations of the principles and purposes of

⁵ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 77th meeting, para. 122.

the Charter and the Geneva Conventions. We also request the General Assembly to adopt a resolution aimed at preventing emigration into occupied Palestine because the Zionist entity is establishing new immigrants in the settlements it is building on the occupied Arab territories and is continuing to prevent the Palestinian people from exercising its right to return to its homeland and from denying that right to the indigenous inhabitants.

27. Basing itself on the foregoing, Iraq cannot accept any solution which would be prejudicial to the vital rights and interests of the Arab nation and the Palestinian people, whatever the circumstances of facts accomplished or the international situation might be. It would be wrong for the international community, including the European countries, to think that the Arab nation is ready to accept a compromise between the Camp David agreements and the decisions taken at the ninth Arab Summit Conference, which was held at Baghdad from 2 to 5 November 1978, that represented the minimum acceptable.

28. The world has witnessed a flagrant example in the fact that the Zionist entity has continued its expansionist aggression by having adopted an illegal decision aimed at annexing occupied Arab Jerusalem and declaring that city to be its eternal capital, in spite of the condemnation of that fact by the entire world and this international Organization.

29. The joint communiqué adopted after the visit of the President of the Republic of Iraq, Saddam Hussain, to Saudi Arabia on 6 August 1980 very clearly defined our position towards those countries which regard that affirmation as null and void and those countries which continue to have diplomatic missions in Jerusalem. That communiqué calls for an economic and political blockade of the latter countries.

30. By the military, economic and political support it gives the Zionist entity, the United States continues to encourage that entity to pursue its aggression. Moreover, the United States support amounts to direct participation in the aggressive actions by the Zionists in the occupied Arab territories and in Lebanon. The statement made by the Secretary of State of the United States in the Security Council during the discussion on the annexation of Jerusalem was a step backward from the previous United States position on the illegal measures taken by the Zionist régime in Jerusalem. That statement constituted a justification of the measures taken by Israel towards annexing the Holy City.

31. In the light of resolution ES-7/2 adopted by the General Assembly during the seventh emergency special session, on Palestine, and confronted by the Zionist challenge in annexing Arab Jerusalem, the General Assembly should once again call on the Security Council to take the measures necessary to impose sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. If the Security Council once again does not shoulder its responsibilities, it will be for the General Assembly itself to apply the relevant provisions of the Charter to the Zionist aggression.

32. It is time for the General Assembly to re-examine the admission of the Zionist entity to membership of the United Nations. I would remind representatives that in its resolution 273 (III), by which Israel was

admitted to membership of the United Nations, the General Assembly adopted a unique formula that has never been used again in any other resolution concerning the admission of States to membership of the Organization. In that resolution the General Assembly noted

“the declaration by the State of Israel that it ‘unreservedly accepts the obligations of the United Nations Charter and undertakes to honour them from the day when it becomes a Member of the United Nations’”.

The Assembly recalled

“its resolutions of 29 November 1947 and 11 December 1948 and taking note of the declarations and explanations made by the representative of the Government of Israel before the *ad hoc* Political Committee in respect of the implementation of the said resolutions”.

The two resolutions mentioned are resolutions 181 (II), on the plan to partition Palestine and the internationalization of Jerusalem, and resolution 194 (III), on the right of Palestinian refugees to return to their homes. The declaration by the representative of Israel referred to the undertaking by Israel to implement those resolutions.

33. It is clear that, before considering and putting into effect the relevant Security Council recommendation, the General Assembly wanted to be sure that Israel would take a positive attitude towards the implementation of United Nations resolutions.

34. In view of the circumstances at the time when the Zionist entity was established and the position it has taken towards the Palestinian territories and the Palestinian people, as well as its position towards Jerusalem, which is not in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions, the General Assembly has the right, even the duty, to reconsider resolution 273 (III), since the Zionist entity has not honoured its commitments to the General Assembly. Under Articles 10 and 14 of the Charter, the General Assembly must shoulder that responsibility.

35. Resolution ES-7/2 regarding the Palestinian cause proves without any doubt that the Palestinian people has general support. For, by that resolution, the Assembly reaffirmed that people's inalienable rights, including its right to self-determination and the establishment of an independent State. It is regrettable that the delegations of the Western countries felt that they should abstain in the vote on that resolution, justifying that abstention by stating that the resolution did not mention recognition of the Zionist entity nor that entity's security.

36. I would remind representatives that we are gathered together here to assist a people that has been the victim of racist Zionist aggression to recover its rights; we are gathered together here to defend a people that has been expelled from its land and prevented from exercising its fundamental rights.

37. In resolution ES-7/3 the General Assembly requested the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People to study the reasons for the refusal to comply with the United Nations resolutions on the rights of the Palestinian people; the resolution is based on an initiative by the

delegation of Iraq and is in conformity with the resolution adopted by the Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers at the second extraordinary session held in Amman on 11 and 12 July 1980 [see A/35/384-S/14097, annex III].

38. The Organization is facing complex problems in regard to its moral authority and the weight given to its resolutions. But the most serious problem is connected with its capacity to ensure the implementation of its resolutions and to impose effective sanctions on countries which refuse to respect them. That having been said, we must not overlook a very clear truth—namely, that the United States and other major Powers are responsible for the fact that the United Nations does not have sufficient authority since those Powers use their right of veto against any resolution that condemns the Zionist entity and calls upon it to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories or to put an end to its acts of aggression and racial discrimination. On this basis, we feel that if the United States is serious about its respect for the international Organization, it should, more than any other country, be sure that it does not abuse its veto power.

39. In conclusion, it is necessary for me to mention an explosive and dangerous situation. We have never hesitated and will never hesitate to say that it is the United States of America which has created this situation as part of its effort to have the Camp David agreements accepted. In order that its efforts should be crowned with success, it was necessary to introduce conflicts in and on the periphery of the Arab world and to have them break out so that the countries of this region—and this includes Iraq—should be prevented from facing up to their agreements, and to induce them to take up secondary questions. The most dangerous aspect of this plot is that Iran committed aggression against Iraq on 4 September this year with its ensuing consequences. Hence, one sees that the Camp David agreements were not simply a bargain between Sadat, the Zionist entity and Carter, but were also a plot designed to engulf the whole Middle East in order to destabilize it and to obliterate the Palestinian cause and drown it in an ocean of other problems so that the world would pay no further attention to it.

40. In Iraq, we realized this very early or even before it happened. That is why we refused to participate in this plot and this was part of our general refusal to support any position that was tantamount to abandoning the cause of the Palestinian people. Therefore, we reaffirmed that the liberation of Iraqi territories and waters occupied by the Iranian authorities represents a step towards the liberation of occupied Arab territories, in particular in Arab Palestine.

41. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Luxembourg, who will address the Assembly on behalf of the nine States members of the European Community.

42. Mr. PETERS (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): Instability in the Middle East is a chronic source of tension and anxiety in the world. During recent months the nine States members of the European Community, whose Heads of State and

Government are meeting at this very time in Luxembourg, have noted with concern the deterioration of the situation in that tormented region. They deeply regret the hardening of positions on all sides, when dialogue and understanding alone can prepare the way for peace.

43. In the context of a global settlement, a just solution of the Palestinian problem is an essential element. Such a settlement based essentially on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) must take into account facts which have been too long neglected. This means reconciling and enabling two realities to live together: the State of Israel and the Palestinian people.

44. In the Venice Declaration of 13 June 1980 [see A/35/299-S/14009], the nine members of the Community listed the two fundamental principles which govern the search for a comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East. The principles in question are the right to existence and security of all the States in the region, including Israel, and justice for all peoples, which implies recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

45. This dual requirement logically entails a range of consequences, including the right of all peoples in the region to live in peace within secure, recognized and guaranteed borders, as well as the Palestinian problem. A just solution to the latter problem, which is not a simple problem of refugees, must at long last be found. The Palestinians, aware of their existence as a people, must be enabled, through an appropriate process, defined in the comprehensive framework of a peaceful settlement, to exercise fully their right to self-determination. The recognition and implementation of the right of Israel to existence and security and of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination should therefore be the basis of negotiations, which should lead to a comprehensive peace settlement. Israel must therefore put an end to the territorial occupation that it has maintained since 1967.

46. In this connexion, Israeli settlements represent a serious obstacle to the peace process. The nine members of the Community reiterate their position expressed on many occasions that these colonies, as well as population and property changes in the Arab occupied territories, are illegal in international law.

47. The law recently adopted by the Israeli parliament concerning the status of Jerusalem, a city where the holy places of many religions are found, has led to a further aggravation of the situation in the occupied territories. We wish to recall here that we can accept no unilateral initiative aimed at changing the status of that city.

48. In the view of the Community, renunciation of violence is a prerequisite for any constructive negotiation. We therefore appeal to the goodwill of all parties concerned to create the climate of confidence and understanding that is essential to the search for a just and equitable solution of the conflict.

49. This settlement clearly presupposes the support and contribution of all parties concerned. The principles that I have just enumerated apply to each of those parties without exception. Therefore, they

apply to the Palestinian people and to the PLO, which should be brought into the negotiations.

50. Lastly, as regards the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People [A/35/35], I wish to recall the reservations we have expressed on many occasions. The proposals of the Committee contain the same basic imbalances as the resolution which created it.

51. The nine members of the European Community nevertheless wish to reaffirm their support for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people in a framework of a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement in the Middle East.

52. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): It is my distinct privilege, in this debate on the question of Palestine, to pay the highest tribute to the Chairman, Mr. Falilou Kane, Ambassador of Senegal, and to the other members of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People whose indefatigable exertions and dedication towards the fulfilment of those natural rights have greatly heightened the awareness, and even the resolve, of the community of nations to see that justice is done, notwithstanding seemingly insurmountable odds posed by those supportive of one of the most galling and fraudulent conspiracies of all time.

53. I should like, at the same time, to express our deep appreciation to the Secretary-General, for placing the available resources of the relevant United Nations organs in the service of disseminating the truth about the Palestinian tragedy.

54. It is fitting that under the auspices of the Committee, members of the community of nations should have observed the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, on Friday, 28 November. The occasion symbolized the consentient conscience of humanity, which in the long run will be far more lethal than all the weapons of destruction and the treachery, intrigue, falsehoods and bestial deeds which have been and continue to be committed against a Palestinian people who have long been left to fend for themselves against the mighty forces of darkness and inhumanity—but now no longer, because of an awakened humanity.

55. Why, since 1947, has 29 November been observed as the Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian people? That was a day of perfidy which will for ever be remembered as having triggered the catastrophe which befell the Palestinian people. It may have seemed then the most opportune moment to commit the crime and to do away with the victim, unlamented and unmourned, through a massive barrage of distortions, fabrications, extraneous factors and brain-washing. The victim, although almost lethally wounded, stunned, staggering and in deep agony, survived the attempted murder and is struggling today, with the invaluable support of the Assembly, to redeem his right to life in his homeland, undaunted by adversities which would have killed off weaker breeds.

56. Even though the Palestinian people, regardless of race or creed, had been pledged full independence in 1939 in the British White Paper, to take effect immediately after the war, they found themselves all of a sudden rushed to a then pro-Zionist, misguided and

grossly unrepresentative General Assembly, which recommended, under colossal pressure, the dismemberment of Palestine without the consent of its legitimate people. I need hardly remind the Assembly that the act of dismemberment was in flagrant violation of international law, since Palestine was a Trust Territory whose provisional independence was categorically recognized and embodied in the Covenant of the League of Nations, which had provided that in the case of the more advanced countries—including Palestine, whose population was more than 90 per cent Arab, and owned, even up to the end of the Mandate in 1948, more than 94 per cent of the lands of Palestine—such independence should be granted.

57. Furthermore, the now universally accepted principle of self-determination, particularly emphasized by President Woodrow Wilson, and the stress on the fundamental importance of the consent of the governed were totally discarded on 29 November 1947. Even the unauthorized author of the Balfour Declaration conceded: "So far as Palestine is concerned, the allied Powers have made no statement of fact which is not admittedly wrong". I need hardly add that the Arab world was then a partner in that allied bloc. Notwithstanding Israeli claims to legitimacy on the basis of the secret Balfour Declaration of 1917, Britain itself acknowledged in 1939, as an authority stated that the most significant and incontrovertible fact is, however, that by itself the Declaration was legally impotent, for Great Britain had no sovereign rights over Palestine, it had no proprietary interest, it had no authority to dispose of the land; the Declaration was merely a statement of British intentions and no more.

58. To cover up the legal and moral delinquency and to spur Zionist immigration, the myth was spread to an unknowing world that Palestine was "a land without a people, for a people without a land"—this in spite of the fact that the would-be immigrants were happy citizens of many lands and that there were 800,000 Palestinian inhabitants in Palestine, a substantial population for a small country three quarters of a century ago.

59. Many may have read Professor Arnold Toynbee, one of the greatest and wisest historians of all time. He wrote:

"All through those 30 years, Britain admitted into Palestine, year by year, a quota of Jewish immigrants that varied according to the strength of the respective pressures of the Arabs and Jews at the time. These immigrants could not have come in if they had not been shielded by British power. If Palestine had remained under Ottoman rule, or if it had become an independent Arab State in 1918, Jewish immigrants would never have been admitted into Palestine, in large enough numbers to enable them to overwhelm the Palestinian Arabs, in their own country. I said in large enough numbers because on other grounds, even during the nineteenth century, the Palestinians always accepted any belonging to the Judaic faith who wished to live in Palestine. The reason why the State of Israel exists today, and why today 1,500,000 Palestinian Arabs are refugees"—they have since, of course, increased to over 1,800,000—"is that for 30 years, Jewish

immigration was imposed on the Palestinian Arabs by British military power, until the immigrants were sufficiently numerous and sufficiently well-armed to be able to fend for themselves with tanks and planes of their own. The tragedy of Palestine is not just a local one; it is a tragedy for the world, because it is an injustice that is a menace to world peace."

60. We have always maintained that although the Palestinians were disenchanted by the dismemberment of their own country through General Assembly resolution 181 (III) of 29 November 1947, it was the Israelis who torpedoed its implementation. The Palestinians protested for a few days, as any other people would have done, but it was the Israelis who exploited the few incidents to implement their strategic Dalet Plan—prepared well in advance and designed not only to establish full control in the areas allotted to the Jewish State and literally uproot the Palestinian Arabs within it, but also to seize the areas designated for the Palestine Arab State as well.

61. We witnessed a full-scale military attack from the first week, but its all-out launching to occupy territories of the Palestinian State was put into action as soon as British control had weakened enough to ensure success. The British were then of course in the process of gradually withdrawing and disengaging. And what did the Security Council do to carry out the task that had been assigned to it by the General Assembly? I regret to say it did absolutely nothing.

62. The Israelis seized four fifths of Palestine even before the Mandate ended and were assiduously attempting to capture the remaining one fifth when some contingents of Arab forces entered the small remnants still in Palestinian hands after the end of the British Mandate, to save the remaining one fifth and its Palestinian inhabitants from being savaged and uprooted.

63. To cite one example, with which I am intimately familiar, the Jordanian Army, then known as the Arab Legion, had been in the most strategic locations in the whole of Jerusalem and Palestine throughout the Second World War to aid the Allied war efforts. It withdrew totally from Palestine by 15 May 1948, when the Mandate ended, to enable the Palestinian people to form their own State in accordance with the resolution of the General Assembly.

64. The Jordanian Army re-entered only at dawn on 18 May with a contingent of 600 troops to help thwart the Israelis' incessant attacks over three days and three nights against the Old City of Jerusalem and after the local civilian inhabitants had expended the last round of ammunition in their own defence and had urgently asked for help through their national committee. And yet, the Zionist propaganda machine, which manipulates much of world opinion, howled that the Arab armies had entered Palestine after the end of the Mandate to nip poor, weak Israel in the bud.

65. Some, unfortunately, believe in that myth, even though the Israeli leaders themselves have, in the meantime, written their diaries, autobiographies, memoirs, biographies and numerous publications which definitively disprove that myth, which was circulated then to gain the sympathy of the gentiles.

66. Even in the aftermath of Israel's usurpation of four fifths of Palestine, its military establishment,

which governs every aspect of Israeli life, notwithstanding the veneer of democracy, was drawing up plans for further expansion. On 26 October 1953, the late Moshe Sharett noted in his diary that a group of American Zionist leaders had been lectured to, in Israel, by Colonel Matti Peled. The colonel stated *inter alia*, first, that the army considered the present border with Jordan to be absolutely unacceptable, and secondly that the army was planning war in order to occupy the rest of what he called "Western Eretz Israel".

67. Mr. Ben-Gurion and his collaborators spent all their energies on schemes to destabilize the neighbouring Arab States, like a vulture waiting for prey to set upon. The facts are more dazzling than any fiction novel, while all the while the world has been inundated with the myth of Arab intentions to bring about the undoing of Israel.

68. Their immediate targets were Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and Egypt, and I could mention many others. On 11 October 1953, Moshe Sharett, the Foreign Minister and later Prime Minister, noted in his diary that he had been to see Ben Zvi, the President of the State. He wrote:

"Ben Zvi raised as usual some inspired questions which have no purpose, such as: 'Do we have a chance to conquer the Sinai?' and [*said*] how wonderful it would be if the Egyptians started an offensive which we could defeat and follow with an invasion of that area. He was very disappointed when I told him that the Egyptians show no tendency to make this occupation easy for us by an international provocation on their side."

Ben-Gurion joined Sharett's Government in 1955 to foment large and small-scale military attacks under the guise of retaliation and security. Indeed, Sharett narrates how throughout 1953-1954 Ben-Gurion, Dayan, Lavon and others made proposals to present Egypt with an ultimatum: either evacuate all the Palestinian refugees from Gaza and disperse them inside Egypt or else.

69. Sharett reflected on a meeting on 31 January 1954 in which General Dayan outlined his war plans vis-à-vis Syria and urged their implementation when President Shishakly of Syria was toppled. He said *inter alia*:

"The second plan: action against the interference of the Syrians with fishing in Lake Tiberias. The third: if, owing to internal problems in Syria, Iraq intervened, we should advance militarily and realize a series of faits accomplis. The interesting conclusion from all this regards the direction in which the new Chief of Staff is thinking. I am very worried."

These are the words of the late Mr. Moshe Sharett. They are not my words.

70. As for Lebanon, the catastrophe which has been afflicting this sister State had been planned in earnest as far back as 1954. We must have been living in a world of illusion. Ben-Gurion, at a meeting with Sharett, Lavon and Dayan, considered the dismemberment of Lebanon as one of the central duties of their foreign policy, if not the central duty. In Ben-Gurion's words this meant that time, energy and means had to be invested in it and that it was neces-

sary to use all possible means to bring about radical changes in Lebanon. Sasson and our other Arabists—I believe he was then Israeli Ambassador to Ankara—had to be mobilized. If money was necessary, no amount of dollars should be spared, and so forth.

71. The diary further states that according to Dayan, the only thing that was necessary was to find an officer, even just a major. I am sure that they could not have been thinking of Major Said Haddad because he was too young in 1954. It continues:

“The plan was to hire a Lebanese officer who would agree to serve as a puppet so that the Israeli army would appear as responding to his appeal to liberate Lebanon from what it terms ‘its Muslim oppressors’.”

72. The random examples which I have just cited straight from the horse’s mouth show beyond any shadow of doubt who has been planning and perpetrating aggression, subversion, destabilization and other fiendish deeds all the way from 1947-1948, and though the 1950s, and who is responsible for the avowed aggression which took place again in 1967, against three Arab countries, and which started with the destruction of the Egyptian air force. This aggression against three States Members of the United Nations, was a deliberate instrument of policy and not, as they deceitfully claim, for reasons of so-called security. The Israelis went to the extent of committing acts of sabotage in Egypt in 1955—there was the famous Lavon affair, for example—to frighten the United States, their benefactor, into not having any dealings with the Arab world.

73. How is one to explain such mad behaviour—and the word “mad” was used by the late Moshe Sharett. Perhaps a conversation between Ben-Gurion and Nahum Goldmann, head of the World Jewish Organization, sheds some light. Excerpts from the conversation were published in a Zionist magazine in the United States called *Moment*. I am grateful to my colleague Mr. Sayegh for bringing it to my attention. In its issue of September 1977, Volume 2, number 9, the magazine related Goldmann’s interview with Ben-Gurion shortly before the latter’s death. Goldmann stated, *inter alia*, that he was once sitting with him until 3.00 in the morning; Ben-Gurion insisted on a heart-to-heart talk and insisted that not even his wife be present. Ben-Gurion is quoted as telling him: “If you ask me why I want arms and strength, it is simple. Why should the Arabs make peace with us? Are they crazy? If I were an Arab would I accept Israel?” Ben-Gurion added to Goldmann: “We came and stole their country. Why should they make peace?” Goldmann said that he was shuddering, and asked Ben-Gurion how he saw the situation? Ben-Gurion replied. “In two or three months I will be 70. If you ask me if I will die and be buried in a Jewish State—I will live 10 more years, maybe 15—I think yes. My son Amos will be 50 in October. If you ask me if he will die and be buried in a Jewish cemetery, he has at least a 50 per cent chance.” Goldmann said he would never forget it. He then said to Ben-Gurion “How do you sleep at night, being the Prime Minister, with this prospect?” and Ben-Gurion replied “Who told you I sleep at night?”

74. If Ben-Gurion’s misguided premises and insatiable and sadistic appetite had not overcome his better judgement—and he was a very learned man, well-read in philosophy and literature—and if he had accepted the Lausanne Protocol of 12 May 1949, which would have solved the Palestine problem 30 years ago in equity and justice and a spirit of live and let live, he need not have had any sleepless nights, for Arabs and Jews had lived in amity and peace for countless centuries. However, not just fear but remorse alone would make it difficult for anyone who had savagely uprooted a whole people to sleep in comfort in this world.

75. Instead, the Israeli political military establishment opted for war and more war and dreaded peace. Dayan believed that continuing tension was the only way to maintain a cohesive society. He was worried that the young pioneers in the Negev would desert if there was no invention of a sense of danger, and he said so. The goal of the Israeli military establishment was, from the outset, to transform the Zionist State into the major Power in the Middle East and from there to rule the world through its highly organized and highly placed Zionist centres of power and intimidation. I mean, of course, by “rule” to influence the world in the way they intend and desire.

76. Moreover, it is the avowed objective of the Israeli military establishment to achieve the liquidation of all Arab and Palestinian claims to Palestine through the dispersion of the Palestinian refugees of 1947-1948 and of 1967 and since to far-away parts of the Arab world, as well as to places outside it. The sight and ghost of their murdered victim is too unbearable, as it would be for me if I were the perpetrator.

77. The Camp David agreements regarding Palestine which the Arab world rejects absolutely and unalterably have been aptly named “The Second Balfour Declaration”, for their aim is to accomplish the total national liquidation of the Palestinian people. The first Balfour Declaration, obnoxious as it is, had some residual protective expression for the Palestinian people’s rights, whereas the Camp David agreements have none, but condemn the Palestinian people to perpetual occupation, servitude and dispossession of even land and water and the refugees are displaced to permanent exile.

78. The eleventh Arab Summit Conference held at Amman from 25 to 27 November 1980 has categorically rejected those agreements. In fact, they are regarded as dead. The Amman Conference has likewise reiterated the earlier resolutions of the ninth and tenth Conferences, held respectively at Baghdad and Tunis in 1978 and 1979, that any solution to the question of Palestine must be based upon full Israeli withdrawal from all the territories occupied in 1967 and the restoration of all the rights of the Palestinian people, whose sole representative is the PLO.

79. It is an incontrovertible fact that the established indigenous inhabitants, namely the Palestinian people, are the amalgam and the melting-pot of over 7,000 to 8,000 years of recorded history of all the races, peoples and cultures for which Palestine has been the continued and uninterrupted place of habitation. They comprise the Canaanite Semitic Arabs and

their branch, the Jebusites, who founded the City of Jerusalem more than 5,000 years ago and named it Urusalem. Recent Israeli excavations in Jerusalem have unearthed the Canaanite city of Jerusalem which antedates King David's home by 2,500 years. That means a stretch of 5,500 years. Other excavations in Ebla, in northern Syria, also prove the same thing.

80. The Palestinian amalgam also includes the Phoenicians of Galilee, the Nabateans of Jordan, the Syrians, the Aramaics, the Hellenics, the Romans, the Arabs who came from the Arabian peninsula in massive numbers 1,400 years ago, ancient Hebrew Semitic tribes, European crusaders and others who became integrated into the ongoing mainstream of the inhabitants and became an integral part of the indigenous population.

81. Those peoples generated their own spiritual experiences and settled on Islam, Christianity and Judaism. They all lived side by side in complete amity as one people, regardless of ethnic origin or creed. Even during the short-lived Israeli hegemony some 3,000 years ago, the Israelis never achieved a monolithic or exclusive presence, but lived side by side and integrated with their neighbours. The present-day Zionists evidently have different ideas about co-existence.

82. What has been the fate of those Palestinian people over the past 30 years? I have told the Assembly who the Palestinian people are. Now what has been their fate? What the Palestinian people are being confronted with is a singularly unique and incomparable combination of 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 by their Zionist tormentors to pursue a ruthless and calculated process designed to achieve Palestinian national obliteration. This is no longer a well-kept conspiracy; it is an avowed objective, systematically implemented day in day out without apology or remorse.

83. In the face of such incredible illegality and inhumanity, resolutions have proved to be of no avail. It is only if the community of nations acts in concert and with firmness that the Palestinian people will at long last be redeemed. Jordan, which unconditionally supports the just cause of the Palestinian people and is faithful to the Charter and to the cause of just and lasting peace, expresses once more its hope and its prayer that the United Nations will take whatever decisive action it deems necessary to bring this long agony to an end. I do not have to remind the Assembly what Articles of the Charter should be applied.

84. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Our debate on the question of Palestine is taking place in the midst of a complex international situation and a grave situation now prevailing in the Middle East. Without any doubt the Palestinian problem is at the heart of the conflict in that region. The responsibility of the international community, represented by the United Nations, with regard to this problem is a responsibility that has been confirmed from the outset. Egypt has asked

the international community to ensure that the United Nations resolutions on the question of Palestine are implemented, in the conviction that there can be no comprehensive and lasting peace in the region without a just and honourable solution of that problem, making it possible for the Palestinian people to recover its inalienable rights, which have long been disregarded.

85. At the head of the list of those inalienable rights is the right of our brothers the people of Palestine to self-determination in full freedom and without foreign interference, just as is its right of return to its homeland. The right to self-determination is one of the basic elements of the contemporary international political order established by the Charter of the United Nations. No one can claim that right for one people while denying it to another. It is therefore our contention that the Palestinian people must exercise its inalienable national and legitimate rights, primarily its right to self-determination. This was Egypt's objective in its efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement.

86. A few days ago the world observed the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian people. Egypt participated in that celebration, and President Sadat made Egypt's position clear in a message addressed to the Secretary-General and to the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People:

“Our brothers the Palestinian people have experienced something that no other people in modern history has experienced—that is, its fundamental political rights have been denied. Some have gone so far as to deny the very existence of that people. The injustice done to the Palestinian people has been the cause of the wars and other tragedies that have devastated the Middle East region for more than 30 years, which have taken tens of thousands of lives and have destroyed enormous material resources that could have been used for the development and well-being of the peoples of the region.

“The Palestinian cause has been foremost among the concerns of the people and Government of Egypt ever since the Palestinian people was expelled from its homeland and deprived of its legitimate national rights. Egypt has been in the forefront of the Arab struggle to help the Palestinian people regain its inalienable rights, and above all its right to self-determination and to return to its homeland.”

87. Egypt has discharged its national responsibilities towards our brothers the people of Palestine since its expulsion in 1948. It has led the struggle for the recovery of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. For more than 30 years Egypt has been the first in all international forums to ask that the Palestinian people be allowed to exercise its legitimate inalienable rights, so that a just and lasting peace can be established in the Middle East, a peace that would preserve the right of all the peoples of the region to live in peace and security within their homeland free from any threat of aggression. It is within that framework that the political initiatives of Egypt's diplomacy have been taken. Egypt has not hesitated for a moment to use its legitimate right of self-defence to break the plot designed to impose a *fait accompli* in order to prevent the Palestinian people from recovering its rights.

88. In this context, Egypt has waged a legitimate and sometimes lonely struggle to face aggression and to impose respect for international legality. To achieve that goal tens of thousands of its children have suffered greatly and billions of dollars have been sacrificed, to the detriment of its own prosperity and the prosperity of its people and their livelihood.

89. The glorious war of October 1973 represented the latest confrontation aimed at breaking the deadlock in a situation which some tried to impose in order to gain acceptance of the occupation. It was also aimed at moving the *status quo* towards a comprehensive peaceful settlement. In fact it was that war that made it possible for the question of Palestine to be given its rightful place at the very heart of the problem.

90. Egypt has always been dedicated to the cause of peace. It has co-operated in all peaceful initiatives, starting with its acceptance of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and including its co-operation with Ambassador Jarring. In its resolution 2799 (XXVI), adopted by an overwhelming majority, the General Assembly recognized this situation and paid a tribute to Egypt, which welcomed the initiative of the Committee of African Heads of State as well as the Rogers initiative.

91. Egypt believes in the Charter of the United Nations and in the need to preserve succeeding generations from the scourge of war as stipulated in the Charter. Egypt believes in the need to resolve international disputes through peaceful means.

92. Although Egyptian forces have won great military victories and have freed Egyptian territory from Israeli occupation, Egypt, through its President, promoted the convening of an international peace conference with the participation of all parties concerned, including the representatives of the Palestinian people, so that all these parties might co-operate with a view to the establishment of a just and lasting peace.

93. It was in pursuance of that policy of principle that Egypt signed the Camp David agreements, which represent an important step towards the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). Those agreements are based on that resolution and they constitute a cornerstone for a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Middle East problem. Those agreements provide for an interim régime, making it possible for the Palestinian people to exercise autonomy for a determined period, preparing the way for that people's exercise of its natural, inalienable right to self-determination and making it possible for contacts to exist between the Palestinian people and Israel in a framework of peaceful coexistence, positive co-operation and mutual respect.

94. Egypt's role stems from its feeling of responsibility as regards the fraternal people of Palestine and from the fact that Egypt believes in the need for serious and responsible action to put an end to the suffering of that people, which has long been in exile, rather than vain rivalry, the use of senseless slogans and futile complaints. Today we have heard words of this sort from the representative of Iraq; they deserve no comment from me.

95. Egypt has achieved much through the Camp David agreements. Those agreements were the first

instruments signed by Israel in which it committed itself to do what it had previously refused to do: first, to respect the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and its just demands; secondly, to work with the Palestinian people with a view to resolving the Palestinian problem in all its aspects; thirdly, to withdraw Israel's military government and civil administration from the occupied Arab territories; fourthly, to accept the establishment of an autonomous Palestinian national authority in the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip within the framework of provisional interim agreements, leading to the exercise by the Palestinian people of its legitimate and inalienable rights.

96. Egypt would never have taken that course of action without bearing in mind the following facts. First, the question of Palestine is at the very core of the Middle East conflict. Secondly, the question of Palestine is a complex one and has many ramifications, and it is thus necessary that we take every opportunity that presents itself. Thirdly, there is a need for interim agreements to prepare the way for a final solution and put an end to the suffering of our Palestinian brothers in the occupied lands. Fourthly, Egypt does not speak on behalf of the Palestinian people, because it is not the role of Egypt or any other party to speak on behalf of that people, which must decide for itself on its destiny and its representatives. Fifthly, the last word must be spoken by the Palestinian people as regards both the form and the substance of its problems.

97. In his statement to the General Assembly at this session the Foreign Minister and Vice-Prime Minister of Egypt made our position clear as regards the efforts to be made towards a peaceful solution. He said: "First, the legitimate and inalienable right of the Palestinian people to exercise their right to self-determination without external interference; in addition, the recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to establish their own independent State in Palestine as an undisputed right, equal to that of all peoples, to independence; secondly, any settlement should provide for the implementation of all the principles embodied in Security Council resolutions, and in particular resolution 242 (1967), which stipulates the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States in the region; thirdly, the right and the obligation of the Palestinian people to participate in all the stages of negotiations leading to a just settlement; fourthly, the rejection of all the Israeli measures which are contrary to international law, the Charter and relevant resolutions of the United Nations and the binding international conventions, in particular those measures relative to the building of settlements in occupied territories; fifthly, the security of the area is indivisible and therefore does not relate to Israel alone; genuine security cannot be realized for one party at the expense of the security and rights of the others; and sixthly, the necessity that Israel immediately undertake certain confidence-building measures to bring about a climate of understanding and coexistence between the Palestinian and Israeli peoples, a climate that would, on the basis of international legitimacy, pave the way towards friendly

relations between the two peoples in the future". [16th meeting, para. 87.]

98. Within that framework, Egypt once again states that it believes that mutual recognition must take place between Israel and the PLO in order to put an end to hatred and distrust and to establish a dialogue of peace directed towards the normalization of relations between the Palestinian and Israeli peoples on the basis of mutual respect and co-operation.

99. Egypt vigorously condemns the measures taken by Israel against the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories, such as the creation of settlements and repression of freedom of expression through barbarous means of expelling elected representatives of the Palestinian people. It goes without saying that such measures create obstacles to peace and the settlement of the problem. Such measures have repeatedly brought the peace negotiations to an impasse.

100. From this rostrum Egypt requests Israel to put an end to its illegal and inhumane practices, which in no way guarantee its security.

101. With regard to the question of Jerusalem—a city which occupies a special place in the three revealed religions—I should like once again very clearly and precisely to express Egypt's position on the matter. Arab Jerusalem is an integral part of the occupied West Bank. Arab Jerusalem must be restored to Arab sovereignty. In this connexion United Nations resolutions must be implemented. Any unilateral attempt by Israel aimed at changing the status of Jerusalem is rejected in substance and in form. Hence Egypt supports Security Council resolution 478 (1980) concerning Jerusalem, which represents international unanimity.

102. Egypt supports the actions of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. At the 75th meeting the Chairman of the Committee reviewed the efforts made by that Committee to preserve and strengthen the rights of the Palestinian people. Here I shall not go into the details of the Committee's report, but we do wish to stress the need to face up to the attempts of a minority which refuses peace and which attempts to divert the Committee from the course it has set for itself. That is why the Egyptian delegation has strong reservations on certain paragraphs of the report.

103. The question of Palestine is a highly important one for every citizen of Egypt. Egypt will not accept any alternative to the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, because that is a right recognized to all peoples and, hence, it cannot be denied to the Palestinian people. After all the sacrifices of the Egyptian people, it cannot accept any violation of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Egypt has chosen the path of peace and will never change that decision. We shall pursue our efforts together with peace-loving countries to lay the foundations for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East for the benefit of the peoples of the region and the entire world. That peace can be established only if the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people are recognized and if that people recovers its freedom and independence.

104. Mr. NISIBORI (Japan): Only last July, at the seventh emergency special session, the international

community focused its attention on the urgent and vitally important question of Palestine. Since then, although the question has become ever more complex and a just solution increasingly elusive, international attention has generally been diverted to the conflict between Iran and Iraq. Nevertheless, the Government of Japan has continued to be profoundly concerned about the question of Palestine.

105. The basic position of the Government of Japan on the Middle East question and, in particular, on the Palestine question, has been presented on various occasions and may be summarized as follows.

106. First, the peace that is achieved in the Middle East should be just, lasting and comprehensive. Secondly, such a peace should be achieved through the early and complete implementation of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and through the recognition of, and respect for, the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination under the Charter. Thirdly, each and every path towards the realization of such a peace must be explored with careful consideration given to the legitimate security requirements of the countries in the region and the aspirations of all the peoples in the region, including the Palestinian people.

107. In accordance with those fundamental principles, Japan is firmly convinced that it is essential first and foremost that Israel withdraw from all the occupied territories, including East Jerusalem. Moreover, the result of the exercise of the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people must be decided by themselves. Japan holds the view that the right of establishing an independent State is included in the concept of the right to self-determination.

108. In accordance with the basic position of the Government of Japan as I have just outlined it, Japan considers that the PLO represents the Palestinian people. Thus, in order to advance the cause of peace in the Middle East, Japan believes it essential that Israel and the PLO recognize each other's position and that the PLO participate in the peace process in the future.

109. In this connexion, I should like to point out that Japan is acutely aware of the importance of the Palestine question, and has consistently maintained the position of recognizing the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. It has been making efforts to find ways of how best to contribute to the achievement of peace in the Middle East. These have included efforts to make known its fundamental position to the parties involved and to deepen mutual understanding through dialogues with the PLO.

110. Moreover, as a concrete means to an early solution of the Palestine question, Japan believes it is important that momentum be maintained and that the search for a just and lasting solution be continued. Thus, it is of the utmost importance that both Israel and the Palestinian people make further efforts to dispel mutual distrust and to foster a genuine will to coexist.

111. Recognizing the need to create an atmosphere conducive to solving the question of Palestine, Japan is profoundly concerned about the recent examples of deterioration of the situation. The Knesset—the

Israeli parliament—has passed a bill to annex East Jerusalem and, as is reported, some Knesset members are even considering a bill to annex the Golan Heights. The mayors of Hebron and Halhul and the Shariat Judge of Hebron were expelled last May and the two mayors are now being detained by the Israeli authorities. At the same time, we also observe that terrorist actions aimed at Israeli citizens are being undertaken by the Palestinian guerrillas.

112. In our view, the worsening of the situation stems primarily from the occupation policies of Israel. We believe that such policies, including the establishment of settlements in the occupied areas, as well as the unilateral steps to change the status of Jerusalem, are incompatible with Security Council resolution 242 (1967); they have no legal validity and are illegal. In addition, in view of the long duration of the occupation, we strongly urge that the occupying authorities make special efforts to protect the human rights of the Palestinian inhabitants of the occupied areas, in accordance with the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 1949, and other relevant international legislation.

113. We are convinced that the best way for Israel to ensure its future security is by negotiating with all the parties concerned and by investigating all possible means of solving the problem peacefully.

114. Japan supports the principles contained in, and the spirit of, General Assembly resolutions 3236 (XXIX) of 1974 and ES-7/2 of 29 July 1980, which recognize the right of self-determination of the Palestinian people. In order to ensure that these resolutions will effectively constitute a firm basis for achieving a just peace in the Middle East, Japan believes that it is necessary to incorporate into them an important principle contained in Security Council resolution 242 (1967), namely “respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force”.

115. As some have argued, since both Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and the aforementioned resolutions of the General Assembly are resolutions of the United Nations, they should all be interpreted as being supplementary to each other. The Government of Japan would stress that what is of utmost importance is that the parties directly concerned accept such an interpretation and that the so-called “right of existence” should clearly be included in the text of a resolution.

116. Each year the General Assembly has adopted two additional resolutions under the present agenda item, one on the mandate of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and another on the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights. We believe that, if it were recomposed according to a new mandate and framework provided by the General Assembly, which acknowledged the aforementioned principle contained in Security Council resolution 242 (1967), Japan would be able to extend fuller support and the contribution of the Committee would be more widely appreciated.

117. The recommendations of the Committee which have been repeatedly contained in its reports to the

General Assembly over the last several years reflect, in our view, only one side of the reality, and hence have not been implemented. We sincerely hope that this inherent difficulty of the Committee will be recognized more clearly so that it can be rectified in the near future.

118. Turning to the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights, my delegation believes that it, too, must be provided with a new framework. Establishing such a special unit within the Secretariat arouses questions of principle relating to the Organization as a whole.

119. Aside from these considerations, we note the fact that the Special Unit has issued a number of publications on the question of Palestine which are gaining recognition as helpful material on the question. Unfortunately, however, there are those who claim that these publications are basically “tendentious and propagandistic”. This stems, we believe, from the nature of the framework under which the Special Unit is currently set up. We also hope that this similar inherent difficulty of the Special Unit will be given due, careful and early attention.

120. In closing, I should like to affirm that Japan supports all international endeavours for the achievement of a comprehensive peace in the Middle East. The Government of Japan will spare no effort in attaining our common goal—an early solution of the question of Palestine.

121. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): The opening of the present debate could, as is customary, give an opportunity to some to abuse the Organization, to denounce our practices, or to deny the realities of international political life, as though the competence of the United Nations could still be questioned in respect of a matter bearing upon the future and the liberation of a whole people, and incorporating elements of conflict which might at any moment lead to the outbreak of a military confrontation on a large scale.

122. It would certainly have suited the Israeli authorities to have had us abstain from reviewing the events and measures that form the backdrop of a constantly deteriorating situation, leave them a free hand and keep our justified criticisms to ourselves. Had they been able to do so, they would have prohibited us from celebrating the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, just as they prohibited the students at Bir-Zeit University from celebrating it.

123. Unfortunately for the Zionist entity, the Palestinians, whose aspirations and protests are now heard throughout the world, refuse to be reduced to silence, and the United Nations cannot be forced to resign its role at the risk of betraying its mission to defend the principles of the Charter with regard to self-determination and the sovereign equality of all peoples.

124. Silence and resignation are not in order so long as the illegal occupation of the Arab territories of Palestine continues, and above all when that occupation is accompanied by acts of aggression, murders, assaults, extortions and all sorts of abuses against which the Security Council has pronounced itself on many occasions, to mention only the past year.

125. We know not one single example of a people that would have uncomplainingly agreed to submit to any form of foreign occupation, colonialism, subjugation or discrimination. The Palestinian people are no exception, and Israel would be deluding itself were it to count on overcoming Palestinian resistance by a systematic resort to violence and arbitrary acts. Indeed, if there is a lesson to be drawn from the years of forced cohabitation of the Palestinian people and the Israeli occupiers, it is that that people is seeing its will to emancipation grow stronger with each day and is emerging from these years of trial with a renewed awareness of its national identity, its destiny, and of the role and place that legally belong to it within the Middle East. Whatever the rigours of the occupation, a people determined to face the problems imposed upon it by the exclusivism and injustices of the usurping entity cannot be deflected from its goals.

126. The Palestinian people, and with it the entire international community, would have had less reason for concern had Israel simply acted as an occupying authority and had it as such observed the pertinent provisions of international law. The fact is that that country also has aims of territorial conquest that prevent it from dissociating itself clearly from international Zionism, whose coveting of the whole of Palestine is not something new. The annexation of Jerusalem is a first step that the international community and the Security Council in its resolution 476 (1980) were right to condemn and to consider as null and void.

127. Forced displacements of the population, confiscations of Arab lands, increased numbers of settlements justified not by reasons for security but by the deliberate intent to alter the demographic composition of the occupied territories—these are manifestations of a plan of conquest which, albeit gradual in its implementation, is none the less being followed with determination.

128. When Mr. Begin's Government proclaims its official policy as one under which there should never be an international boundary between the Jordan and the Mediterranean, we are being confronted with a proposal that is designed to dissociate Israel's existence from the partition plan adopted in 1948 and purely and simply to annex the west bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip.

129. We leave it to the General Assembly to judge the legitimacy of such a position, as well as its political and legal implications. At this juncture, we merely emphasize the dangers that it represents for the Palestinian people, whose future can be settled neither by the maintenance of the present *status quo* nor by its assimilation into Israeli society, nor its being given minority status within a Zionist entity to which it is not, for that matter, attached by any common history, culture or aspirations.

130. Is there any need for us to add that that future cannot be conceived in the nebulous form of some autonomy whose content and outlines are difficult to make out today.

131. Supposing that an agreement were to be concluded based on that formula—which seems doubtful under the present circumstances—there is nothing to guarantee that Israel would not, during the transitional

period provided for, take all the necessary measures to close off any options contrary to its annexationist aims. Without guarantees or commitments on the part of Israel, it is unrealistic to try to urge the Palestinian people to gamble with its future, to accept an autonomy reduced to municipal functions, to renounce even temporarily the exercise of its sovereign right to form an independent State, to look to Israel for the definition and conduct of its foreign and security policy and, finally, to accept the settlements as a fait accompli.

132. Thus, the General Assembly in resolution 34/65 B quite rightly rejected as devoid of validity the agreements and arrangements purporting to determine the future of the Palestinian people without the participation of its legitimate representative, namely, PLO, agreements and arrangements that "ignore, infringe, violate or deny the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people... and which envisage and condone continued Israeli occupation".

133. In the last paragraph of the recommendations contained in its report at the present session, the Committee for the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People expresses the opinion that a wider understanding of the just cause of the Palestinian people would be a major contribution towards a just solution of the question of Palestine [see A/35/35, para. 48]. As a member of the Committee, my delegation has no need to add that it subscribes fully to that opinion, as well as to the other recommendations of the Committee approved and reaffirmed by the Assembly every year since its thirty-first session, which we are still asking to see implemented.

134. In essence, those recommendations are based on the notion that there can be no just and lasting peace in the Middle East so long as no solution has been found to the problem of Palestine, a solution based on the attainment of the Palestinian people's inalienable rights, including its right of return and its right to national independence and sovereignty in Palestine in conformity with the Charter. Those recommendations imply the integral and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli occupation forces.

135. As to form, we insist that the PLO, the representative of the Palestinian people, be invited to participate in all efforts and all deliberations and conferences concerning the Middle East held under United Nations auspices on an equal footing with other parties.

136. In spite of the efforts of Israel and its allies to water down and contest the recommendations of the Committee, the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people are being ever more widely recognized within the international community, a support that constitutes a rejection of specific steps being taken towards any goals other than the full recognition of a sovereign, independent and distinct Palestinian nation. An almost universal consensus exists that could serve as a basis for a just and lasting solution to the question of Palestine but a minority is preventing it from being translated into reality.

137. This minority introduces into the Organization an unjustified confrontation, opposing its *diktat* to the democratic will of the majority and blocking the normal functioning of the competent United Nations

bodies. The questions raised this morning by the representative of the PLO, our comrade, Mr. Farouk Kaddoumi, derived from these obstructionist manoeuvres.

138. Can we permit a single people, in this case the people of Palestine, to lose the faith which it has placed in the Organization and its confidence in the defence and realization of their humanitarian and national rights? Should we limit ourselves to adopting resolutions which reflect the just nature and legitimacy of the Palestinian cause and our continued adherence to the principles of the United Nations?

139. In our view the United Nations cannot go back on its commitments with respect to the Palestinian people and shirk its responsibilities with respect to the right of peoples and the maintenance of international peace and security. In this regard, it is important that the General Assembly, which expresses the collective conscience of humanity, exercises all its influence to stop the Security Council from being used for partisan political aims, and to enable that body fully to discharge its role as the ultimate guarantor of the observance of the Charter and of the implementation of United Nations decisions.

140. It is not too early for the Council to show its determination to maintain the authority of this international Organization towards countries such as Israel, which treat the United Nations with derision and simply pay no attention to appeals, recommendations and injunctions directed to them.

141. The moment has come, it seems to us, to envisage the proclamation, under Chapter VII, of sanctions against that country whose implementation of resolutions 465 (1980) and 478 (1980) adopted by the Security Council we are still awaiting. We cannot remain hesitant and indecisive, because if the United Nations is to collapse under the weight of its own ineffectiveness and repeated failures, the Palestinian people, which are already the victim of injustice, will not be the only victim. In the future, all humanity will have to confront insecurity, disorder and injustice, which are the very negation of the principles that bring us together in this hall.

142. We wish once again to assure our brothers in Palestine of our solidarity with them and our continued readiness to lend our modest support to the struggle that they are waging against foreign occupation, oppression and injustice. Their fight is our fight, and it will end only with recovery of the rights of which they are now deprived.

143. To Mr. Falilou Kane, who presided over the deliberations of the Committee for a year that was particularly fertile in events and who then brilliantly directed certain initiatives of the Committee in the Security Council and before the General Assembly as well, I should like to pay a tribute that has been more than deserved. Under his firm and courteous direction, the Committee broadened and deepened the support enjoyed by the Palestinian people at the international level, and we want to indicate our recognition of that fact.

144. Mr. MUNTASSER (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is a pleasure for me, at the outset, as we discuss the report of the Com-

mittee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People to express my thanks and appreciation to the members of the Committee for their continued efforts to discharge their responsibilities. In commending the members of the Committee, I have in mind in particular the outgoing Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Fall, and the acting Chairman, Mr. Kane, both of Senegal, as well as the Rapporteur, Mr. Gauci of Malta.

145. In spite of our reservations concerning certain paragraphs and conclusions contained in the report of the Committee, we support many of its recommendations and conclusions, especially where it states, first of all, that the problem of Palestine is at the very heart of the Middle East problem, and, consequently, that no solution in the Middle East can be envisaged which does not fully take into account the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people. Secondly, the Committee recognizes the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to return to their homes and property and to achieve self-determination, national independence and sovereignty, because the full implementation of these rights will contribute decisively to a comprehensive and final settlement of the Middle East crisis. Thirdly, the Committee stressed the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and the consequent obligation for Israel to withdraw speedily and completely from any Arab Palestinian territory so occupied. Fourthly, the Committee stressed the duty and responsibility of all parties concerned to enable the Palestinians to exercise their inalienable rights. It also stressed the need to strengthen the role of the United Nations and its organs in promoting a just solution to the question of Palestine. The United Nations should take immediate measures to facilitate the exercise by the Palestinians of their right to return to their homes, lands and property.

146. The report of the Committee demonstrates the evolution of the situation in the Assembly and in international bodies during recent years, as well as changes in world public opinion concerning the question of Palestine—especially following the adoption by the General Assembly of resolutions which recognized the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, in particular their right to self-determination. It also recognized the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and the need for the Palestinian people, represented by the PLO, to participate in any international conference or gathering which deals with the question of Palestine.

147. These developments in the United Nations and in other international and regional organizations, as well as in the international community itself, augur well for the liberation struggle being waged against imperialist and Zionist aggression. They are in fact a recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people, of the resistance of that heroic people against Zionist aggression and of its determination not to submit to the ambitions of Zionism and imperialism.

148. The question before the General Assembly once again at this session is in fact the question of the Palestinian people and their tragedy. What is at issue is a fundamental question which is of continual concern to the international community and has been for more than 30 years. It is the question of a people which has

been deprived of its land, expelled from its homes and obliged to live as refugees in tents, or which still suffers under the odious yoke of colonialism.

149. The Palestinian problem is the greatest possible injustice suffered by peoples in the world and is a grave threat to international peace and security. The militant people of Palestine has been the victim of Zionist racist aggression, intended to uproot a people from its homeland, replacing it by immigrants from all parts of the world on the basis of a slogan which says, "Move out so that I can take your place". The Palestinian people has been the victim of a plot hatched by imperialist forces in collaboration with international zionism.

150. Instead of giving the Palestinian people its rights, a mandate has been imposed on it, making it an easy prey to racist zionism and depriving it of its lands, its homes, and its rights.

151. During this session, the General Assembly has again been discussing the Palestinian problem, four months after the seventh emergency special session at which the Gener¹ Assembly dealt with the same question. The Assembly adopted resolution ES-7/2 of 29 July 1980, which *inter alia* reaffirmed that there can be no comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East, in accordance with the Charter and the relevant United Nations resolutions, without a just solution of the problem of Palestine on the basis of the attainment of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people in Palestine.

152. The General Assembly reaffirmed the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to return to its homeland and to recover its goods in Palestine. It demanded its return and reconfirmed the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people in its resolution. That includes its right to self-determination without any foreign interference and its right to independence and national sovereignty. It again recognized the PLO as the sole representative of the Palestinian people and its right to participate on an equal footing in all efforts, discussions and conferences dealing with the question of Palestine and the Middle East, in the framework of the United Nations.

153. But what about the implementation of that resolution? It met the same fate as other resolutions adopted by the United Nations concerning the rights of the Palestinian people. The Zionist entity completely ignored the resolution, as confirmed by the reply of the Zionist entity to the Secretary-General in a report dated 11 November 1980 [A/35/618-S/14250]. In the face of the Zionist entity's defiance of that resolution, the United Nations must assume its responsibilities and take a position consistent with the Charter, failing which, the Organization will open the way for its own break-up.

154. The United Nations, which has recognized the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, and has recognized the PLO as the legitimate representative of that people, has an historical responsibility to redress its wrongs towards the Palestinian people following the Second World War, in circumstances with which we are all familiar.

155. The Zionist entity has not contented itself with disregarding the numerous resolutions of the

United Nations, the latest of which was resolution ES-7/2. It continues its racist policies against the Palestinian people and against the occupied Arab territories by continuing the policy of settling the occupied Arab lands, by gaining a hold on Arab lands. The Zionist entity continues its aggression against the Palestinian people and we continue to be informed about Zionist plans, known to everyone, and whose aim is the annexation of occupied Arab territories.

156. The Zionist entity could never have taken such a stand towards United Nations resolutions if it were not encouraged by certain imperialist Powers, headed by the United States. The alignment of the United States with the Zionist entity needs no further proof. Everyone knows that the United States gives total support and increasing assistance to the Zionist entity in all fields. The United States offers the most modern of weapons to the Zionist entity to be used against Arab peoples. Financial assistance granted by the United States Government to the Zionist entity has exceeded \$10 billion during the past three years. That was confirmed by President Carter himself in an interview given on 25 February 1980. The United States Government did not content itself with giving vast financial support to the Zionist entity. It also opposes the right of the Palestinian people and refuses to recognize the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, despite the fact that 110 States have extended that recognition.

157. The Security Council has examined the question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its legitimate rights four times: in 1976, 1977, 1979 and in March and April 1980. Everyone knows that the Council has not been able to adopt the most minor draft resolution because of the use by the United States of its right of veto. The United States has on every occasion used its right of veto against draft resolutions concerning the rights of the Palestinian people, stating that those draft resolutions were not balanced. This is a startling position on the part of a permanent member of the Security Council which claims to be in favour of the strengthening of human rights throughout the world. That contradiction needs no comment. The position of the United States once again confirms the feeling of frustration of the third world because of the veto right which is used in the Security Council. It is high time for the majority of the third world States to raise their voices to demand that the voting system and the right of veto be changed. Otherwise, the international community will never be able to have the provisions of the Charter respected.

158. The United States does not confine itself to opposing all draft resolutions that are in favour of the rights of the Palestinian people. Through its officials the United States declares that it will oppose any draft resolution submitted in the Security Council that recognizes Palestinian rights. That was confirmed by President Carter on television in January 1980 when he said in the United Nations the United States had opposed any attempt to violate the sacred nature of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) or aimed at changing its present formulation, and that it could use the right of veto to oppose any attempt to sabotage the Camp David agreements. He said that he would not hesitate to use the right of veto if necessary.

159. The United States, all of whose acts indicate that it opposes the rights of the Palestinian people, cannot be considered an arbiter of the Palestinian problem and cannot be considered as a serious factor in the search for a just solution to that problem. United States officials have stated that they are seeking a peaceful solution to the problem. The solution envisaged by the United States is the solution planned in the so-called Camp David agreements, planned and signed by the United States. Those agreements go against international law since they disregard the cause of the Palestinian people, the cause recognized by everyone to be at the heart of the Middle East problem. The Camp David agreements also disregard the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and all the aspects of those agreements involve a parody of autonomy. Those agreements have created a new situation of tension in the Arab region, which not only obstructs the establishment of peace in that region but also causes its deterioration and creates the danger of war.

160. The acts of aggression committed against Lebanon and the escalation of Zionist practices in the occupied Arab lands and the fact that the Egyptian régime is sending troops to the border with Libya and is conducting joint manoeuvres with United States rapid deployment forces in the region constitute the best proof of what we are stating. We know that the Sixth Fleet is undertaking manoeuvres along the entire length of our coastline.

161. My country's position of objection to these imperialist agreements is a clear one. We have condemned those agreements, and they have also been condemned by Arab, Islamic, African and non-aligned conferences. They were even condemned by the General Assembly in resolution 34/65 B. Those agreements were rejected by the Palestinian people also.

162. Those in certain circles, primarily Zionist circles, are attempting to distort our position and to make others believe that we are against peace. The achievement of peace in the Arab region and throughout the world is the objective of the entire Arab nation and of all other peoples throughout the world. We cherish peace based on justice, not on submission and injustice. The establishment of peace in our Arab region is a question of vital importance to us and to all peoples throughout the world. But the establishment of that peace cannot be accomplished as long as zionism and racism cling to their doctrine based on the creation of a Zionist State, the expulsion of Arabs and their replacement by Zionist immigrants. What we want to confirm here is that peace in our Arab region cannot be achieved through piecemeal measures aimed at containing the problem, nor through unlawful measures and the denial of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

163. A just peace can be established only through the recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, thus enabling that people to free its land, to decide on its own destiny and to return to its homeland. A just solution to the Palestinian problem can be found only if an end is put to the immigration of settlers into Palestine. It can be found only through a return of the Palestinian people to its land and through the exercise of its right to self-determination by the

creation of a democratic Palestinian State in which the three revealed religions can coexist.

164. The Palestinian people's inalienable rights are recognized in the Charter and United Nations resolutions, as well as by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Palestinian people, regardless of the forces of evil, regardless of the plots hatched against it, is resolved to continue its legitimate struggle under the guidance of the PLO to liberate its land, to decide its own future and to recover its rights. There can be no doubt that history teaches us that liberation causes always triumph in the end.

165. Mr. SHELDON (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The achievement of a just and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict, which arose and has been maintained for many years by the rulers of Israel and their imperialist patrons, is one of the major tasks confronting the United Nations.

166. In the Middle East there is still no peace; moreover, the situation there has become so tense in recent times that at any moment there may be a new explosion, threatening universal peace and security. The whole problem is that Israel is continuing its expansionist and adventurist course, relying on the support and assistance of imperialist elements, especially the United States of America; and that major United States military forces have been concentrated in this area, new military bases are being built and American rapid deployment forces are behaving in a threatening manner and carrying out blackmail. Efforts are continuing to divide the Arab peoples, with the help of the Camp David agreements; broad areas of Arab territory continue to be occupied and this is an attempt to deprive a whole people, the Arab people of Palestine, of its inalienable right to self-determination and to create its own State.

167. The main element in a Middle East settlement, along with the frustration of the designs of the imperialists, is the need to guarantee the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine. This is recognized by the overwhelming majority of States and has been reflected in resolution 3236 (XXIX), adopted by the General Assembly six years ago, as well as in subsequent resolutions of the Assembly on the question of Palestine.

168. The Security Council has discussed various aspects of the Middle East question on many occasions, including this year, and has adopted resolutions condemning oppression and crimes on the part of the Israeli authorities against the Arab people of Palestine and its leaders and demanding that Israel liquidate its settlements in the occupied Arab territories and respect the historical character and status of Jerusalem. Those resolutions confirm the overriding necessity to end the prolonged occupation of Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem. In particular, by its resolution 478 (1980) of 20 August 1980, the Security Council condemned Israel's adoption of legislative and administrative measures designed to change the status of Jerusalem.

169. Some months ago, in this very hall, the General Assembly adopted resolution ES-7/2 in which it demanded that Israel "withdraw completely and

unconditionally from all the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since June 1967, including Jerusalem". Further it "urges that such withdrawal from all the occupied territories should start before 15 November 1980". This date has come and gone, yet Israel is boldly and unceremoniously continuing its occupation of Arab territories, intensifying its oppression of the Arab people of Palestine and its elected leaders and extending its military settlements on Arab lands. In essence, it has formally annexed eastern Jerusalem and is preparing to do the same with respect to the Golan Heights, which is an ancient territory of Syria. As a result of the unending provocations by the Israeli military authorities and their puppets, blood is flowing in long-suffering Lebanon.

170. Quite recently information has been published about plans to expand Israeli settlements in the Arab lands. It is not enough that, as *The New York Times* indicated on 12 November 1980, since Begin came to power in 1977 the number of settlements in the occupied West Bank of the Jordan has increased from 24 to 68, that is, almost three times, while the number of settlers has increased from 3,200 to 17,000, which is more than five and a half times. It is intended to increase the number of settlers to 28,000 by the end of 1981. Indeed, the aggressive appetite of the Israeli expansionists knows no limits.

171. The reasons are well known. Today the representative of the PLO, at this very rostrum, described them to us in sufficient detail and with sufficient conviction. They were described not only by Kadoumi but by a number of other speakers too.

172. Yes, limitless patronage and generous assistance is given by the United States to Israel, the ultimate aim of whose leaders in governing circles is the satisfaction of its unquenchable thirst for territorial expansion and whose method of achieving this is the continued escalation of aggression. On the political map of the world, as is well known, Israel has been in existence for just over three decades, and throughout all that time, in a planned and methodical way, it has been gnawing away bits of land from its Arab neighbours; and with each mouthful of Arab land it has become increasingly hungry and its appetite has thus become increasingly unappeasable. That aggressive course has led Israel to the edge not only of political but even of financial bankruptcy. It is in fact living on injections of dollars which are regularly administered from overseas at the expense of the American taxpayer.

173. According to official Israeli data mentioned by *The New York Times* on 12 October of this year, the gross national product of Israel is \$15 billion per year, whereas its external debt is \$19.2 billion. But all these enormous debts are willingly paid by the United States, and that enables Israel to make ends meet somehow or other to maintain a military machine which is very powerful for such a small country and thus to persist in its aggressive and expansionist policy against its Arab neighbours and continue to hold the Arab lands that were seized in 1967.

174. Some months ago Tel Aviv, here also following the course of escalation, sent Washington a record request for military assistance to the amount of \$3 billion for the current financial year. According to information in *The New York Times* on 21 November

of this year, it is anticipated that Israel will be granted \$3.1 billion dollars for military purposes in the 1981 financial year. What extraordinary generosity, in conditions when, as is well known, the present social and economic prospects of the United States itself are, to put it mildly, far from glowing. Indeed, while we are talking about assistance to Israel, the United States does not even hesitate to refuse to meet its own commitments to other countries, as was the case concerning the Soviet-American statement on the Near East of 1 October 1977. It exerts maximum pressure on its North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] allies when they themselves, timidly perhaps, attempt to develop some sort of proposals of their own for a settlement of the Middle East situation.

175. Although the Camp David policy has clearly reached a dead end, the United States is attempting to reactivate it, presenting it as practically the only way to settle the problem, but everyone except the members of the Camp David clique, two and a half years after the agreements, has realized that the policy of separate deals, the attempts of the United States, Israel and Egypt to take on themselves the right to carry on behind the backs of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples some sort of negotiations affecting the fate of those peoples, is destined to fail. This is true in particular with respect to attempts aimed at the ultimate annexation of the Palestinian lands by Israel. That is described as autonomy for the Palestinians, but what does that "autonomy" mean when practically everything, even the way in which the communal lands will be farmed from year to year, has to be determined by agreement with the Israeli authorities? As is perfectly obvious, the Camp David separate agreements have collapsed, yet with a zeal that is worthy of a better cause, the American leaders continue to vaunt those agreements as very valuable documents designed to burden the Arabs with separate deals and compel them to capitulate to the Israeli aggressor.

176. At the same time the United States does everything to prevent the United Nations from adopting effective measures aimed at ending this unending tragedy of the Palestinian people. Starting in 1976, the United States has three times vetoed decisions confirming the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine, the latest occasion being on 30 April of this year. In the General Assembly, whenever questions of ensuring those rights come up, the American representatives refuse to support decisions aimed at that, describing General Assembly resolutions as one-sided, unrealistic and so on. At the present session of the General Assembly, in the Special Political Committee, when the question of UNRWA [item 53] and the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories [item 57] have been discussed, the United States, together with Israel, has generally voted against draft resolutions or has abstained. They cannot bring themselves even to recognize the right of the 4 million Palestinians to self-determination which, by the way, most of their NATO allies have felt compelled to do.

177. The fact that the Palestinian question and other elements of a Middle East settlement remain unresolved in itself represents an explosive situation.

The threat of such an explosion becomes even greater as a result of the acts of imperialism and its hirelings, intensifying the already tense situation in the Near East and the Persian Gulf and creating the conditions there for more new conflicts.

178. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, like the majority of States Members of the United Nations, is convinced that in order to ensure a just and durable settlement in the Near East the Arab people of Palestine must be given the possibility of exercising the full range of its national rights, including its right to create an independent State. The Arabs must have restored to them unreservedly all the lands seized from them by Israel in 1967, including East Jerusalem. At the same time, such a settlement must provide guarantees for the security, independent existence and development of all States of the region. The only way to achieve this is through the collective efforts of all interested parties, including the Arab people of Palestine, represented by its only legitimate representative, the PLO.

179. A political settlement in the Middle East, including a resolution of the question of Palestine, requires that actions to prevent achievement of these goals be ended and that no new such actions be undertaken. Furthermore, no State should interfere in the internal affairs of the States and peoples of that region, no attempt should be made to impose on them any social or political systems not of their own choice, and no claims or encroachments should be made on their natural resources.

180. We also wish to stress that, as regards the struggle for the achievement of a firm and just peace in the Middle East and for ensuring the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, what is of decisive significance is the unity and cohesiveness of all Arab peoples in the development and strengthening of co-operation with the forces of world socialism and with all progressive forces in general. The Byelorussian SSR, like the other countries of the socialist community, has consistently been on the side of the Arab peoples in their struggle to eliminate the consequences of Israeli aggression. We have been in favour of the rights of the Arab people of Palestine against imperialist *diktats* and the bargaining away of the vital interests of the Arabs in capitulationist deals.

181. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR considers that the General Assembly should adopt decisions which would demonstrate the firm support of the overwhelming majority of the States of the world for the just cause of the Palestinian people and which would provide, as indicated today by many speakers, effective measures to implement these inalienable rights and bring pressure as necessary on the aggressive State of Israel, including sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, in order to compel Israel to take into consideration the will of the international community.

182. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan): I should like to begin by paying, on behalf of my delegation, our sincere tribute to Mr. Kane of Senegal who, in his capacity as the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, has made a commendable contribution to the cause of the Palestinian people. We greatly appreciate his coura-

geous and principles guidance of the deliberations and activities of the Committee over the past year.

183. Pakistan, as a member of that Committee, has been actively participating in its work ever since its establishment. Therefore we wholeheartedly associate ourselves with the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee regarding the solution of the question of Palestine as contained in the annex to its report. In his lucid and comprehensive presentation on the work of the Committee, Mr. Kane has fully underscored the seriousness of the situation, which now calls for firm and determined action by the United Nations to secure the implementation of its decisions on the exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights, including their right to self-determination and their right to establish an independent and sovereign State of their own in Palestine.

184. Only four months ago the General Assembly met in an emergency special session to consider the grave situation in occupied Palestine as a result of Israel's persistent violation of all basic norms of international law and morality and its continued defiance of the collective verdict of the international community. Resolution ES-7/2, adopted on 29 July 1980, like all previous resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly, remains unimplemented. The report of the Secretary-General of 11 November 1980 [A/35/618-S/14250] in this regard is fully reflective of how adamant Israel remains in its refusal to recognize the fundamental elements of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

185. The question of Palestine continues to be a source of anguished concern for the international community. It has engaged the attention of the United Nations since the Organization's very inception and, despite the sustained efforts of the world community towards a definitive solution of this problem, the continuing tragedy of Palestine remains the core of the Middle East conflict. The denial of the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people has led to the creation of an explosive situation constantly imperilling peace not only in the Middle East but in the entire world. The continuation of the inclusion of this item on the agenda of the General Assembly is, therefore, a clarion call for the international community to ensure peace and justice.

186. The Palestinian problem has now entered a threatening phase and is casting a long and ominous shadow on the international scene, for the conflict has spiritual, economic, geo-political and strategic implications reaching far beyond the interests and preoccupations of the contending parties. Any delay in finding a just and comprehensive solution of the Palestine problem will not only prolong the agony of the Palestinian people but also threaten the world with the spectre of a wider conflict which could bring about a disaster of unprecedented magnitude. In his statement on behalf of the Islamic world, the President of Pakistan fully underscored the gravity of this threat and emphasized that injustice and oppression provoke strong sentiments which cannot be suppressed by arrogant reliance on force and coercion nor smothered by unremitting persecution. The President reflected the feelings of the international community when he said that "Israel, which is so ready to invoke the past, should not forget the oft-repeated lesson of history

that its policy of annexation and domination is doomed to failure. History has the habit of unceremoniously repeating itself' [18th meeting, para. 28].

187. The essential elements of a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East are clear and categorical. They are the complete withdrawal of Israel from the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, full restoration to the people of Palestine of their inalienable national and human rights, including their right to establish an independent and sovereign State of their own in their homeland under the leadership of their sole and legitimate representative, the PLO and the dismantling of all Jewish settlements in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories. These principles have been enunciated in the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, as well as in numerous resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

188. In total defiance of the verdict of the international community as reflected in those resolutions and decisions, Israel remains bent on consolidating its illegal occupation of the Arab and Palestinian territories, and continues to pursue its reprehensible measures of changing the physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure and status of the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including the Holy City of Jerusalem. The Israeli authorities have revived with increased vigour the obsessive Zionist scheme to Judaize the Holy City of Jerusalem by systematically mutilating its historic personality and turning it into the "capital of Israel". In pursuit of its expansionist design, Israel continues to follow its policies of annexation through expropriation of property, establishment of new Jewish settlements and expansion of existing ones. According to the latest report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories [see A/35/425], more than 27 per cent of the land in the occupied territories has been taken over by the Government of Israel, and over 127 settlements have been established in those territories.

189. In the face of growing pressure from the world community and the intensified struggle by the Palestinians to regain their inalienable rights, Israel has escalated its reign of terror and repression against the Palestinian people. The Israeli authorities have been deliberately provoking the civilian population in the occupied territories with a view to imposing harsh reprisals on them. The rampages unleashed on the inhabitants of Halhul, Ramallah and Hebron, the arbitrary expulsion of the Palestinian leaders in the occupied territories—particularly the Mayors of Hebron and Halhul and the Chief Religious Judge of Hebron—and the assassination attempts against the Mayors of Nablus, Ramallah and El-Bireh are the horrid manifestations of the mounting severity of those reprisals. It is clear that Israel's contemptuous defiance of the recognized norms of international behaviour, its terrorism, its policies of annexation and its colonial expansionism have not only continued unabated, but have in fact been intensified.

190. Outside the occupied territories, Israeli aggression against Lebanon continues unabated. The con-

tinuing Israeli armed incursions into Lebanon are not only resulting in the killing of innocent Lebanese and Palestinian civilians, including women and children, but are also obstructing the fulfilment of the mandate of UNIFIL. There were repeated acts of violence and harassment by the Israeli armed forces against the members of UNIFIL this year, aggravating the already volatile situation in the area. The Israeli aggression against Lebanon seriously jeopardizes the territorial integrity, unity, sovereignty and political independence of that country. This is a challenge to the world community which under the Charter of the United Nations is committed to the principles upholding the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Member States.

191. A primary factor responsible for Israeli intransigence and refusal to comply with the relevant United Nations resolutions is the failure of the Security Council to act effectively by imposing sanctions against Israel, on account of the protection of the veto of a permanent member of the Council which is available to Israel. The inability of the Security Council to restrain Israeli aggression involves grave perils. Events in the Middle East are moving fast. The situation is worsening with each passing day, and portends consequences of dangerous proportions. It is imperative that the entire international community, especially the supporters of Israel, realize the serious implications of the continuing illegal occupation of Arab and Palestinian territories by Israel.

192. The unabated sufferings of the Palestinian people, and their continuing exile, have constantly distressed the Islamic world, which has remained unswervingly committed to the valiant struggle of the Palestinian people for self-determination and to the liberation of the Palestinian homeland as well as of the Holy City of Jerusalem. This determination, and the deep indignation of the Islamic world over Israel's defiance of the verdict of the international community on the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, have been consistently manifested in the declarations and resolutions of the Organization of the Islamic Conference. Categorically rejecting the aggressive policies and measures being applied by Israel against the Palestinian people and the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, the Islamic Foreign Ministers, at an extraordinary session of the Islamic Conference held in Amman in July this year, called for the application against Israel of measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

193. Since Israel has failed to comply with United Nations resolutions—particularly Security Council resolutions 465 (1980), 476 (1980) and 478 (1980) and General Assembly resolution ES-7/2—it is now necessary for the Security Council to proceed to take concrete action in terms of the relevant provisions of the Charter and to enforce implementation of its decisions in the interest of world peace and security. The Islamic world is anxiously awaiting a firm response from the international community to bring to an end the injustice and tyranny perpetrated by the Zionist entity against the Palestinian people.

194. At this point, I should like to reiterate Pakistan's firm commitment to the special status of the Holy City of Jerusalem. We reject Israeli attempts to Judaize the Holy City of Jerusalem by declaring it as

their "eternal capital". The Holy City is a unique symbol of the confluence of Islam with other sacred divine religions, and it cannot be annexed by right of conquest. The international community cannot acquiesce in the annexation of the Holy City of Jerusalem as the spoils of war. The world community, through numerous United Nations resolutions, has given a clear verdict to the effect that the Holy City of Jerusalem is an integral part of the occupied Arab territories and its return to Arab sovereignty constitutes an imperative element of a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict. Israel's policy and actions with regard to the Holy City have been condemned and rejected without ambiguity by the United Nations. We are deeply appreciative of the principled response to Security Council resolution 478 (1980) from the 13 brotherly countries that decided to remove their diplomatic missions from Jerusalem. Their decision has indeed strengthened the legal and moral force of international law and public opinion in regard to the illegality of Israel's action with regard to the Holy City of Jerusalem.

195. Finally, I should like to reiterate Pakistan's total and unstinted solidarity with the Palestinian people in their valiant struggle for their inalienable rights under the leadership of the PLO. We remain firmly committed to seeing that justice is done to the Palestinian people, which has long been the victim of Zionist aggression and exploitation. Our solidarity has been consistent for more than half a century. As

long ago as the 1930s the people of Pakistan, through their accredited leaders, called on the Mandatory Power to enable the people of Palestine to exercise their right to self-determination. In 1947 the founder of the Pakistan nation, Quaid-e-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah, warned that the proposed partition of Palestine would entail "the gravest danger and unprecedented conflict". Pakistan has ever since held faithfully to its position of principle and has been in the forefront of the forces advocating the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East on the basis of the principle of non-acquisition of territory by force and the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

196. In his message on the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, which was observed on 28 November 1980, the President of Pakistan reaffirmed that our consistent and resolute support for the Palestinian cause was based "on our faith in the principles that force and coercion should not be allowed to trample over the rights and aspirations of peoples and nations and that justice must prevail".

197. Pakistan will continue its resolute support for the Palestinian people until their aspirations for a sovereign homeland of their own are realized and Al Quds Al Sharif is liberated and restored to Arab sovereignty.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.