



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 31: Question of Palestine: report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (continued)	1389
Agenda item 32: Policies of <i>apartheid</i> of the Government of South Africa (continued): (a) Report of the Special Committee against <i>Apartheid</i> ; (b) Report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against <i>Apartheid</i> in Sports; (c) Reports of the Secretary-General Report of the Special Political Committee	1405

President: Mr. Ismat T. KITTANI (Iraq).

AGENDA ITEM 31

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

1. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Yet again the General Assembly is going through its perennial exercises on what is called here the question of Palestine. These exercises have long since been emptied of meaningful content. They have become ritualistic. And for all the rigmarole involved in adopting a steadily increasing number of resolutions on this item, progressively less thought and attention is given to it.

2. The undeniable fact is that the Arab League States and their supporters, including the United Nations Palestine Committee, which stage-manages this annual event, can engage as much as they like in rhetoric here at the United Nations. Given the parliamentary situation in the Assembly, they can push through almost whatever resolutions they like. But these can only be illusory victories. Those who seem to think that an excess of repetitive Assembly resolutions adopted by large built-in majorities creates "rights" or makes binding "obligations", or even international law, are deluding themselves. And those who seem to think that an orgy of special committees, special reports, special missions, special sessions, special units and special agencies can resolve anything have also lost touch with reality. There is nothing special or magical about any of these. They may be the *specialité de la maison*, but in the final analysis they will not change anything on the ground. They will not bring the cause of peace any closer.

3. Only when the Arab League States exhibit a genuine willingness to come to terms with Israel and make peace, only when they sit down and negotiate with Israel on the basis of recognition and mutual respect will a comprehensive solution to the Arab-Israel conflict in all its aspects be achieved.

4. Representatives have become weary with the Arab obsession with this topic. Thus, the same empty assertions made year in, year out are for the most part accepted without challenge and without critical scrutiny. The Assembly yawns, but in truth many representatives have abdicated from one of the fundamental tasks of diplomacy, namely, the meticulous, detached examination of claims and counter-claims on the basis of the facts, readily available to those who take the time and trouble to check them.

5. The usual claptrap will be trotted out. It will be suggested once again that the Arab-Israel conflict is the cause of all the instability in the Middle East—as if there would be no crises and conflicts in the Middle East were the Arab-Israel conflict to go away; as if the Iraq-Iran war, for example, is in any way connected with the Arab-Israel conflict; as if the Soviet Union would stop fishing in the troubled, or should I say the oily, waters of the region.

6. Similarly, it will no doubt be suggested *ad nauseam* that the heart of the Arab-Israel conflict is the question of the Palestinian Arabs—as if it were not common knowledge that the heart of the conflict has always been and remains the adamant refusal of most Arab States to accept Israel's right to exist, irrespective of its size and boundaries, as demonstrated yet again before the whole world by the new Arab League at its abortive Arab summit meeting at Fez last week. Does anyone really imagine that if the question of the Palestinian Arabs—which is certainly one of the many components of the Arab-Israel conflict—were solved, the whole conflict would then be resolved; that Syria, Iraq and Libya, to name but three Arab States, would accept Israel's right to exist, and everything, as the Americans say, would be "hunky-dory"? Of course not.

7. Another myth which will be regurgitated in these deliberations will be that the Palestinian Arabs do not have a State of their own. What nonsense! What utter nonsense! Everyone who has a smattering of Middle Eastern history knows full well that in everything but name the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is the Arab State in Palestine, in precisely the same sense that Israel is the Jewish State in Palestine.

8. Jordan is the independent, sovereign State of the Palestinian Arabs. Sceptics might wish to ponder the following questions: First, is it not a fact that the territory of Jordan today constitutes 76.9 per cent of the Palestine Mandate? Secondly, is it not a fact that the vast majority of Jordan's citizens are Palestinian Arabs? Thirdly, is it not a fact that the majority of Palestinian Arabs are Jordanian citizens? Fourthly, is it not a fact that Palestinian Arabs occupy leading positions in Jordan today too numerous to mention? Fifthly, is it not a fact that the Jordanian Assembly is made up primarily of Palestinian Arabs? Sixthly, is it not a fact that Jordan's administrative, intellectual and economic elite are Palestinian Arabs, and that they constitute the backbone and mainstay of the country? Seventhly, is it not a fact that the Permanent Represen-

tative of the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan to the Organization is a Palestinian Arab, and, I might add, very properly so? Eighthly, is it not a fact that Crown Prince Hassan of Jordan, addressing the Jordanian Assembly on 2 February 1970, declared unequivocally that "Palestine is Jordan and Jordan is Palestine: there is one people and one land, with one history and one and the same fate"?

9. In brief, it is an incontrovertible fact that the Palestinian Arabs achieved self-determination and national independence on almost 80 per cent of the territory of the Palestine Mandate in 1946, two years before the Jewish community in Palestine achieved its national rights on considerably less than 20 per cent of the territory of the Palestine Mandate.

10. These questions are very much to the point, because when it is recognized that the Palestinian Arabs do have an independent, sovereign State of their own in Palestine, the whole question of Palestine as discussed here takes on a very different aspect.

11. The same moral and intellectual lassitude which characterizes the deliberations on this item in the Assembly has tended to permeate the reception given to suggestions floated recently from various quarters for the solution of the Arab-Israel conflict.

12. Before I demonstrate what I mean, let me remind representatives that Security Council resolution 242 (1967) remains the only agreed basis for a negotiated settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict. It includes all the elements necessary for the settlement of the conflict, and any tampering with it can only jeopardize its delicately balanced formulations and the potential for peace which they contain.

13. In laying down the guidelines for a negotiated settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict, resolution 242 (1967) stressed the need for "secure and recognized boundaries" in the Middle East. Thus, it could not logically require the restoration of the territorial *status quo* which existed before 1967. It follows therefore that any such demand of the kind we have heard all too often in recent months fundamentally contradicts resolution 242 (1967).

14. One can call either for secure boundaries or for the restoration of the now defunct armistice lines, which existed from 1949 to 1967. But one cannot call for both at one and the same time, since the former armistice lines were neither boundaries nor secure. Those lines served as an open invitation to Arab aggression. At one point Israel was no more than eight miles wide. Jordanian artillery pieces were in easy striking distance of most of Israel's population. The city of Jerusalem was divided. Any Arab gunman sitting on the walls of the Old City with a tommy-gun could—and at times would—pick off Israeli passers-by at will.

15. It is for this reason that resolution 242 (1967) does not contain any call for a return to the *status quo ante* 5 June 1967. In 1967 the Arab and Soviet delegates were fully aware of this. In the discussions prior to the adoption of resolution 242 (1967) they tried to persuade the then British Permanent Representative, Lord Caradon, to amend the British-sponsored draft. But Lord Caradon, together with the majority of the Council's members, refused to give way, precisely because they regarded the establishment of "secure and recognised boundaries" as being of paramount importance and they considered the restoration of the former armistice lines as inconsistent

with the attainment of that goal. Indeed, when resolution 242 (1967) was adopted, Lord Caradon, who presented the draft text to the Council on 22 November 1967, declared:

"the draft resolution is a balanced whole. To add to it or to detract from it would destroy the balance and also destroy the wide measure of agreement we have achieved together. It must be considered as a whole and as it stands."¹

16. Since 1967 the range and accuracy of modern weaponry have been greatly extended. No responsible Government, whose first duty is to preserve the lives and security of its citizens, would agree to return to the totally insecure lines that obtained before 1967. In the 19 years between 1948 and 1967 thousands of Israelis were killed and wounded in three wars and the State of Israel was exposed to constant danger. To return to that situation would be suicidal. I am sure that representatives will agree that national suicide is not an international obligation, and Israel is not willing to commit it.

17. Despite all this, not merely the enemies of Israel, but also countries that one might have hoped would know better and not bend to the winds of political expediency have made, and reaffirmed, declarations which indeed call for the return of the territorial *status quo* prevailing before June 1967. What would be the purpose of such a manoeuvre? It would be to establish a second Palestinian Arab State for an allegedly stateless Palestinian Arab people. It is of no consequence that, as I have already explained, the Palestinian Arabs already have an independent State in Palestine—namely, the Palestinian Arab State of Jordan—and that therefore there is no justification, moral, legal or other, for the creation of a second Palestinian Arab State.

18. But let us, for the sake of argument, put this minor political inconvenience aside, and look at the suggestion at face value. As we all know, what is intended is a PLO State in whatever areas Israel can be induced to vacate, and there is nothing mysterious or secret about the borders of the State which the PLO aspires to. It even had the audacity to flaunt it in a map exhibited in the corridors of this building earlier this week.

19. It is common knowledge that the PLO denies outright the national rights of the Jewish people and therefore the right of Israel to exist. For a number of years now the PLO has advocated a two-stage policy to do away with Israel. The object of the first stage would be to set up the second Palestinian Arab State alongside Israel in the narrow area between the River Jordan and the Mediterranean Sea. The second stage would use that second Palestinian Arab State as a launching pad for the attempted overthrow of Israel.

20. One of the more paradoxical aspects of the proposal for a second Palestinian Arab State is that it would not just be PLO-dominated but, given the PLO's links with the Soviet Union, both direct and indirect, it would inevitably become Soviet-dominated. How many of the proponents of such ideas can contemplate them with equanimity is not easy to comprehend. Foresight is sometimes a rare commodity in international politics; but thinking just one or two moves ahead would still be desirable. For its part, Israel, besides all its other objections to the idea of a second Palestinian Arab State, is not prepared to offer the Soviets a foothold in its own backyard.

21. Much has also been said about Jerusalem in recent months. I must stress that any assault on Jerusalem, political or otherwise, is tantamount to an assault on Israel as a whole. United Jerusalem is and will remain the eternal capital of Israel and of the Jewish people. It epitomizes the restoration of our national sovereignty in our homeland, the Land of Israel. At the same time, the Government of Israel has ever been conscious of the fact that Jerusalem is also of deep meaning and concern to other faiths, to Christians and Moslems, as well as Jews. Israel is deeply and reverently mindful of the city's manifold spiritual heritage, of its Holy Places, of its historical treasures and of its rich cultural legacy. Israel has given ample evidence of this profound regard for Jerusalem, as anyone who has visited the united city since 1967 well knows.

22. The problem is not and never has been the territorial situation which has prevailed since 1967. It is not and never has been the misplaced attempts to bestow national sovereignty on the Palestinian Arabs for a second time. It is not and never has been the status of Jerusalem.

23. As was so vividly demonstrated at the abortive Arab League summit meeting at Fez last week—which you, Mr. President, had the honour to attend—the root cause of the Arab-Israel conflict is and always has been the unwillingness of the Arab League States to come to terms with Israel and to accept the presence of a sovereign Jewish State in the area. The problem remains in essence what it has always been—the three Arab “noes”, which were so succinctly summed up at the Arab summit meeting at Khartoum after the Six-Day War in 1967: no recognition of Israel, no negotiations with Israel, no peace with Israel. The Arab press still feels embarrassed about mentioning Israel without qualification. For example, the Saudi newspaper *Al-Jazirah* even felt the need on 22 July of this year to explain to its readers that where the term “Israel” is used in its columns it

“does not imply recognition of Israel, which is an enemy State which conquered Palestine. The existence of Israel is a fact. But we, as the Arab nation, struggle against that fact in arms and in words until it is eradicated from the map of Arab reality.”

The world has been so used to declarations of this kind that it accepts them as par for the course. Indeed, much of the world has acquiesced in still more offensive Arab statements, such as calls for a holy war—*Jihad*—against Israel. Such calls are of course in flagrant breach of the Charter of the United Nations, under which Members of the United Nations undertake, *inter alia*, to settle their international disputes by peaceful means—Article 2, paragraph 3—and to refrain in their international relations from the use and from even the threat of force—Article 2, paragraph 4.

24. As a result of the well-known Arab obsession with Israel, and of the bellicose stands taken by the Arab League States, many have come to the view that timid Arab statements, which through a process of wishful thinking may be construed as an indirect form of implied recognition of Israel and its right to exist, are to be seen as progress, as a great concession. This is not the case. As was pointed out by Mr. Abba Eban, a former foreign minister of Israel, in *The New York Times* on 18 November 1981:

“Nobody does Israel any service by proclaiming its ‘right to exist’ . . .

“Israel’s right to exist, like that of the United States, Saudi Arabia, and 152 other States, is axiomatic and unreserved. Israel’s legitimacy is not suspended in mid-air awaiting acknowledgement by the royal house in Riyadh. Nor does a group such as the PLO have any juridical competence to accord recognition to States, or withhold it.”

No State in the Organization would consider the mere recognition of its “right to exist” a favour or a negotiable concession. Instead, it would consider it an insult. So does Israel.

25. Let us take what happened between August this year and today. Prince Fahd of Saudi Arabia floated a number of elements which he suggested might be included in a plan to solve the Arab-Israel conflict. One of those elements was confirmation of “the right of the countries of the region to live in peace”—admittedly not exactly world-shattering, but one which, we were told, was a small beginning, which we should nurture carefully and not nip in the bud; we should explore it, encourage it.

26. What happened? Well, “for starters”, as the Americans say, the Secretary-General of the Arab League, in an interview in the Abu Dhabi daily *Al-Itihad* on 30 September 1981, stated flatly that “Prince Fahd’s peace plan does not, as some people believe, imply recognition of Israel’s existence”. Then, a few weeks later, when the Saudi chargé d’affaires to the Organization was rash enough to assure a newsman that recognition of Israel was in fact implied by the plan, and that negotiations with Israel would have to take place, he was immediately repudiated by his Government. Then came Fez. That Arab summit meeting was preceded by three months of hectic diplomatic activity and by three days of inconclusive debate at the foreign minister level. The summit meeting itself was boycotted by more than half of the Arab League heads of State, precisely because the Saudi plan, unforthcoming as it was, was on the agenda. And after four or five hours of wrangling, the summit collapsed. Why? Because it was considered improper to consider even the implied recognition of Israel in a context which does not even mention Israel by name and in a plan which does not even call for negotiations with Israel. What had happened to that small step forward, that glimmer of hope which had given rise to so much misplaced hope in certain quarters?

27. The collapse of the Fez summit meeting has proven yet again what Israel has contended all along—that the root cause of the Arab-Israel conflict is the adamant refusal of the Arab League States to come to terms with Israel and its right to exist. All the rest is eyewash, especially claims that the question of the Palestinian Arabs is at the heart of the conflict and that all would be solved if a second Palestinian Arab State were to be created.

28. The problem is as it always has been: the Arab fixation with Israel. And let there be no mistake about it: when the Arab leaders do eventually pull themselves together, as they surely must, and rid themselves of their obsession, then they will be doing us no favours, they will have made no concessions. They will merely have broken through that psychological barrier that has been at the root of the Arab-Israel conflict from the outset; they will merely have set the stage for negotiations to allow us to move forward together towards a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict.

29. The Arabs know in their heart that sooner or later they are bound to sit down and negotiate with Israel. There may be twenty-odd Arab States in the new Arab League. But, whether they like it or not, Israel is 50 per cent of the Arab-Israel conflict. They can talk about us as much as they like, but until they talk to us, and talk to us directly, they will achieve nothing.

30. A framework for peace in the Middle East already exists; it is the Camp David framework, which has already yielded spectacular results in the form of the Treaty of Peace between the Arab Republic of Egypt and the State of Israel, signed in 1979, and the normalization process which is developing between our two countries. By way of illustration, let me just mention some of the progress which has been attained in the stepped-up normalization talks over the last two or three months. We have agreed to expand trade between Israel and Egypt, which will already amount to about \$100 million worth of goods in both directions by the end of this year. We are putting the final touches to a trucking agreement which will greatly facilitate the flow of goods between our two countries. We are expanding our civil aviation links so that both countries will operate five flights a week in both directions. We have agreed to open Government tourist offices in each of our countries and to promote third-party tourism to both our countries. We are working on and solving highly technical questions of communications between Israel and Egypt, involving telephone links, radio, television and telex. Our police forces are widening their co-operation over matters ranging from stolen cars to drug-smuggling. We have worked out a two-year programme to give substance to the cultural agreement between our two countries. These are no mean achievements. Together they represent the mechanisms which will underpin and guarantee the peace treaty between our two countries.

31. All of these have been attained in a framework which is firmly grounded in Security Council resolution 242 (1967). It is open to other Arab States to join. It offers the only practical way to progress towards a comprehensive solution of the Arab-Israel conflict, in all its aspects, including the question of the Palestinian Arabs.

32. It is true that difficult problems remain in the negotiations for full autonomy for the Arab inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza district. But again—despite the nay-sayers—solid progress has been made here too, and we are determined not to relax our efforts in this sphere either.

33. Let me remind the Assembly that the Camp David framework invites the Palestinian Arab residents of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza district to play an active role in shaping their future, by calling on them to participate not only in the current negotiations but also in the negotiations which will determine the final status of the areas they live in, as well as in the eventual negotiations on a peace treaty between Israel and Jordan, in which the delimitation of boundaries between the two countries will be agreed.

34. The autonomy plan for the Palestinian Arab inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza district, as incorporated in the Camp David framework accord, is the first practical proposal to be advanced to provide a dignified solution for the needs of the Arab population of those areas. It comes in place of all the empty declarations, plans and frameworks with which the Palestinian Arabs concerned have been deluded by States and organizations

over the years. It has been the tragedy of the Palestinian Arabs in Judea, Samaria and the Gaza district, who are prepared to live in peace with Israel, that they have been steadily terrorized and intimidated by the PLO, which has been conducting without let-up a campaign of political assassination against them. To quote from *The Times* of London of 27 November 1981:

“the Palestinian people . . . ever since the birth of Israel have paid dearly for the extremism and intrigue of the Arab radicals who destroyed the Lebanon, nearly destroyed Jordan and will not rest, they say, until they have destroyed Israel. The Arab radicals . . . cannot deliver anything except what they have delivered in the past: bloodshed and futility.”

35. It must surely be recognized by now that the pattern adopted by the Organization in its deliberations on the Arab-Israel conflict has proved sterile and has indeed become an obstacle to a peaceful settlement. Yet that conflict is clearly amenable to solution, given the political will to effect a solution. Moreover, it is a conflict for which a framework for a solution exists, and, indeed, one which has over the last few years been moving towards a solution within that framework.

36. Hence we do not need alternative frameworks, we do not need alternative plans. We certainly do not need advice from States in the Organization which are fully identified with the Arab cause, or from those which over the years have preferred to sit on the fence and, instead of being generally supportive of the peace process, have to all intents and purposes put spokes in its wheels.

37. Israel has shown its willingness and ability to make peace with its largest Arab neighbour. It is now up to the rest of the Arab world to show that it is willing to make peace with Israel. The Organization, under its Charter, is dedicated to the promotion of international peace and security and of peaceful relations among nations. Instead, it has grotesquely condemned a peace treaty of epoch-making proportion, while at the same time lending its support and granting irregular privileges to a group of international terrorists. If the United Nations has a contribution to make, it is to encourage the Arab States to come to terms with Israel and to negotiate with us directly, without preconditions, seriously and in mutual respect.

38. Mr. NUSEIBEH (Jordan): On 29 November 1947 the General Assembly, in its then minority composition of Member States represented at the United Nations, decided at a special session to dismember the “trust” territory of Palestine and to dismantle its peace-loving people. I am referring to the real and genuine Palestine and not to the imaginary Palestine to which the Israeli representative has just referred. Rarely in history have a people’s inalienable rights in their own ancestral country been so brutally and totally trampled upon in a cold-blooded conspiracy in which ends and means tripped over one another in shameless and unprecedented perfidy. Precious little thought was given to the fact that a mere two to three years earlier the Charter of the United Nations had been bravely proclaimed as the herald of a new and just world governed by law. And yet, in all of its provisions the Charter runs counter to everything that has since been perpetrated against the Palestinian people.

Mr. Roa Kourí (Cuba), Vice-President, took the Chair.

39. Since that fateful day 34 years ago the people of Palestine have been thrown outside the mainstream of

human and national existence. They have had to endure a prolonged and agonizing nightmare. Their clamour for the restoration of their homeland has fallen on deaf ears, and been received with thinly disguised scorn, benign silence, outright indifference or even audacious irritation.

40. With the passage of the years, peace and security have become increasingly equated, in some powerful hostile quarters, with Palestinian exile and with acquiescence in the non-existence of the Palestinians. But this is clearly against the laws of nature and the accumulated values of humanity and cannot therefore endure indefinitely.

41. No one asked the Palestinians to accept their dismemberment, their exile or their occupation. The sharp edge of the Israeli bayonet and its supporters accomplished this ultimate act of unbridled inhumanity.

42. It was the old United Nations which initiated the dismantling of the Palestinian people. The duty devolves upon the United Nations, in its present universal representation of humanity, to redress, through its collective will and dedication to justice, what its predecessors did to bring about the catastrophe.

43. There are universally accepted values relating to the inviolability of every people's homeland, the sanctity of every human being's right to life, to home, to freedom, to security, to identity, to self-determination, to property and to normalcy. I do not have to enumerate those rights. Their denial or violation is a return to the law of the jungle, the fight of all against all, with all that this portends for the future of the world—and, mark my words, this is what will happen.

44. For over three decades the question of Palestine has been discussed in varying forms, plans and modalities. Having studied so many plans, by so many people, over so many years, since the British Mandate over Palestine was established, and thereafter, it has become increasingly difficult to consider the feasibility of any plan in realistic terms. The Israeli representative shed crocodile tears over Crown Prince Fahd ibn Abdul Aziz's plan² for the solution of the problem. Did he forget that his superiors, his Prime Minister and the entire Israeli Cabinet shot the plan down even before it was presented in any forum? The process of retrogression has been so precipitous and ongoing that it has become wellnigh impossible to hold to an anchor or to see a beginning and an end.

45. Right from the beginning of this fateful journey we have had a broad spectrum of unfulfilled plans. The Mandate of the League of Nations recognized in the early 1920s the provisional independence of Palestine with its 90 per cent Palestinian Arab majority. I do not know whether the Israeli representative was born then, but Palestinian independence was recognized in the early 1920s by the League of Nations. In 1937 the Peel Commission³ recognized in its proposed partition plan the preponderance of Palestinian Arab entitlement to the greater part of Palestine. In 1939 the British Government White Paper again recognized the independence of Palestine with its two-thirds Palestinian Arab majority. This is the Palestine that we are talking about. Let us have some respect for the intelligence of the Member States in this Hall. That White Paper remained the official British policy until 1945-1946 when, as a result of the bloodbath, gangsterism and terrorism of the Irgun, which was headed by none other than Begin, and the other terrorist groups, the British Government handed over that trust territory to the United Nations.

46. General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947 provided for an independent Palestinian State, much larger than the armistice lines of 1949, alongside a Jewish State, and without a single Palestinian being expelled from his homeland, whether in the Palestinian Arab State or in the Jewish State. That many of those plans were well-meaning and were indeed intended to contribute to a just and lasting peace should by no means be overlooked. Their drawback was that they were consistently nipped in the bud because of the existence of a seemingly impenetrable wall of Zionist intransigence, an irrevocable determination to usurp not only the whole of Palestine but other Arab territories beyond, in an insatiable drive for conquest which can only be stemmed by a countervailing force. The Israelis have by words and deeds impressed this fact deeply on everybody's mind, whether in this Assembly or throughout the world; they have made no secret of it.

47. This is the bottom line and the bedrock, deliberately compounded and blurred by a stream of peripheral issues, crisis situations and systematic brain-twisting which continue to emerge from Israel's inexhaustible Pandora's box. For example, the representative of Israel tried a few minutes ago to confuse the debate by quoting a newspaper here and a newspaper there and referring to problems which are not relevant to the item under debate, which is the question of Palestine.

48. Without any shadow of a doubt, the Zionist objective has always been and will continue to be to divert attention from the need to come to grips with the real issue, the core of the turmoil in the Middle East, namely, the rights of the Palestinian people and Israel's adamant refusal even to consider them. They want to dump the Palestinian people into, among other places, Jordan, which the representative of Israel has called the "Palestinian State of Jordan", even though he should know that the official title of Jordan is the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and that he was committing an illegal act by distorting the name of that Kingdom. Thus, the world is kept fully occupied with a multitude of issues, crises and tragedies which are of the utmost gravity in themselves and perpetuate the suffering and the dispersal of the Palestinian people.

49. By their cumulative effect, these extremely unsettling Zionist diversionary plans and adventures have succeeded in putting out of focus, at least temporarily, any and all genuine efforts at peacefully and rationally considering any plan or plans for resolving the intolerable plight of the Palestinian people. Walking literally on quicksand and ever-changing slippery ground, how is anyone to untie the Gordian knot that Israel has systematically woven and tightened, and which it continues to tighten?

50. Assumptions accepted in the Lausanne Protocol of 1949⁴—which was initialled by the two parties and which would have solved the Palestinian problem and the Arab-Israeli conflict more than 30 years ago—have been rendered inoperative by the Israeli aggressor's faits accomplis. Even the assumptions embodied in the Security Council resolutions of 1967 and 1973 have become empty shells with Israel's colonization of close to 40 per cent of the occupied Palestinian and Arab lands to date. Israel makes no secret about its determination to annex all the occupied territories while it strives to squeeze their lawful inhabitants out by every possible means. They have already gone a long way towards achieving that goal, particularly in the expanded holy Al-Quds Al-Sharif—Jeru-

salem—which is the eternal central point of the total history of the Arab and Islamic world.

51. The Arab world is not disunited, as some media reports would have us believe. Throughout the length and breadth of the sprawling Arab world, in which over 150 million people reside, the swallowing up of Palestine and the Palestinian people throbs in every beat of every heart, in every mind and conscience. It is the centrepiece of the lives of the Arab peoples, their legacy and their innermost souls, notwithstanding deceptive and shallow appearances to the contrary. It is an integral part of the Arab destiny, and will be for generations to come.

52. Those who gloat over so-called disagreements among leaders over ways and means and timing for achieving a truly just and lasting peace for all should never naively interpret them as disarray, still less as meaning that Arab unity is a mirage. On the contrary, the question of Palestine is so sacrosanct, so momentous that it would be surprising—I myself would be surprised—if differences of opinion did not arise within our united Arab nation, including the Palestinians themselves, in dealing with a Zionist Israel determined to shoot down any feasible solution at first sight. I wish to assure the Assembly—and in doing this I am relaying reports communicated to me by my Government—that the recent Arab Summit Conference was one of the most incisive and in-depth dialogues on the Palestinian issue, and that all options were explored candidly and responsibly, cutting through any and all parochial considerations. Rather than having division over this momentous issue, which affects the destiny not only of the Palestinian people, but of the entire Arab nation, and in order to reach consensus with the participation of all member States, it was decided that more time and study were needed for an agreed approach.

53. The exploration of the question of Palestine has had a tragically long and arduous history. But, as Tolstoy wrote in his classic *War and Peace*, history is not the decisions of tsars and generals. History is the motion of peoples, and those so-called decisions just boil out of that motion. So what emerges is a great motion of peoples, and that is the integral of those differentials in the calculus. Such a historic motion of the Arab peoples is under way, and united decisions will boil out of that great motion by our collective leaderships at the appropriate time.

54. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, under the outstanding chairmanship of Mr. Sarré of Senegal, should be highly commended for its report [A/36/35], for its dedication and for its tireless efforts all the year round, here and beyond the confines of United Nations Headquarters, to promote a greater understanding of the justice of the Palestinian cause. Unlike its predecessor, the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine, which hurriedly recommended a dismemberment of Palestine back in 1947 and set in motion the turmoil, wars and traumatic events that have plagued the region and the world ever since, the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People has presented a programme of action, in measured phrases, to bring about a just solution to the question of Palestine, taking into account all factors in and parties to the situation. And yet, in glaring contrast to the hysterical euphoria that accompanied the adoption—to a great extent by ruthless and immoral methods which I am sure a previous generation knows a great deal about and which have since been described in memoirs—

of the recommendations of the Special Committee on Palestine, and in contrast with the irrational and unconsidered speed with which a chaotic free-for-all of implementation was set in motion, the plan recommended by the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, endorsed by the General Assembly at its thirty-first session and annexed to the Committee's report this year, are still regarded by some of those who do not wish to see a just solution as an academic exercise, as though it did not address itself to the rights and survival of 4 million flesh-and-blood Palestinians.

55. It is not a ritual, Mr. Ambassador from Israel. It is not an exercise in futility. What we are talking about is the survival and destiny of 4 million Palestinians, and this is going to be discussed, even if it should take 100 years.

56. Hence the question of Palestine remains a blot on the conscience of the world: in concrete terms, 2 million refugees—more than half a million displaced and approximately 1.3 million under one of the longest and most ruthless occupations. I think I have already quoted what an Israeli journalist wrote in an Israeli newspaper: that during the past 14 years of occupation, a quarter of a million inhabitants of the occupied West Bank and Gaza have been in Israeli gaols with sentences ranging from 24 hours to life imprisonment, with all the accompanying torture. This translates into one out of every five citizens, which in terms of the United States would come to 45 million people gaoled during a period of 14 years. This has been the record of Israeli occupation. Furthermore, there has been total disregard for the inviolability of land, water, resources, human rights, international law, conventions and all norms of civilized behaviour. All it takes is for an Israeli officer to say: "I like this piece of land". He immediately sends a notice to the owner of the land stating: "I am going to get my hands on it". This is how our land is being confiscated right and left. There is nothing parallel or equal to this lawlessness anywhere else in the world.

57. This is the question of Palestine, which will one day tear apart the lethargy, indifference and enmity of those who are bent on denying Palestinian rights. All peace-loving peoples will continue to work and struggle for the restoration of their rights. Our strategic allies are the overwhelming majority of the community of nations which is represented in this hall. All great causes have encountered formidable resistance, but eventually have triumphed against all odds. One would have liked to see a just cause resolved justly in one's life span. But it is by far preferable and more moral to visualize, to strive towards and to achieve a just solution regardless of any time perspective than to accept an unjust and immoral solution imposed by an ephemeral imbalance of forces. A great deal of homework has yet to be done, is being done and will be done to induce adversaries and to enable friends to bring about a just, comprehensive and lasting peace. Pending that glorious moment, the Palestinian people are left with no choice but to bear their suffering and to continue their struggle until that great moment inevitably arrives.

58. It is needless to reiterate that the question of Palestine is the centrepiece and cardinal concern of the Government and people of Jordan. The destiny of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the destiny of the Palestinian people are inseparable because of the contiguity of their territories and their brotherly relationship. Jordan pledges its unflinching commitment to and support for the struggle of the Palestinian people, whose sole legitimate

representative is the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO]. The Government of Jordan and the PLO will continue to work hand in hand until the common goal of Palestinian redemption is achieved, no matter how long or how trying the struggle may be. No, Israel, you cannot solve the problem of the Palestinian people's dispersal and exile by dumping them on neighbouring Jordan, Lebanon or any other Arab country. The Palestinians will accept no place other than their ancestral homeland of thousands and thousands of years.

59. Jordan has always been committed to the achievement of a just and lasting peace, but the Israelis are making this cherished goal elude us more and more each day. How then can this goal be achieved in the face of Israel's boundless expansionism and indescribable arrogance? My statement this afternoon speaks about 40 per cent of our land in the West Bank being confiscated, which constitutes a mere 18 per cent of the total land of Palestine, over 90 per cent of which we had owned up till the end of the British Mandate in 1947-1948. Perhaps next year I shall be talking about the Israeli plunder of 50 per cent of that land, and then 60 per cent, and then 70 and 80 per cent. And yet the Israeli representative has the audacity to talk about a just solution of the Palestinian problem. Where are the Palestinians to live if there is not a piece of land for them to build a hut on to live in?

60. The day before yesterday an agreement on strategic co-operation was signed between the United States and Israel. That such an implicit alliance has been in existence for decades is hardly a secret, but what is really startling is that a super-Power should enter into a military alliance with an Israel whose boundaries are not known. The Israelis would never define their boundaries. The late General Dayan said that they were the point at which the last Israeli soldier had arrived. How can a super-Power enter into an alliance with an Israel whose boundaries are not known and whose plans for greater expansion are official policy? All anyone has to do is listen to the news on the radio and on television and to the statements of Mr. Begin to know that I am telling the truth in saying that this is official policy. This cuts to the heart of the question of Palestine.

61. The questions arise: What about the occupied territories? What about a just settlement of the Palestinian problem? And what if Israel should attempt to invade southern Lebanon, Jordan or Saudi Arabia?

62. How can any country enter into an open-ended alliance with another country whose boundaries are not known? And what if Israel should attempt to invade southern Lebanon, Jordan or Saudi Arabia? It has given indications to this effect; its planes are flying over all those territories. These questions are of the utmost gravity to all the peoples of the Middle East—which, although they form one nation, are divided into many States, as is the case of the United States of America—because the might of a super-Power will automatically be involved in Israel's policies of aggrandizement. That strategic alliance is totally unprecedented in international law and signals an acceptance of Israeli occupation, colonization and expansion. I do not like to see missiles or artillery pieces placed in front of my house in Jerusalem. I like to see the good American people who live just opposite my house there, and who have an American colony there and have been living in harmony and friendship with us for 100 years, but I do not want any outside country to place missiles and weaponry on my territory. I know that only a few kilometres to the north of Shafat there is an extremely

important headquarters of the Israeli defence establishment and presumably co-operation will take place and meetings will be held there, on my own territory. The Governments and peoples of the Middle East view this very ominous development with the utmost gravity. It means the end of any peace effort, because the more arms Israel is given, the more aggression is bound to be given in return. I think that our good American friends have learned that lesson—or have they? If they have not, it can only be strongly deplored.

63. A great Arab king returning from the Versailles Conference after the First World War, stunned and dispirited by the duplicity he had encountered and the disappointment he had suffered because of the international machinations of presumed allies, remarked sadly: "Rights are never given—they must be wrested". Perhaps this sums up our position today.

64. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan): Once again the General Assembly is resuming consideration of the question of Palestine, which lies at the heart of the Middle East conflict and the continuing aggravation of which poses the gravest threat to world peace and security. Although the question of Palestine has figured as a separate item on the agenda of the General Assembly only since 1974, this issue has been under consideration by the world body since its very inception. Over the years the United Nations has remained deeply preoccupied with the fate of Palestine and the travail of the Palestinian people. The Security Council, as well as the General Assembly, has adopted numerous decisions to redress the wrongs done to the Palestinian people and to restore their inalienable rights. However, those decisions continue to remain unimplemented. Israeli aggression against the people of Palestine and other Arab nations continues unabated.

65. It is ironic that Israel, which owes its existence to a controversial resolution of the General Assembly, has been attempting systematically to erode the authority of the United Nations by defying its decisions with impunity. The question of Palestine is thus the gravest challenge to the United Nations and its Charter's commitment to the preservation and strengthening of international peace and security.

66. The elements of a just and lasting solution of the Middle East conflict are well known. They have been outlined repeatedly in Security Council resolutions—specifically resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973)—as well as in General Assembly resolutions adopted over the years. It is universally recognized that a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East cannot be realized without ensuring the complete withdrawal of Israel from all the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, and the full restoration of the inalienable national and human rights of the people of Palestine, including their right to establish an independent and sovereign State of their own in their homeland.

67. Moreover, there can be no Middle East settlement without the full and equal participation of the PLO, which is the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. Israel's response to this international consensus has been one of total defiance and stubbornness. Ignoring the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and in complete violation of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,⁵ Israel persists relentlessly in its expansionist policy of consolidating its illegal occupation of the Arab and Palestinian territories, repressive measures

against the Palestinian people in the occupied territories and the changing of the physical character, demographic composition and institutional structure of these territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem. A most sinister feature of this policy is further manifested in the systematic expropriation of Arab and Palestinian property, the establishment of new Jewish settlements and the expansion of existing settlements in the occupied territories. Israel has also resorted to new measures, seeking control of the natural resources, particularly the water resources, of the occupied territories, and it has now embarked on the project of building a canal linking the Dead Sea to the Mediterranean.

68. The Israeli reign of terror and persecution against the Palestinian people is being systematically intensified. Arbitrary arrests and evictions of Arab and Palestinian inhabitants, expulsions and assassinations of elected Palestinian leaders in the occupied territories, the demolition of Arab homes and acts of sacrilege carried out against Arab shrines have become daily occurrences. Emboldened in its intransigence, Israel has widened the sphere of its aggressive actions, and Lebanon has become a primary victim of its predatory designs. Its reprehensible attack on southern Beirut last July, which resulted in the death of several hundred innocent civilians, including women and children, was only one of the sordid examples of Israeli terrorist practices and acts of aggression against the sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and unity of Lebanon which arouse the strong indignation of peace-loving peoples all over the world.

69. I personally had the privilege of participating in a delegation of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People which visited Lebanon last August at the invitation of Mr. Yasser Arafat, the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO. The delegation noted that the damage caused by the Israeli air and sea attack during July 1981 was confined to civilian targets, resulting in heavy loss of human life, and appeared to have been aimed at terrorizing the civilian population and destroying its morale.

70. The unprovoked Israeli attack on Iraq's peaceful nuclear installations near Baghdad is yet another grave instance in a series of crimes which Israel is perpetrating in Palestine and against Arab nations in the Middle East.

71. It would be an illusion if through relentless repression and terrorism Israel expected perpetually to deny the people of Palestine their inalienable national and human rights. The people of Palestine have waged a heroic struggle and are making sacrifices in blood and tears to resist the occupation of their ancient homeland. Their determined struggle enjoys the recognition, support and respect of all freedom-loving peoples in the world. Vivid proof of this recognition is General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX), which formalized the status of the PLO and recognized the Palestinian people as a principal party in the efforts for peace in the Middle East and as having the right to regain their rights by all means.

72. The hallmark of this century is the assertion of national rights by all people. Israel cannot block the advance of history and hope to achieve its aggressive designs by obliterating the Palestinian nation. The supporters of Israel, who are sustaining its intransigence, must also acknowledge that the struggle of the people for the restoration of their national rights is imperative.

73. It is particularly distressing that only two days ago an agreement on strategic co-operation was concluded between the United States and Israel. This agreement with an aggressor cannot win peace or friends in the Middle East. Such an agreement will be seen by the aggressor as an accommodation and, indeed, an endorsement of its expansionist ambitions and is likely further to aggravate the conflict in the Middle East.

74. The long suffering of the Palestinian people and the continued denial of their national rights have caused the deepest anxiety and concern, particularly throughout the Islamic world. This concern and anxiety have been demonstrated repeatedly in the decisions of the Organization of the Islamic Conference. A categorical expression of the commitment of the Islamic world to the Palestinian cause was embodied in the final communiqué of the Third Islamic Summit Conference, held at Mecca-Taif from 25 to 28 January 1981 [see A/36/183, annex IV]. That communiqué affirmed at the highest level the resolve of the Islamic nations to liberate the occupied Palestinian territories and the holy places and to recover the incontrovertible rights of the Palestinian people, as recognized by international law and the United Nations resolutions relating to the question of Palestine.

75. A grave aspect of the Palestinian question, which stirs the deepest emotions and sensibilities of the entire Islamic world, is Israel's occupation of the Holy City of Jerusalem and the insidious Zionist scheme to destroy its historic and spiritual character. This profound concern of the Islamic world over the fate of the Holy City is shared equally by the international community.

76. Security Council resolution 242 (1967) emphasized the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by military conquest, and this applied to all occupied territories, including Jerusalem. Security Council resolutions 252 (1968) and 267 (1969) specifically addressed themselves to the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem. Ever since those decisions, and through its subsequent resolutions 271 (1969), 298 (1971), 446 (1979), 465 (1980) and 476 (1980), the Security Council has declared all legislative and administrative actions taken by Israel to change the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem, including expropriation of lands and properties, transfer of population and legislation aimed at the incorporation of the occupied section, to be totally invalid.

77. The Council has also repeatedly condemned and censured Israel for its refusal to comply with those decisions. The most recent resolution adopted by the Council in this regard, namely, resolution 478 (1980), censured in the strongest terms the enactment by Israel of the so-called basic law on Jerusalem. The Council further declared in that resolution that the enactment of the basic law and similar actions by Israel constituted "... a serious obstruction to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East".

78. Resolutions 2253 (ES-V) and 2254 (ES-V), adopted in July 1967 at the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly, declared all measures taken by Israel to change the status of Jerusalem invalid and called upon Israel to rescind those measures and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of the Holy City. In July 1980 the General Assembly, at its seventh emergency special session [resolution ES-7/2], reaffirmed this position. The Organization of the Islamic Conference and the non-aligned movement have also re-

peatedly adopted the same position of principle on the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem.

79. In his solemn address at the thirty-fourth session⁶ of the General Assembly, His Holiness Pope John Paul II also underlined the universal spiritual heritage and significance of Jerusalem. Soon afterwards the European heads of State and Government and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the nine member States of the European Community declared at Venice on 13 June 1980 that they would—and I quote from their declaration—“not accept any unilateral initiative designed to change the status of Jerusalem . . .”⁷

80. In total disregard of this universal sentiment with regard to the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem, Israel persists in its reprehensible designs to alter that status and to destroy the historic, spiritual and demographic character of the Holy City. The continuing excavation of a tunnel under Al-Haram Al-Sharif, which endangers Islamic buildings, is one of the series of Israel's criminal actions desecrating the holy Islamic shrines.

81. The Holy City of Jerusalem is a symbol of the confluence of the greatest spiritual traditions and the continuity of the divine message proclaimed by Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Throughout the history of 13 centuries of Arab sovereignty over the Holy City this unique spiritual heritage was ardently preserved and nurtured. It is the paramount responsibility of the international community to preserve this unique spiritual heritage and save the Holy City from systematic Judaization and from Zionist schemes to alter its status and its historic and spiritual character.

82. The Holy City of Jerusalem cannot become the spoils of war. It must be returned to Arab sovereignty.

83. The cause of the Palestinian people has been close to the heart of the people of Pakistan ever since Palestine became the target of a colonial conspiracy. In 1947 the founder of the Pakistani nation, Mohammad Ali Jinnah, warned that the proposed partition of Palestine would entail the gravest dangers and an unprecedented conflict in the world. As in the past, the leaders and the people of Pakistan will continue to extend their total and unflinching support to the heroic national liberation struggle of their Palestinian brothers.

84. In that resolve the people of Pakistan, together with other peace-loving nations all over the world, have a profound commitment to the cause of justice, freedom and international peace.

85. We firmly believe that the issue of Palestine is at the core of the Middle East conflict and that a genuine and lasting peace in the Middle East can be established only when the just demands repeatedly affirmed by the Assembly are met in full. As long as Israel continues to flout the verdict of the international community and usurp the rights of the people of Palestine, the world will remain haunted by the spectre of a wider, tragic conflict.

86. Those just demands will be repeated once again by the Assembly at its current session in its resolutions based on the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. In this regard I wish to pay a personal tribute to Mr. Sarré of Senegal, who has so admirably guided the Committee's work in pursuance of its mandate of ensuring the exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable human and national

rights, including their right to self-determination and their right to establish a State of their own in Palestine.

87. The time has now come for the United Nations to use all the means at its disposal to secure compliance with its decisions pertaining to the question of Palestine and the Middle East conflict. A heavy responsibility in this regard lies with the Security Council.

88. Here I should like to recount a vivid experience that I had when I visited the Rashidiyeh Palestinian refugee camp as a member of the delegation of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. An elderly lady inquired who we were, and on being told that we were part of a United Nations delegation she posed a fundamental question. She said: “Israelis come here every day. They strafe us; they bombard us; they devastate our homes. Why has the United Nations not been able to stop this destruction?”

89. That fundamental question, posed by an ordinary, unnamed, elderly lady, confronts the international community in all its gravity today, as it has confronted it for more than a generation.

90. The Security Council must act resolutely to restore the credibility of the United Nations as an effective international Organization for the maintenance of international peace and security. The Council needs to take firm and coercive measures against Israel to ensure that the tragedy of Palestine is finally brought to an end and that the injustice perpetrated against the people of Palestine is fully redressed.

91. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): A great deal of progress has been made on the question of Palestine, both inside and outside the United Nations. World public opinion now realizes the true dimensions of the tragedy which has afflicted the people of Palestine. It realizes the real nature of the racist Zionist entity, which since 1948 has been busy trying to end the Arab Palestinians' existence, revealing by its actions its fascist and racist character and its expansionist designs and ambitions, which are being fulfilled stage by stage through terrorism, aggression and war, to establish greater Israel which, according to the Israelis' expansionist doctrine, should stretch from the Euphrates to the Nile.

92. At this stage, the elimination of the Arab presence in all parts of Arab Palestine, in keeping with the Zionist plan, has been accorded the highest Zionist priority, above all other objectives. We are sure that Israel is taking advantage of every opportunity to put into effect its grand colonialist design through aggression, because Israeli behaviour is by its very nature aggressive. The international community, after many years of turning a blind eye to Israeli crimes—because of the opinions imposed by the West—has now understood that it must order Israel to cease harassing the Palestinian people, threatening international peace and security and jeopardizing the future of the world as a whole.

93. Becoming aware of Israeli crimes, the international community has recognized the rights of the Palestinian people—as it has done so for all colonized peoples—to freedom and independence, to establish its own independent national State and to self-determination like other peoples. It has also recognized the right of that people to return to its homeland from which it was driven out by force and terror, for the origin of the problem of Palestine

is to be found in the policy of emigration practised systematically by Israel in keeping with its arrogant, racist nature, which grants no one the right to live unless he was born a Jew, as if Judaism was an exclusive, selective nationality and not a revealed religion.

94. The crisis in the Middle East would not have occurred without the Zionist racist mentality allied with colonialism, which resulted in all Jews, whether they liked it or not, becoming friends of settler colonialism like the white colonialists of South Africa. Indeed, through terrorism, pressure of all kinds and the deformation of truth, the Zionist movement and its regional base, Israel, have been able to prompt thousands upon thousands of Jews to emigrate from their lands of origin and to settle in Palestine, thus giving rise to this dispersal of the Arab people of Palestine. The Zionist movement continues to work for the dispersal of Arabs and Jews at the same time. We say "the dispersal of Jews" because Israel, which from the very beginning has claimed falsely that the Jews were a people without land seeking a land without people, now confronts an internal crisis resulting from the distinction between the elite and the exploited.

95. The counter-immigration which Israel is fighting against, with the co-operation of the United States, is a phenomenon reflecting the disappointment of large sectors of the Israeli community—a community which the United States Administration and others continue to call ideal and democratic, embodying Western values, whereas the world knows today, on account of Israel's intensification of its occupation, its expansionist aims, its evictions and its bloody military adventures, that Israel is a barracks governed by a chosen elite which has beaten the record for driving out Arabs by force and violating their national and human rights. Of course, what happens in Palestine happens also in the occupied Arab territories, because of the expansionist nature of the Zionist entity.

96. The Arab cause, following the 1973 war of liberation, has made a great deal of progress and the Palestinian revolution has also gained much ground on the international scene. So the Camp David conspiracy was hatched to plunder the Palestinian people of their rights recognized in General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX) and other resolutions. Foremost among those rights is the right to self-determination and the right of the Palestinians to return to their homes and to establish an independent State on their own land, under the leadership of their sole authentic representative, the PLO. All these capitulation agreements negated the rights of the Palestinian people and made mockery of the major interests of the Arab nation. The Egyptian command left the Arab front engaged in the struggle for liberation and joined the front of conspiracy against the rights of the Palestinian people. That left the way open to Israel to speed up the application of its plan to strip the Palestinian people of its remaining rights under an iniquitous occupation that began in 1948 and lasted to 1967. The subterfuge of autonomy—which misled no one—was but a means to give Israel more time to strip the Palestinians of their few remaining rights.

97. In spite of all these tragic developments, the Palestinian people has succeeded in resisting occupation. All sectors of the population—men, women, students, workers, the elderly—have resisted the occupation and faced up to Israeli soldiers in American armoured cars.

98. All these tragic developments have not bent the will of the overwhelming majority of the international community to reveal the true dimensions of the conspiracy em-

bodied in the American-Israeli-Egyptian alliance, which, through the Camp David agreements, is trying to eliminate the Palestinian cause, on the one hand, and to extend the domination of imperialism and zionism throughout the Middle East, on the other. All this is being done in order to strengthen the Israeli occupation, to divert our attention from the true enemy, to exploit our natural resources, to occupy our strategic positions, to decide the destiny of the Arab nation, to erect obstacles to all economic and technological development.

99. Our confidence in the international community—the officials and the people—has never wavered. The international community not only has criticized the Camp David agreements but has condemned them as contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and international law. It has adopted resolutions calling for the restoration of the rights of the Palestinian people. We need merely recall in this connection the sincere and successful efforts of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian Peoples. In spite of all the difficulties, that Committee has succeeded in championing the rights of the Palestinian people and has called for the realization of those rights without delay. In this it has been supported by the non-aligned countries, by the Organization of African Unity, by the States of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, by the socialist countries and by other countries which have chosen to support what is just and to condemn what is not just. The Palestinian people has not been able up to now to exercise its rights because of the United States veto in the Security Council and the military, economic and financial support given Israel by the United States. That is why we consider the United States primarily responsible for the failure of the work of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. That failure encourages Israel to continue its policy of settler colonization and expansion and to violate human rights in Palestine and elsewhere, to escalate its attacks against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples and to threaten the Syrian Arab Republic.

100. The United States, with its ally Israel, is doing everything it can to put an end to the only hope for a solution to the Middle East problem by failing to recognize that the Palestinian problem is the central issue in the Middle East crisis and that that crisis can be settled only on the basis of an equitable solution, that is, the recovery by the Palestinian people of their rights. Instead of concentrating on the Palestinian cause, the United States has been manoeuvring to create another concept, that of the strategic alliance, which has been rejected by the Arab States. The United States has also tried to show its muscle through the manoeuvres of its deployment forces in Arab Egypt, named "Bright Star". The United States has also built military bases in Israel and outside it and has stockpiled arms in the region.

101. The great American-Israeli conspiracy has recently been given specific form in what has become known as the American-Israeli military alliance, the provisions of which were made public for the first time on 1 December 1981. We wonder what the objective of that alliance is and of the publicity given to it, the like of which has never been seen in the past, despite the organic links between the dwarf State and the giant State.

102. The reason for that alliance is the official decision of the United States to prevent the Palestinian people from recovering their rights and at the same time to put the reins of power throughout the region in Israel's hands. Furthermore, this military alliance constitutes a danger to

all the Arab countries that are supporting and strengthening the struggle of the Palestinian people. The United States was Israel's friend, then Israel's partner; now it is Israel's ally, and consequently the enemy of the Arab people. This shows that the confrontation has broadened and has now become a confrontation between the Arab nation and the American-Israeli alliance, which is a real threat to our vital interests and our existence as a nation.

103. Therefore, as Arabs, we cannot but consider the United States to be our principal enemy, because of the very nature of that alliance, which is directed against us and against our aspirations to freedom and economic and political independence; against our struggle at the side of the Palestinian people for the restoration of their usurped rights. This alliance has placed the United States and its people, who have not yet realized the dimensions and the disadvantages of such an alliance, in a position of confrontation with the Arab peoples. It is clear that the United States Administration has not learned its lesson from its war in Viet Nam and Cambodia. We should like to remind the United States that the Viet Nam war overturned all previous concepts, because it was the militarily weaker people that won, thanks to its determination to defend its freedom. We are certain that the forces determined to face this new challenge will continue to increase their potential, because every challenge can be met. We remind the United States that the strategic alliance with Israel has destroyed any possibility of peace in the region and any chance of restoring stability and security. This has placed the United States face to face with the Arabs and the United States will therefore bear the heavy responsibility for many international situations and for their repercussions.

104. We should like to take this opportunity to recall also what was said by the Foreign Minister of the Syrian Arab Republic in the general debate, when he gave a warning against a strategic alliance between the United States and Israel: "There still exists for the United States the possibility to consider its policy and depart from this dangerous path which is harmful both to the Arabs and to the interests of the American people." [17th meeting, para. 141.]

105. That appeal was not heeded by the United States Administration. That is why we doubt whether the United States can claim the existence of legitimate interests in our region while that Government fails to recognize our vital interests, in particular our interests regarding the Palestinian cause, the rights of the Palestinian people and the liberation of our occupied territories. How can we recognize that the United States possesses legitimate interests in our region when that Government puts obstacles in the way of any solution based on a just and comprehensive peace, withdrawal by Israel from all the occupied territories and the exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights?

106. The Palestinian question is the fundamental question; the Palestinian people and the Syrian people form part of a single Arab nation, a single Arab homeland.

107. The General Assembly and particularly the Security Council must appreciate the danger that threatens us all, especially the danger concerning the future of the Palestinian people. That is why our resolutions must analyse the results and consequences of that danger. United States resolve and Israeli resolve form a kind of perfect symbiosis following their alliance, and whatever happens in our region will be the result of that alliance, which we

must all condemn. The time has come for the General Assembly—this very day, before it is too late—to condemn the strategic alliance between the United States and Israel, which threatens not only our region but also international peace and security.

108. In conclusion, the Syrian delegation would like to express its appreciation of the efforts made by the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. We are sure that the resolutions of this session will respond appropriately to the grave events which are threatening peace and security in our region, as well as international peace and security.

109. Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): Romania's position, one of solidarity with and support for the cause of the Palestinian people and the attainment of their rights and legitimate aspirations to a free and independent existence within the context of their own national State, is well known. It was confirmed in the message addressed by our President, Nicolae Ceaușescu, to the President of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People.

110. In the present complex and contradictory international circumstances, heightened by trends towards the consolidation and realignment of spheres of influence, it is essential that all States and all peoples intensify their efforts to speed up a settlement of the conflicts and hotbeds of war between States, to settle disputes exclusively by peaceful means and to respect strictly the sacred right of all peoples to free and independent development. That is a position which Romania has always actively defended.

111. It was in this spirit that from the outset the Romanian Government took a clear position on the imperative need for a just political settlement of the problem of the Palestinian people and the ways of achieving that objective, which is of paramount importance to peace in the Middle East and throughout the world. Thus, from the outset we believed that, like any other people, the Palestinian people had an inalienable right to organize their lives in accordance with their national interests and to establish their own independent State. In giving expression to that conviction, Romania was one of the first countries to recognize the PLO as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, and to develop with it relations of friendship and co-operation based on equality and mutual respect. Similarly, our country was one of those States that took the initiative in having the Palestinian problem inscribed on the agenda of the General Assembly and which sponsored the resolution by which the PLO was granted observer status in the United Nations [*resolution 3237 (XXIX)*].

112. The many meetings and talks between the President of Romania and Chairman Yasser Arafat and other PLO representatives have become important aspects of the strengthening of Romanian-Palestinian friendship.

113. As a member of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, and within the General Assembly and the Security Council, Romania has helped to define the specific modalities for a just settlement of the problem of the Palestinian people, with a view to the establishment of lasting peace among all States and peoples of the Middle East. As we have frequently emphasized, we are firmly convinced that unless there is a just and acceptable political settlement to

this problem the establishment of a viable, lasting peace in the Middle East will not be possible and, thus, all peoples of the region will be exposed to a succession of armed conflicts, each more destructive than the last.

114. Romania has taken a strong position against the acts of force committed by Israel against the population of Palestine, in the Arab territories occupied following the 1967 war and against neighbouring Arab States. We have condemned Israel's illegal practices in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories, including the establishment of Israeli settlements in those territories, the violation of the Arab historical and cultural heritage, the oppression and discrimination to which the Arab inhabitants are subjected and the practices designed to change the status and the demographic make-up of those territories, to consolidate the Israeli occupation and to annex parts of the occupied territories. Our repeated appeals for moderation and understanding derive from our belief that abstention from force is an absolute prerequisite for the establishment of the conditions necessary for the political settlement of the problem of the Palestinian people and of other problems existing between Israel and neighbouring Arab States, with a view to bringing peace to that sorely tried part of the world.

115. In accordance with our position of principle, Romania has advocated and continues to advocate firmly the participation of the PLO on a basis of equality in all efforts aimed at a political settlement of the situation in the Middle East. In accordance with the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations and with international law, the Palestinian people are fully entitled to participate through their legitimate representatives in negotiations directed towards a just settlement of the Palestinian problem. The participation of the authorized representatives of the Palestinian people in those negotiations is not only a right but also a necessity, for unless there is such participation a viable solution to the Palestinian problem and the establishment of lasting peace in the Middle East are simply inconceivable and will remain mere aspirations.

116. The Romanian delegation considers that in the present international circumstances it is all the more necessary to intensify political and diplomatic efforts directed towards the establishment of peace in the Middle East. A number of proposals have been made recently aimed at a political settlement of the situation in the region, and this reflects increased concern on the part of States, an increased desire to find modalities that will make it possible to overcome the obstacles to peace in the Middle East.

117. As far as Romania is concerned, consistent with its policy of principle, it advocates a solution of the Middle East conflict by the political approach and by negotiation in order to establish a comprehensive, just and lasting peace based on the total withdrawal of Israel from the Arab territories it occupied in 1967, including Arab Jerusalem; to settle the problem of the Palestinian people through recognition of its legitimate rights, including its right to self-determination and to establish its own independent State; and to assure the independence and sovereignty of all the States in the area. As was stressed in the message of the head of State of Romania on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People,

“it is necessary now to intensify political and diplomatic activity, including that of the United Nations, in order to give a new impetus to the peace process in the

Middle East and to make use of the present propitious conditions to build a new negotiating framework by convening an international conference within the framework of the United Nations, with the participation of all the parties concerned including the Palestine Liberation Organization, as well as the Soviet Union and the United States of America and other States which might make a positive contribution to the solution of the conflict in the region”.

118. We should also like to take this opportunity to emphasize also our deep conviction that the central problem of the attainment of comprehensive peace in the Middle East depends upon the solution of the Palestinian problem and upon the establishment of conditions that will make it possible to ensure that the Palestinian people are able to realize as soon as possible their natural aspiration to live in their own independent State and to devote their efforts and talents in peace and tranquillity to their free and independent development towards progress and prosperity.

119. We also believe that ensuring broad participation by the PLO in efforts at the international level aimed at the solution of the problem of the Palestinian people is of particular importance and would have positive effects on the overall efforts to achieve a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement in the Middle East.

120. The Romanian delegation is deeply convinced that, in the present international circumstances, the United Nations can and must play a more active role in those efforts, just as it must in the political settlement of all situations of tension and conflict. In this connection we might consider the adoption of a resolution calling for the convening of an international conference on the establishment of a just and lasting peace in that tormented region of the world, in accordance with the aspirations and hopes of the peoples to live in a climate of peace, tranquillity, security, co-operation and understanding.

121. For its part, Romania is determined to act in the future, as it has in the past, to make its contribution to the just and lasting settlement of the problems of the Middle East, to the establishment of a comprehensive peace in that area, and to the attainment by the Palestinian people of their legitimate rights, in the interests of peace, co-operation and security in that region and throughout the world.

122. Mr. KIRCA (Turkey): The question of Palestine constitutes the core of the Middle East problem. Since we are to address ourselves to the larger issue in the course of the debate scheduled for next week on the situation in the Middle East, we shall focus our attention here primarily on the dimensions of the Palestinian question and developments related specifically to it.

123. First, we would like to reiterate our perception of the Palestinian question, because it occupies a central place, and is indeed the point of departure for defining the problem of the Middle East as a whole. While this is perhaps evident, it is still useful to stress that correctly defining and formulating a problem is the first crucial requisite for finding the solution to it.

124. Posing the question of Palestine as the crux of the Middle East problem, therefore, is not an exercise in semantics. Rather, it is the single most important criterion in terms of which any approach to the Middle East problem can be properly assessed. For, in spite of greater recognition by the international community of the problem of

Palestine, there remains much distance to be covered in obtaining wider acceptance of its true significance and place in a Middle East settlement.

125. The Government of Turkey believes that a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East cannot be established without the achievement of a just solution of the problem of Palestine, on the basis of the attainment and the unfettered exercise by the Arab Palestinian people of their inalienable rights. The linkage between the question of Palestine and the larger problem of the Middle East of which it is a part is, thus, structural and elemental and not capable of even conceptual separation. No peace effort that does not take account of this umbilical link has any chance of global and lasting success.

126. The realization of the legitimate aspirations of the Arab Palestinian people will entail the achievement of those conditions that would unavoidably be elements of a larger Middle East settlement. Two such conditions of primary importance are the withdrawal of Israel from all the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since June 1967, including Jerusalem, on the one hand, and respect by Israel for the special character and status of Jerusalem, on the other.

127. Turkey has long believed and consistently argued that the Arab Palestinian people have rights which are inalienable and which, therefore, cannot be the subject of compromise. Those rights are so fundamental that their articulation and affirmation at every opportunity must be viewed as a duty in the interests of justice and peace in the Middle East. Hence, we solemnly reaffirm those rights of the Arab Palestinian people in our reiteration of them before the General Assembly. They are: first, the right to return to their homes and property; secondly, the right to self-determination without external interference; thirdly, the right to national independence and sovereignty; and, fourthly, the right to establish their own independent sovereign State.

128. The Government of Turkey further considers that the PLO, the representative of the Palestinian people, has the right to participate on an equal footing in all undertakings within the United Nations that concern the future of the Palestinian people.

129. The resolution of the Palestinian question, in the view of the Turkish Government, will be significantly facilitated when it becomes possible for the PLO to participate in the peace-making process as a full partner.

130. Just as there can be no peace in the Middle East without a just solution of the Palestinian question, so there can be no discussion of consequence of the Palestinian question and the future of the Palestinian people without the equal participation of the PLO.

131. We support the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People as reasonable guidelines for a just solution of the question of Palestine. Those recommendations have received the endorsement of the General Assembly for a number of years now, but the Security Council has so far not found it possible to act upon them.

132. Turkey, as a member of the Committee, feels that by its endorsement of those recommendations once again the General Assembly would be attesting to the validity of the principles and elements contained in them.

133. The fact that a just solution to the problem of Palestine has so far eluded the international community should not make us insensitive to the pressing and disturbing problems of the Palestinian people under Israeli occupation. When Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the population of the territories occupied since 1967 are scrutinized from the perspective of the Arab Palestinian people, we find the situation extremely discouraging and diametrically opposed to the hopes of the Palestinians for the attainment of their inalienable rights. The situation in those occupied territories has grown worse as the degree, frequency and scope of Israel's violations of human rights has increased.

134. Israeli practices, which also constitute a violation of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,⁵ are deplorable, and Israel should desist from such actions forthwith. Needless to say, Israel should also dismantle all existing settlements in those territories and refrain from establishing new ones.

135. Another dimension of the question with which Turkey has been closely involved is the humanitarian aspect of the Palestinian refugee problem. We must emphasize that the refugee problem is ultimately political in nature—that is, no humanitarian measure, however effective, will be sufficient to eliminate the refugee problem unless and until a just and lasting solution is found for the overall question of Palestine. But, in the meantime, we must attend to the immediate needs of the Palestinian refugees and try to alleviate their suffering. UNRWA has performed invaluable services, but unfortunately the Agency is faced with severe financial difficulties. The need to create a sounder and more stable financial base is evident and we feel that the suggestions of the Commissioner-General and of the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA, particularly with respect to the initiation of informal consultations on this matter, warrant serious consideration.

136. The question of Jerusalem has a very special place not only within the larger context of the Middle East situation, but also in relation to the question of Palestine. The Turkish Government does not in any way recognize any measure taken by Israel affecting or purporting to change the status of Al-Quds Al-Sharif and considers all such measures null and void. Continued failure on Israel's part to comply with the United Nations resolutions on Jerusalem will make the solution of the problem of Palestine all the more difficult.

137. In the past year we have not moved closer to a solution of the problem. There are some points of consolation, however. One is that the recognition of Palestinian rights has been consolidated in the world as a whole and has found new and greater understanding, particularly in the West. Another is the important initiative undertaken by Saudi Arabia, an initiative that was praised by the Prime Minister of Turkey and that contains positive elements specifically related to the question of Palestine.

138. Turkey will continue to support and encourage all reasonable initiatives aimed at the full realization of the inalienable rights of the Arab Palestinian people, initiatives which have the support of, and provide for the participation of, the Arab Palestinian people and its representative, the PLO.

139. In conclusion, I should like to confirm that Turkey will support all the draft resolutions before the General

Assembly on the question of Palestine—whether they have originated in the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People or in other bodies. I should also like to emphasize that Turkey's support should be interpreted as a continuation of our well-established views on the matter as we have just explained them and within the terms of Turkey's past record of consistent backing of the Palestinian cause with respect to previous resolutions on or related to the question of Palestine.

140. Mr. TUÉNI (Lebanon) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Palestinian question, which we are discussing today, is older than the General Assembly. Every year since the decision on partition—that is, for 33 years—this question has been before us and before the entire world from a new angle and with new dimensions. Whenever a nation, large or small, believes that it has to bring before the United Nations a serious problem that is greater than ours and should supplant it, that nation realizes, along with the United Nations, that Palestine is still at the centre of the storm. There is in fact no greater threat to peace, because this question relates to Jerusalem, the meeting point of religion and history, the place where the will of God is translated into the deeds of man.

141. This year again we fear war, perhaps even more than in previous years. But some of us also fear a peace that could be worse than a war. Neither peace within such a framework, nor war itself is an end in itself. What is important is that all the objective conditions be met for lasting peace to be established and war to be made impossible. This means balance and harmony between national desires and international justice.

142. In this connection I wish to pay a tribute to the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People for the tremendous efforts it has made. Its report and its work reflect the universal vision which alone can save the Organization and the Middle East.

143. In this respect, we also express our appreciation of the words of the representative of the PLO—that is, the representative of the Government of Palestine in exile and Palestine in place—when in moving terms he spoke of the Palestinian identity, the Palestinian homeland, for which the Palestinian people can accept no replacement. Those words confirmed the rejection of the conspiracies to find lands in which to install the Palestinians, to the detriment of the inhabitants of those lands, and rejection of peace outside the Palestinian homeland, a military peace in the occupied territories, which would mean that the revolutionary war would be carried on in the immigration areas, which would also be to the detriment of the inhabitants of those areas.

144. My country, Lebanon, has paid more dearly than any other, and continues to pay, the price of these conspiracies. Therefore, for us, alongside the Palestinian cause there is the Lebanese cause, which represents the greatest tragedy and an equally flagrant injustice. Lebanon has the right—indeed, the duty—while paying a tribute to the attitude of the representative of the PLO, to recall certain essential questions within the framework of the present debate.

145. First, recognition of Israel is subjected to certain conditions, the first of which is that Israel recognize, in law and in fact, the Palestinian homeland and the right of the Palestinian people to return to it. For there will be no

peace for Israel, no peace in Israel, in the Middle East or in the world as a whole as long as the Palestinian revolution continues in foreign lands, as long as the Palestinians seek their homeland while Israel drives them out, thus spreading the war to all the other Arab countries.

146. Secondly, Israel is benefiting from the so-called peace efforts which are being actively made in the region to abolish the international juridical conditions of peace. Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which certain parties are reproached for rejecting completely, has been progressively stripped of its meaning by Israel and has thus become ineffective, even for those countries which had made it the corner-stone of their policy. Israel refuses to withdraw from the occupied Palestine territories, to which it gives new names. Israel is judaizing Jerusalem and creating a division between the peoples and their land, inventing theories of sovereignty and autonomy which ignore science and logic. As a result, if resolution 242 (1967) is one day accepted by everybody, it will be no more than a formula, devoid of reason and meaning.

147. Thirdly, there is the risk that resolution 242 (1967) will meet the fate of resolution 425 (1978) by which the Council tried to restore peace in southern Lebanon by creating an international force and ordering Israel's withdrawal. But Israel did not withdraw; it delimited a zone in the south for the international force. We fear that zone in southern Lebanon may become another West Bank which will then be annexed by Israel, in accordance with its old, well-known ambitions.

148. Fourthly, the war in southern Lebanon, now in the stage of a cease-fire, has threatened and still threatens the international force itself, whose reliability became somewhat doubtful when the war moved to the north of that force's zone, from one town to another, until it reached the capital, Beirut, with the brutal, tragic raid that left hundreds of innocent dead and did irreparable damage to the life of that city.

149. Lebanon confirms all those facts, which have been cited by many preceding speakers, in order to emphasize once again that the war in Lebanon threatens not only the future of Lebanon or the Palestinian cause but also the Middle East as a whole and world peace. Aware of this fact, the Arab kings and other leaders, at their Twelfth Summit Conference, held at Fez in November, were never more unanimous than on the resolution on Lebanon, which states that "the problem of southern Lebanon is as much an Arab responsibility as it is a Lebanese responsibility . . . the increasing dangers which confront southern Lebanon . . . do not threaten Lebanon alone, but also reach beyond Lebanon to imperil all Arab States, the Palestine question, and the entire region".*

150. That resolution reflects the concern of the Arab States for the territorial integrity of Lebanon and its unity, and for ensuring stability and putting an end to the tragedy.

151. In referring to that resolution, my delegation is not simply setting forth an attitude, but bringing out a fact—that peace in Lebanon and elsewhere remains the very essence of and the direct link between the Arab countries.

152. The historical truth is that the Arab countries, within and outside Lebanon, respond to war with peace. They respond to Israeli expansion of the war by an even greater attachment to the resolutions of the United Nations, as is proved by the resolution quoted from, which

provides for us to remain committed to Security Council resolution 490 (1981), relating to the cease-fire, and to the exertion of every possible pressure to bring the Security Council to implement fully resolution 425 (1978) and its ensuing resolutions, including the total withdrawal of Israel to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon so that the south will be under the exclusive authority of the Lebanese State as a zone of peace and stability.

153. Arab strategy, in Lebanon and outside Lebanon, continues to be a strategy of peace. Even resistance, Palestinian or Lebanese, is a means of seeking peace, a peace that will guarantee our national rights and international justice. On behalf of that peace, Lebanon has said and repeats today that wars conducted by others on its territory will not succeed in crushing it. On the contrary, it will be a new version of the story of the sorcerer's apprentice, whose art was turned against him. Instead of this mini-war preventing a big-Power war, we see it becoming a hotbed of conflagration for the communities and States of the region, thereby threatening the peace of the great and of the small, and of all those in between.

154. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Tension in the Middle East, which has been caused by the militaristic aspirations of the United States and the aggressiveness of Israel, has not been reduced; on the contrary, it is increasing. This cannot fail to cause concern to the international community. Historic Arab lands remain under Israeli occupation. The inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine have not been restored.

155. Challenging world public opinion and impudently ignoring the rules of international law, the Israeli authorities continue to extend their aggression and brigandage against the Arab peoples. A further stage in the escalation of the State policy of international terrorism was the barbaric bombing in July this year by the Israeli military of peaceful Lebanese cities and villages and Palestinian refugee camps. As a member of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, the representative of the Ukrainian SSR had the honour of visiting Lebanon with a delegation of the Committee in August this year to see on the spot the damage which had been caused by these attacks. We were shaken by what we saw. As a result of Israeli bombing and shooting from the air, sea and land, hundreds of completely innocent people were killed, mainly women, children and old people. Thousands were wounded. The targets of the attacks were basically civilian.

156. In our opinion, one of the main purposes of Israel's aggressive actions, including this latest one, in Lebanon, which have been going on for many years now, is to put down the Palestine resistance movement. From numerous United Nations documents, including the recent report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, and also from the statements made by the representative of the PLO, it is quite obvious that in the past year the Palestinian people under occupation have continued to be the victims of acts of violence, torture and repression. The Israeli authorities continue to expel the Arabs from lands that belong to them and to deprive them of their property. The criminal practice of deporting Palestinians and creating new Israeli settlements has continued, as has that of changing the historic character of Jerusalem. Thus, we have evidence of the practice of colonization by the Israeli authorities of

the occupied territories, which have belonged to the Palestinians from time immemorial.

157. What is the real reason for the provocative and impudent conduct of Israel, which has ignored the numerous decisions passed by the Security Council and the General Assembly? It must be obvious to everyone that the Israeli aggressor is emboldened because it feels that it enjoys comprehensive support from its protectors over the sea. The so-called "strategic co-operation" between the United States and Israel brings the Arabs blood, devastation and grief. The so-called strategic agreement signed yesterday between Israel and the United States of America is a new act for the juridical enshrinement of that strategic co-operation, which is aimed first and foremost against the Arab countries, against the Arab people of Palestine in their just struggle.

158. We are profoundly convinced that that alliance and the unreserved support for Israel's criminal acts by the United States have encouraged Israel to continue its policy of expansion vis-à-vis the Arab peoples, to perpetuate its occupation of Arab lands, to flout the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people which have been recognized by the United Nations, and to suppress the Palestinian resistance movement.

159. The Israeli leaders have frequently stated and have not concealed the fact that they intend to maintain control over the occupied territories, to continue their "colonization", to prevent the Palestinian refugees returning there and not to permit the establishment of an independent Palestinian State. That is the main purpose of the Camp David collusion, the participants in which are making attempts to replace with negotiations on so-called "autonomy" for the Palestinians the solution of the fundamental problem of the Middle East, that of granting the Arab people of Palestine the opportunity to exercise their legitimate right to self-determination and to create their own State.

160. We are deeply convinced that it is essential to solve the Palestinian problem as quickly as possible and to secure a comprehensive Middle East settlement. This can be done only by means of collective efforts on a just and realistic basis. A realistic and constructive way of securing such a settlement is, we believe, to be found in the proposal put forward by the Soviet Union on the convening of an international conference on the Middle East, to be held with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

161. In conclusion, my delegation wishes to say that the Ukrainian SSR has constantly supported the just cause of the Arab people of Palestine. Its dauntless struggle for the enjoyment of its inalienable national rights has won it the sympathy and respect of the Ukrainian people. It is our hope that, during the current session of the General Assembly, specific and useful decisions will be worked out, aimed at reaching a just solution of the Palestinian problem.

162. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): I have the honour of speaking on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community.

163. The 10 member States continue to be deeply conscious of the importance of the problem of Palestine for the future peace and security of the Middle East. They remain firmly of the view that a just solution of this prob-

lem is an essential element for any comprehensive peace settlement of the Middle East conflict. During the past year there has been a tragic escalation of acts of violence in the area. These have underlined both the dangers of the failure to achieve such a settlement and the urgent need to work towards a just solution of the Palestinian problem.

164. The essence of any solution must be the reconciliation of the State of Israel and the Palestinian people, so that these two realities can live together in peace and security. The 10 member States, basing themselves on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), have set out in the Venice Declaration of 13 June 1980⁷ the two fundamental principles which they believe must govern the search for such a reconciliation. These principles are the right to existence and to security of all the States in the region, including Israel, and justice for all the peoples, which implies the recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. If the parties concerned can be brought to accept both these basic principles, the European Community believes that this will represent an important step towards the just, lasting and comprehensive peace settlement which is so sorely needed.

165. The European Community considers that certain important consequences follow from these two principles. All the countries in the area have the right to live in peace within secure, recognized and guaranteed borders. A just solution must be found to the Palestinian problem, which is more than simply a problem of refugees. The Palestinian people must be enabled, by an appropriate process defined within the framework of the comprehensive peace settlement, to exercise fully its right to self-determination. Israel must put an end to the territorial occupation which it has maintained since the conflict of 1967. Negotiations leading to a comprehensive peace settlement should be based on the recognition and implementation of the twin rights of Israel to existence and security and of the Palestinian people to self-determination.

166. The European Council, at its meeting in Luxembourg on 2 December 1980, noted⁹ that a number of different formulas were possible to give substance to some of the principles of the Venice Declaration. In order to explore these formulas more thoroughly and encourage a more favourable climate for negotiations, the President of the European Community undertook at the Council's request a further round of contacts with the parties concerned during the first half of this year.

167. Underlying such contacts was the Community's recognition that a just and lasting peace settlement presupposes the support and commitment of all the parties concerned. The 10 member States have continued to make it clear that the principles of the Venice Declaration apply to each of the parties without exception. They have reiterated that they apply therefore to the Palestinian people, and to the PLO, which will have to be associated with negotiations. With this in mind, the PLO was included in the various contacts made.

168. At the same time the members of the European Community have continued to appeal for the creation of a climate of confidence and understanding as an important element in the search for a comprehensive peace settlement. They stress that such a climate can be achieved only by an end to acts of violence and by the parties concerned taking positive steps, both in their pronouncements and their actions, to foster such a climate.

169. In this context, the 10 member States are deeply concerned by Israel's continuing policy of settlements in the occupied territories. They reiterate that they consider these settlements, as well as the concomitant changes in demographic structure and property ownership in the occupied territories, to be illegal in terms of international law and contrary to the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war. They call again upon Israel to put an end now to this damaging and illegal policy. They also recall that they can accept no unilateral initiative aimed at changing the status of Jerusalem.

Mr. Naik (Pakistan), Vice-President, took the Chair.

170. The European Community takes note of the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. The views of the member States of the Community and the reservations which have been expressed in regard to the Committee are well known. At the same time they are grateful for the appreciative reference to their efforts which the Committee made in its report [A/36/35, para. 31].

171. The European Council, at its meeting in Luxembourg on 1 July this year, decided to instruct its Ministers to elaborate further the practical possibilities available to Europe to make an effective contribution towards a comprehensive Middle East peace settlement. Since then the member States have been actively pursuing their efforts. At the same time they have felt obliged to stress that ultimately it must be for the parties themselves to do the negotiating if such a lasting settlement is to be achieved.

172. The members of the European Community regard as helpful all clear statements of interest in a peaceful settlement, and in the context of the search for a negotiated comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East they have welcomed the eight-point statement made by Crown Prince Fahd ibn Abdul Aziz of Saudi Arabia.² The British presidency of the Community, in the person of Lord Carrington, made a visit to Saudi Arabia at the beginning of November for a discussion with the Saudi Government of its approach and that of the Community on the subject.

173. The European Community also considers that the recently announced decision of four of its member States—France, Italy, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom—to participate in the multinational force in Sinai meets the wish frequently expressed by members of the Community to facilitate any progress in the direction of a comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East, on the basis of mutual acceptance of the right to existence and security of all the States in the area and the need for the Palestinian people to exercise fully its right to self-determination.

174. In conclusion, the 10 member States of the European Community take this opportunity to reaffirm their support for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. Recognition of these rights remains one of the two fundamental principles to which I have referred and which, in the Community's view, must underlie the search for a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement in the Middle East.

175. The PRESIDENT: The Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization has asked to be allowed to reply to a statement made by one of the speakers in the general debate. I give him the floor on the basis of General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX).

176. Mr. ABDEL RAHMAN (Palestine Liberation Organization): Once again the General Assembly has been given an overdose of the usual distortions, misinformation and lies by the representative of the junta of Menachem Begin. For the sake of truth, and even peace, allow me to put things in their proper perspective.

177. It has become a common practice for Zionist representatives, whenever they run out of convincing arguments in seeking to rationalize and legitimize their historic aggression and the daily crimes that they commit against the Palestinian people and the Arab nation, to resort to diversionary tactics with the aim of misleading international public opinion and the international community.

178. The Israeli representative alleges that Jordan should be the State for the Palestinians, thus relieving the international Zionist movement, and its concrete political creation, Israel, of its historic responsibility towards the Palestinian people, and in this simple way settling the Palestinian question. We should like to reaffirm that Jordan is the homeland of the Jordanian people, and Jordan was an independent State long before the illegal creation of the State of Israel on the land of Palestine. The Palestinian people are in Jordan not from choice but by force—in the same way that the Palestinian people are in Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, Iraq and other places in the world. They are in Jordan because they cannot be in Palestine. They are in Jordan because Blum is in Palestine and because Menachem Begin, who was born in Poland, is in Palestine and because 65 per cent of the colonial settlers who are now living in Palestine were not previously in Palestine and are taking the place of the Palestinians.

179. Probably 90 per cent of the Israeli delegation here at the United Nations are part of the colonial settler movement in Palestine, and none of them was even born in Palestine. Yet they want to deny the right of the Palestinians who were born in Palestine to live and exercise their inalienable right, which is theirs by divine and by human law, to live in their own homeland, free of foreign domination.

180. But this is the mentality of the Zionist colonizers, a mentality that is based on and was conceived in racism and exclusivity. What is the criterion, moral or legal, for the presence of Menachem Begin and his clique in Palestine, except that they are Jews? I happen not to be Jewish: that is the only criterion for my exclusion and the exclusion of the Palestinians from Palestine. In the same way, the right of citizenship in the *apartheid* régime of South Africa is reserved for the white minority at the expense of the indigenous people of South Africa, the black majority of South Africa.

181. The second point raised by the representative of Israel concerned the aims and objectives of the PLO in Palestine. We definitely consider political, social and economic institutions of the State of Israel, based on the racist Zionist ideology, to be illegal. The only social reality is the people who are living there.

182. In Mr. Kaddoumi's statement this morning [80th meeting], he spoke of the coexistence of the Jewish community and the Palestinian community in the land of Palestine on a basis of equality. That is one of the proposals that we have made, to equate the Jew who arrived in Palestine from Brooklyn yesterday with the Palestinian who

was born there. As an alternative to exclusivity, which is characteristic of Zionism, we provide inclusivity.

183. We offer equality between the Palestinians and the Jews in the historic land of Palestine. But in no circumstances will we tolerate or accept our rights being limited in our homeland. In no circumstances will we accept foreigners coming to Palestine to dominate us. It is our homeland, the home of our fathers and forefathers, the home of future generations of Palestinians. Therefore, we reaffirm that we cannot tolerate any domination, and that we shall fight against the Zionist occupation of Palestine.

184. As regards the Camp David accords as a formula for peace, none other than a member of the Israeli Knesset, Uri Avineri, said that it could not be a formula for peace; it was a declaration of war, a war against the national existence of the Palestinian people. That is so, because it seeks to legitimize the illegal Israeli occupation of Palestine. This should not be accepted, since it has been rejected by the overwhelming majority of the international community, including every Member State of the United Nations—except, of course, Israel and the United States. It is a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of the principles of human and legal behaviour. Therefore, it has been rejected and will be rejected, as it has been rejected by the Palestinian people within and outside the occupied Palestinian territories.

185. Today in the Gaza Strip there is a general strike against the imposition of autonomy, or the so-called civilian administration of Gaza. Israel daily increases its repression of the Palestinians. Only last month four young Palestinian students were murdered in Israeli goals.

186. So, enough of the arrogance of the Israelis, because if they seek to mislead the international community they are dehumanizing the Jewish community in Palestine.

AGENDA ITEM 32

Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (*continued*):*

- (a) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*;
- (b) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports;
- (c) Reports of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/36/719)

187. Mr. OYONO (United Republic of Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): At this late stage in our debate I should like on behalf of my delegation to address the crux of the issue before us by presenting to the Assembly a few thoughts on the policy of *apartheid* of the racist régime of South Africa.

188. The General Assembly has been considering this question for several days. The fact that it has held the attention of the General Assembly almost since the creation of the United Nations testifies to the major concern of the international community about that scourge, which the Assembly has described as a crime against humanity. This also testifies to the Assembly's determination to do everything in its power to eradicate it and to promote the establishment of a multiracial democratic society in south-

* Resumed from the 79th meeting.

ern Africa, providing everyone with equal opportunities to achieve well-being and happiness.

189. For almost 30 years, 4 million whites, who have made of discrimination based on the colour of a man's skin a philosophy and system of government, have been shamelessly oppressing more than 20 million blacks reduced to a nomadic existence and to exile in their own country. This has been achieved by means of an arsenal of the most infamous laws and measures ever conceived, to the great detriment and in flagrant violation of the most elementary human rights. These measures have been applied in blind terror that does not spare the women, the children or the old of the black race.

190. The Pretoria racists try to find justification for that odious policy in a Christian morality which would make the black race a race damned since the days of its mythical ancestor, Ham—which, however, has in no way prevented them from consorting with that race, with decidedly fruitful results. Moreover, the racists pose as defenders of Western Christian civilization in that part of the world, and to that end do not hesitate to carry out massacres, such as those at Sharpeville, Soweto and Kassinga, and to practise torture and all sorts of ill-treatment of the black peoples and captured freedom fighters.

191. Is it in the name of that same morality that the illegal minority of Pretoria carries out barbarous attacks on neighbouring States, maintaining tension and instability, whose dangerous escalation seriously threatens international peace and security in the region; that it persists, in spite of the many resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, in its illegal occupation of Namibia and its manoeuvres intended to prevent the Namibian people exercising its right to self-determination and genuine independence?

192. It is undeniable that racial discrimination is condemned by the value systems of liberal ethics and of socialist ethics. Therefore, we would have expected the combined efforts of the international community to put an end to the racist régime of Pretoria, by isolating it and giving aid and assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and its national liberation movement, to be crowned with success.

193. Unfortunately, that has not happened. The racist régime is still in place, and its economic and military strength continue to grow. In the face of the insurrection of the oppressed masses its armoury of oppression becomes more and more brutal. Intimidation, physical violence, torture, murder and summary executions have become everyday occurrences. In the face of the increasing dangers presented by the magnitude of the irresistible struggle of the black people to win their dignity, South Africa, despite the opposition of the international community, has been intensifying the application of its policy of bantustanization. As for the many resolutions adopted by the Assembly aimed at enforcement action against that illegal racist minority, they have remained without effect. The report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* [A/36/22 and Corr. 1], which is excellent, is particularly enlightening in this connection.

194. How can such a paradox be explained? In the view of Cameroon, the answer is clear. Because of its extensive and numerous mineral resources, its cheap black manpower and its geo-strategic position, South Africa, in a world dominated by the rivalry of Powers seeking spheres of influence, raw materials, military bases, markets and

so on, has woven solid networks of multifaceted interests, the magnitude of which now impedes the dismantling of *apartheid*.

195. It is regrettable that certain Powers, the very Powers that have special responsibilities in the maintenance of international peace and security and whose dedication to the ideals of freedom, human rights and justice is, moreover, well known, have allowed themselves to be caught in this web of interests to the extent that South Africa has been brought to its present level of strength, including its nuclear capability, making it possible for it to defy the entire international community.

196. However, we welcome the measures taken by the Nordic countries and many other countries aimed at discouraging collaboration with South Africa in the economic, cultural, military and nuclear fields, as well as in sports.

197. The United Republic of Cameroon, whose well-known position has often been reaffirmed here and elsewhere, for its part firmly condemns the policy of *apartheid*. It does not maintain any relationship of any kind with the odious and condemned régime of *apartheid*. It supports and applies strictly all the relevant resolutions adopted by the Organization in its efforts to compel South Africa to abandon its inhuman policy. A member of the Liberation Committee of the Organization of African Unity [OAU], the United Republic of Cameroon firmly supports the liberation movements of southern Africa in their noble struggle for the dignity of their peoples.

198. Faithful to the ideals, principles and objectives of the Charter, as well as to its commitment to contribute to the complete liberation of Africa from colonialism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*, the United Republic of Cameroon today as in the past supports all the draft resolutions submitted by the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. As was stated recently by Mr. Ahmadou Ahidjo, President of the United Republic of Cameroon:

“With respect, in particular, to the persistence of colonial and racist domination in southern Africa, Cameroon continues, and will continue in the future, to denounce and to struggle, together with all anti-colonialist and anti-racist organizations and forces, *inter alia*, the OAU, the United Nations, the front-line States and the South West Africa People's Organization, against colonial exploitation and the system of *apartheid* maintained in Namibia and Azania.”

199. Mr. SARRÉ (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): I should like first of all to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General and to congratulate the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, under the skilful and competent leadership of our colleague, Mr. Maitama-Sule, on its unceasing efforts to wipe out that scourge of this century, *apartheid*.

200. The Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, which began on 10 December 1973, will run its term in two years' time, and yet very little progress on the matter will have been achieved because of the attitude of South Africa, which continues deliberately to ignore the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. We could even go so far as to say that the more resolutions we adopt on this matter and the more appeals we make, the more South Africa redoubles its efforts to consolidate the system of *apartheid*.

201. As an illustration I shall cite only the legislative measures that have outlawed all formerly legal organizations which have declared themselves against *apartheid*. This is the gift South Africa has offered the world on the first anniversary of the events in Soweto. Then there is the proliferation of bantustans, provided with some sort of factitious independence. It has been amply demonstrated that those that govern those bantustans are able to remain in power only through the application of Draconian security measures and the suppression of all resistance. The bantustans are at once a reservoir of cheap labour and a dumping ground for the unemployed. Next, the blacks are prohibited from forming trade unions. There is also racial discrimination in education and public and private employment. There is control over the mass media. I could give many more examples.

202. The application of such measures has necessitated the strengthening of the powers of repression and the military capability of South Africa. We may rest assured—or, rather, we must deplore the fact—that South Africa has not failed to take the measures called for. It is stated in a publication entitled “The *Apartheid* War Machine” that the present strength of the armed forces of *apartheid* is approximately 230,000 regular serving men. This figure represents an increase of more than 150 per cent since 1974 and more than 50 per cent since 1977. South Africa’s military expenditures for the budgetary year 1981-1982 must be 3 billion rand, that is, an increase of more than 300 per cent since 1974 and of slightly more than 50 per cent since 1977. With this background information it is very easy to appreciate the degree of militarization of South African industry.

203. In the light of all this machinery which has been so carefully planned and set up in South Africa to preserve *apartheid*, the resistance movement, not being able to make Pretoria see reason, has been forced in spite of itself to engage in armed struggle. It is very edifying to read the affirmation of a nationalist, writing in the publication entitled “The Sun Will Rise”, that “I was and I still am essentially a peaceful person who believes that, in order to deal with the violence that is being used against us, we are compelled to defend ourselves: there is no possible alternative”. That clearly shows that the black South African aspires, quite rightly, to be treated with the dignity and the respect due to any human being. The nationalists of the African National Congress [ANC] and the Pan Africanist Congress [PAC], who deserve our full sympathy and support, share his view.

204. The international community has unanimously denounced and condemned the system of *apartheid*—that cultural, political, economic and social evil—which has been institutionalized by the South African Government. Because of what follows in its wake, it is indeed a serious threat to international peace and security. Hence, it is essential for the Organization to study ways and means of ensuring effective implementation of the resolutions it has adopted on this matter. Let us recall that this involves putting an end to all military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa; imposing on it an effective embargo, particularly on petroleum; no longer granting it any investments or loans; putting an end to all commercial transactions; and refusing to provide South Africa with essential supplies, particularly electronic and telecommunications hardware. Those measures may well prove effective, because it has been clearly established that the South African economy is largely dependent on outside sources.

205. Our devotion to the Charter of the United Nations and to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as our duty and responsibility towards the oppressed people of South Africa and its liberation movements, make it essential that we take enforcement measures against South Africa. In so doing, we would be contributing to a restoration of the fundamental rights to which we are all committed, and we would, at the same time, be restoring peace to that region.

206. Mr. CHAMORRO MORA (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The mercenary act of aggression against the people of Seychelles once again brings home the fact that the criminality of the *apartheid* system is suffered not only by the heroic people of that nation but also by other, neighbouring peoples. They, too, are subjected to acts of direct and indirect aggression, such as these mercenary activities which threaten international peace and security.

207. For that reason, the Government and people of Nicaragua, which also suffers the scourge of mercenaries promoted by those who support and shelter the racist régime of Pretoria, wishes to convey a message of solidarity to that sister nation in the face of this most recent act of aggression committed by the common enemies of the right of peoples to self-determination—an act of aggression that was valiantly rejected.

208. This act of aggression cannot be separated from the persistent attempts of the Pretoria régime to destabilize neighbouring countries. It reaffirms the fact that the policies and acts of the *apartheid* régime—*inter alia*, the intensification of its acts of aggression and its refusal to grant independence to Namibia—constitute a grave threat to international peace and security.

209. One can almost get lost in the welter of resolutions that the Organization has devoted, and continues to devote, to the quest for the restoration of the inalienable rights of the people of South Africa—rights usurped with impunity by a racist and criminal minority régime.

210. The *apartheid* régime has responded with defiance, with atrocities and brutality to the just demands of the South African people and the international community. We wish by our present statement to pay a tribute to the heroic people of South Africa, to its vanguard, ANC, and to those imprisoned, tortured, assassinated and persecuted patriots who have struggled to win the alternative of freedom and dignity. The Nicaraguan people, just like peoples throughout the world, is with them and supports their noble objective. But the eradication of the *apartheid* régime is the task of all, and the international community is aware of its responsibility towards the oppressed people of South Africa and its liberation movement.

211. It is encouraging to note that, while the Pretoria régime is practising indiscriminate repression, humiliating treatment, torture and assassinations, the patriots struggling to satisfy the claims of their oppressed people and its liberation movements demonstrate to the world the justice of their struggle. To that people, an example of the grandeur of mankind, we extend the solidarity and support of a free people, the people of Nicaragua.

212. It is no less encouraging that at the last meeting of ministers of the non-aligned countries there was a demand for the immediate, unconditional release of all South African political prisoners who continue to languish in the goals of the racist régime.

213. But we must face the fact of the illegal régime which denies independence to Namibia, which violates the sovereignty of neighbouring States, which unhesitatingly engages in the most reprehensible activities of the present-day world, which disgracefully sets back the history of mankind and attempts to survive and to strengthen itself in the face of an alarmed world conscience. It is only fair to ask, therefore, why the resolutions of the General Assembly, decisions of various bodies and voices clamouring for justice have been unable to destroy the network of support provided the racist régime. It is fair to ask why the Security Council has not declared that the situation in South Africa and its effects on southern Africa constitute a threat to international peace and security. It is fair to ask why Chapter VII of the Charter exists if mandatory sanctions are not imposed against South Africa.

214. The Pretoria régime's defiance of the United Nations is shared by the defenders of that régime. As a result of the constant military and nuclear collaboration on the part of certain States, South Africa's programme of military expansion and nuclear development has made further progress. It is my delegation's view that any such assistance, direct or indirect, is a crime against the people of South Africa, against Namibia and against the front-line States, as well as defiance of the authority of the United Nations and an affront to the conscience of mankind.

215. Undoubtedly, a most important role is played in the survival of that odious régime by the participation of transnational corporations, in the field of trade as well as in South Africa's nuclear and military development. Moreover, that co-operation, besides constituting a hostile act against the oppressed South African people, encourages the régime to persist in its aggressive policy, which endangers international peace and security.

216. Viewed from that standpoint, the panorama is grim, indeed. The contempt of South Africa's allies for the mandate of the international community indicates to us that their voracious appetite for wealth is greater than their moral commitment to the African continent, and that the lives of our South African brothers are being stifled by the economic interests of the transnationals.

217. But while the racist régime and its allies steadfastly defy the United Nations, the people of South Africa is valiantly and courageously winning victories against its entrenched enemies, confident of the support of all mankind in its struggle against infamy.

218. The determination of a people to struggle for its freedom must be given the broadest support of the international community. Only by supporting that struggle can we be fair to our brothers in South Africa. Such support is not a responsibility that may be side-stepped. Solidarity with the people of South Africa is tantamount to solidarity with all of Africa, with the front-line States, with the OAU, which is playing so decisive a role in that struggle, and with all non-governmental organizations that are endeavouring to find a solution. By the same token, it serves to strengthen the purposes of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* itself. It also means working towards the goals of the Namibian people, with which the people of South Africa has common enemies. It means rejecting bantustanization, that delight of the racists; it means resolutely condemning all arbitrary measures. Lastly, to the Revolutionary Government of Nicaragua, solidarity with the people of South Africa means being

consistent with the very struggle and aspirations of our own people.

219. Mr. SCHELTEMA (Netherlands): My British colleague, Sir Anthony Parsons, speaking on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community [78th meeting], has already voiced our common rejection of the *apartheid* policies of the South African Government. The Netherlands is of course in full agreement with his statement. The inhumane system of racial segregation practised in South Africa meets with universal condemnation by the Netherlands people. My Government attaches the greatest importance to its eradication as early as possible. Consequently my delegation wishes to avail itself of the opportunity which this important debate on *apartheid* in the General Assembly offers us in order to elaborate on the Netherlands point of view on various aspects of that problem.

220. We condemn *apartheid* because of its systematic discrimination on the basis of race and colour. A majority of the South African population is denied the legitimate exercise of its political rights. This form of institutionalized racial discrimination is firmly rejected by my country. The homelands policy has always been firmly opposed by the Netherlands. This policy of separate development, planned to make the non-white population foreigners in their own country, is doomed to failure. My Government therefore condemns the impending proclamation of independence of Ciskei and will join the international community in withholding recognition from that artificially created homeland.

221. The fate of Africans residing in the urban areas is equally miserable. They are confronted with a vast array of repressive legislation and they are restricted in their freedom of movement, residence or employment. The hated pass laws are an insult to the dignity of any African, man or woman. In order to enforce those laws and to stifle any opposition, the South African State has at its disposal a variety of means of repression. The practice of detention and bannings and the imprisonment of people who give expression to their convictions make for a truly repressive society.

222. The cycle of violence was again stepped up with the forced eviction of squatters from the Nyanga camp last August. The determination of the South African Government in denying civil liberties and squelching dissent has recently hardened. That attitude does not reflect, in the opinion of my Government, any understanding on the part of the South African authorities for the need to address the complex problems of a multiracial society in a constructive spirit and with a sense of elementary justice.

223. After a flicker of hope, the Government of South Africa apparently abandoned its intention to pursue meaningful reform and resigned itself to continued immobility and repression. Expectations that the urgent and necessary reforms would finally be implemented and that the structures of *apartheid* would be dismantled were disappointed. That has led to further indignation and despair. Death sentences were imposed, prompting international calls for clemency. At the same time, boycotts, strikes and acts of peaceful resistance were suppressed with force and raids were conducted over the borders with neighbouring States.

224. We noted that the Prime Minister's constitutional initiatives, the Black Advisory Council and the President's Council, failed to gain support from the black commu-

nity. The African population therefore still has no authoritative voice in matters pertaining to national and provincial government. To be sure, it is not up to the Netherlands Government to prescribe how a free and equitable society in South Africa can best be organized. We do, however, insist on strict respect for the dignity and rights of every human being and will continue to address ourselves to violations thereof.

225. The Netherlands Government intends to promote peaceful change with a view to bringing about a multi-racial society based on equality, in which every citizen, whatever the colour of his skin, can participate in shaping South Africa's destiny. To that end we wish to maintain our dialogue, but we are also ready to intensify pressure on the South African authorities. My country will first of all pursue its policy of active opposition to racial discrimination through the organs of the United Nations. The Organization has from the beginning been steadfast in upholding its principles and purposes when confronted with the *apartheid* policies of the South African Government. Thus we strictly respect the terms of Security Council resolution 418 (1977), which instituted a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa. In fact, the sale of arms by the Netherlands had already long been prohibited on a voluntary basis.

226. In addition we shall contribute, both nationally and in close co-operation with our partners in the European Community, to the establishment of freedom, progress and equality in South Africa. My Government considers that the collective weight of the 10 members of the Community provides an important means to influence events in that country. The Community adopted a Code of Conduct for Companies with Subsidiaries, Branches or Representation in South Africa.¹⁰ By following progressive and non-discriminatory policies with regard to wages and employment, those companies can contribute to social change.

227. The Netherlands Government views with the greatest concern any development leading to the acquisition by South Africa of a nuclear-weapons capability. No nuclear exports from the Netherlands have taken place or will take place to South Africa. We urge the Government of South Africa to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons or, as a minimum, to accept full-scope safeguards on its nuclear installations.

228. My Government considers that increased international pressure is necessary since South Africa continues to violate United Nations resolutions and remains unwilling to initiate necessary and fundamental reforms. Selective economic measures against South Africa should preferably be decided upon by the Security Council or be implemented by a sufficient number of other countries in a position to exert meaningful pressure.

229. However, my Government feels that the pressure on South Africa should also be increased by initiatives taken by the Netherlands on an autonomous basis. With due regard to its international obligations the Netherlands Government is in the process of considering a number of specific actions: first, participation, in as effective a manner as possible, in the existing voluntary embargo on the supply of oil to South Africa; secondly, regulations concerning investments in South Africa; and thirdly, limitation of certain imports from that country.

230. These future actions will complement a number of steps which my Government has taken in the past. We

withhold medium-term and long-term credit guarantees to South Africa. The Netherlands has abrogated the cultural agreement with that country and together with our Benelux partners we have decided to impose visa requirements for South Africans visiting our country. On the other hand, my country will continue to maintain those contacts that can contribute to the early eradication of *apartheid* in South Africa. Non-governmental organizations and groups are offered the possibility of maintaining contact and providing political and humanitarian support to those resisting repression and racial segregation.

231. The Netherlands is strongly committed to giving aid to political prisoners and their families. Consequently, we shall continue to contribute to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and the International Defence and Aid Fund, which have distinguished themselves by their efforts in support of the victims of persecution. My Government also provides humanitarian and educational assistance through South African anti-*apartheid* movements.

232. The continuation of *apartheid* also has grave implications for the southern African subregion. The suppression of the aspirations of the black majority creates tensions and leads to an increasingly aggressive attitude by the South African authorities. Since the countries surrounding South Africa—with the tragic exception of Namibia—have reached independence, their stability is threatened by military and political pressure from South Africa. Military actions add to the burden of the local populations and the ultimate survivability of multiracial coexistence in southern Africa is challenged. Individually, and together with our partners in the European Community, the Netherlands attaches priority to providing financial aid to the so-called front-line States. From its inception, encouragement and material support have been given to the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference, through which the peripheral States strive to lessen their economic dependence on South Africa.

233. We shall continue to provide assistance to these efforts of mutual co-operation and self-reliance, as we have done again recently. They contribute to our common goal of creating a prosperous and free Africa where people will be equal irrespective of colour, creed or race.

234. Mr. CHAN (Singapore): Almost since the time the United Nations was founded the ugly item of *apartheid* has appeared on the agenda of the General Assembly. Each year we gather to reason with, to persuade and to exhort the Government of South Africa to give up what to us is an irrational State policy.

235. Since 1962 when the Special Committee against *Apartheid* was established at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly under resolution 1761 (XVII), it has worked hard to review the *apartheid* policy and its international repercussions. Each year it lays before us a well-documented report which must have been difficult for the Committee to write. Difficult not because it had to collate so much factual material, but difficult because the Committee had to filter through the enormous suffering imposed upon a people in order to prepare the report.

236. This one issue which has occupied the time of the General Assembly for 30 years is clear evidence that the nations of the earth, except South Africa, believe in one abiding principle—that a man has certain basic human rights. And these rights cannot be abrogated, least of all on the grounds of race. This is the basic tenet of racial

equality and the core of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. South Africa, by its policies of *apartheid*, has rejected these principles and carried private bigotry and personal hate to the level of a national creed and philosophy.

237. After nearly 30 years of international condemnation the white supremacist Government of South Africa is proclaiming that political initiatives for reforms are being taken. Ostensibly these reform measures are to remove what it calls "hurtful and unnecessary discrimination". This is mere rhetoric, because the pillars of the *apartheid* system have not been touched. The Pretoria Government has tried to set up bodies such as the Coloured Representative Council and the South African Indian Council, but these, fortunately, have failed to win the support of the communities. The truth is much more bleak. Residential segregation and educational segregation still exist. As Mr. Maitama-Sule of Nigeria, Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, said when he opened this debate,

"The majority of the people of South Africa have no vote; they cannot live in a place of their own choosing. They are constantly being shuttled around from place to place simply on account of their colour. Families live in enforced separation, and through the obnoxious bantustan policy, the blacks of South Africa are now being alienated from their homeland." [75th meeting, para. 26.]

That is the sad truth in South Africa today.

238. The brighter prospect is that the people inside South Africa have become more politically vocal. A nation-wide campaign in May this year was carried out to boycott the twentieth anniversary celebration of the establishment of the Republic. Students boycotted classes and workers organized stay-at-home actions. Commemorative services were held throughout the country to mark the Soweto uprising and the Sharpeville massacre.

239. Our votes on the resolutions condemning *apartheid* as well as those on the question of Namibia will, I am sure, go a long way to bolster the resolve of the people in South Africa to continue in their struggle against racism.

240. On the international front, 1981 marked a year of military adventure by South Africa against the neighbouring African States. In January airborne raids were carried out in Angola and military actions in Mozambique. Since July the South African army has virtually occupied parts of Angola. All these were carried out against the backdrop of massive military spending and the growing threat of nuclear capability in South Africa.

241. With these ominous signals in mind, the Singapore delegation fully supports the call in the Special Committee's report for more effective monitoring of the arms embargo which the Security Council imposed in resolution 418 (1977). We further support the proposals by the Scandinavian countries that the Security Council should take appropriate action in order to achieve, at an early date, the cessation of further foreign investments in and financial loans to South Africa.

242. On the controversial question of nuclear co-operation, my delegation would urge that countries supplying South Africa with nuclear technology and equipment reconsider their nuclear co-operation, especially since South Africa is not a signatory to the Treaty on the Non-

Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, nor are the full-scope safeguards applied to its nuclear programme.

243. Looking at South Africa's military budget and preparations, one cannot help but wonder why South Africa is arming itself to the hilt. If they feel threatened, then it is self-inflicted. Because, if there are demands put on the South African Government, the demands are from the people of South Africa, and their demands are simple. The late Chief Albert Luthuli put it this way:

"In government we will not be satisfied with anything less than direct individual suffrage and the right to stand for and be elected to all organs of government. In economic matters we will be satisfied with nothing less than equality of opportunity in every sphere. In culture we will be satisfied with nothing less than the opening of all doors of learning to non-segregated institutions on the sole criterion of ability."

Those are basic human rights taken for granted by the rest of the world; surely they are not too much for the majority in South Africa to ask.

244. Mr. KISEKA (Uganda): I should like at the outset to pay a very special tribute to Mr. Maitama-Sule, who, as Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, has presented to the General Assembly a comprehensive report on the situation in South Africa arising from the practice of *apartheid* policies. In the short period that he has been Chairman, he has provided very dynamic and most committed leadership to the Committee.

245. My delegation wishes also to register its appreciation to all the members of the Committee for their tireless efforts in exposing the evils of the *apartheid* system. As a result of their efforts, more and more people are conscious of the noble cause and struggle against the oppressive régime and of the need to help the people of South Africa to free themselves from this Fascist bondage.

246. In May this year the racist régime marked the twentieth anniversary of the establishment of the Republic. In many other countries that would have been an occasion for jubilation. The people would have turned out in their throngs and joined in national festivities. That was not the case in *apartheid* South Africa. The vast majority of the population demonstrated its contempt for the *apartheid* Republic by boycotting Government festivities. Instead, thousands held commemorative services to mark those events, such as the Sharpeville massacre of 1960 and the Soweto uprising of 1976, that have become the major landmarks of the struggle of the South African people for a democratic society. Thousands more heeded the boycott call by staying away from their jobs and classes and by boycotting transportation.

247. In its attempts to stop the nationwide protests, the Pretoria régime used its brutal *apartheid* apparatus to unleash violence against the peaceful demonstrators. They were attacked and many were injured by the police. Community leaders were arrested and served with stringent banning orders, and callous raids were carried out to intimidate the population.

248. What happened in May this year is characteristic of what has been taking place and what continues to take place in South Africa. On the one hand we see examples of brutal repression practised by the *apartheid* régime, and on the other we see massive resistance to those prac-

tices by the overwhelming majority of the population. Fascist repression breeds more and greater massive resistance.

249. Every year the Assembly addresses itself to the question of the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. Rather than heeding the call of the international community, the racist Government has instead pursued a policy of intransigence and has stepped up its oppression. Significantly, the internal situation and the conditions of the population have continued to deteriorate. The so-called bantustan policy is being pursued with increased vigour. Vast numbers of people are forcibly ejected from their houses, detained and then deported to barren areas—the so-called homelands—that cannot support them. Recently, over 2,000 people from Nyanga township outside Cape Town were driven from their homes by bulldozers and witnessed the deliberate burning of their homesteads by the police.

250. Throughout the year there has been increased intimidation and arrests of black trade unionists. In September, for example, 205 unionists were arrested in East London. Their only fault was to sing freedom songs. Only last week, more trade union leaders were rounded up.

251. The full weight of South Africa's obnoxious *apartheid* laws has been used in a frantic effort to silence opposition. In what could be described as judicial murder, a number of political militants are under sentence of death on the basis of evidence obtained under torture. Among them are Johannes Shabangu, David Moise and Anthony Tsotsobe, who have been convicted and sentenced to death under the so-called Terrorism Act. They now face the threat of death on the basis of evidence which would not be admissible in any civilized legal system.

252. The racists are so afraid of their victims that they think the solution is to eliminate them. Only last week, Griffith Mxenge of ANC, a prominent member of the South African Bar, was assassinated by racist agents. This came in the wake of the death of Joe Gondi, an ANC official who was a victim of South Africa's murder squad in Zimbabwe. Rather than weakening the people of South Africa in their struggle, increased repressive measures have strengthened their resolve to dismantle the *apartheid* apparatus and to struggle for a truly democratic society. Since October 1980, the freedom fighters have conducted armed attacks against police stations and railway lines; they have destroyed oil pipelines and clashed with South African forces. The people have manifested their resolve to support the liberation struggle by the boycott of the anniversary festivities and by their attendance, by thousands, of the memorial services for the martyrs of the Silverton siege and the victims of the raids into Mozambique.

253. Faced with international condemnation and increased resistance, the South African régime has been pretending that it is intent on carrying out reforms through the introduction of the so-called Presidential Council, where Coloureds and Indians would participate along with whites. The aim is partly to deceive the international community and to avert concerted opposition. The so-called reforms are hollow and will deceive no one. The Indian community has rejected the Government scheme for it by a derisory 10 per cent turnout in the Indian Council elections. As was the case with regard to the sham independence for the homelands, the interna-

tional community cannot be hoodwinked by such a façade.

254. South Africa's domestic and foreign policy has been to make the world safe for *apartheid*. Before the victories of patriotic forces in Angola and Mozambique which took South Africa and its friends by surprise, they believed that Portuguese colonialism would remain a durable feature of the region and that a wide belt of the region would remain safe for *apartheid*. South Africa and its friends have never reconciled themselves to the new reality. That reality is embodied in the powerful symbols of dignity and freedom which are now represented by the proud nations of Mozambique, Angola and Zimbabwe, all of which lie at South Africa's doorstep.

255. Instead of learning the lessons of history and dismantling the *apartheid* apparatus, the South African régime has embarked on a policy of intimidating the front-line States with the aim of preventing them from giving support to the liberation movements or assisting the refugees. Mozambique, Angola, Zambia and Botswana have all been victims of aggression at the hands of South Africa. Economic structures and installations have been targets of its aggressive acts of destabilization. The objective of South Africa is to weaken their economies and make them dependent on South Africa under the so-called constellation of States.

256. Only recently the People's Republic of Angola suffered a massive invasion by South African forces, which continue to occupy the southern part of the country with the major objective of establishing in that region a situation like the one in Lebanon. In that scheme, it is envisaged that South Africa will play the role of Israel, that puppet, the renegade Savimbi, will play the role of Major Haddad and that the southern part will become the new southern Lebanon. By having this corridor, South Africa hopes to create a bigger zone from which it can destabilize Angola and insulate itself from the liberation movements fighting against *apartheid* and South African colonialization. It is incumbent on the international community to arrest this development.

257. Only last week yet another State member of the OAU was a victim of an invasion sponsored by South Africa. A group of mercenaries, well-armed and based in South Africa, invaded Seychelles with the clear aim of overthrowing the Government and destabilizing that country. Uganda reservedly condemns that act of aggression. The clear implication of that invasion is that any country in Africa, however distant from South Africa, that is consistent in its support for the liberation struggle is regarded by the *apartheid* régime as a front-line State and is thus vulnerable. We congratulate one Government and the gallant forces of Seychelles for repelling the aggressors. On behalf of my delegation, I wish to pledge Uganda's solidarity with the Government and people of Seychelles.

258. Another consequence of South Africa's *apartheid* policy is the continued illegal occupation of Namibia. Namibia should have become independent this year. But instead of seeing movement towards independence in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), we have seen South Africa resort to every machination to delay a settlement. The aim is clearly to delay the arrival of another truly independent State on South Africa's doorstep. Peripheral concerns are being used as a stumbling block in the path of the desire of the overwhelming majority to attain freedom. South Africa is taking full advantage of the equivocation of the five Western States. The régime in

its desperation is using internal accomplices to maintain its *apartheid* policies in the Territory. The Western five have an obligation to convince Pretoria of the futility of its machinations and bring it to honour the letter and spirit of resolution 435 (1978).

259. Why has South Africa been adamant in refusing to comply with various United Nations resolutions and in defying the international community and breaching the Charter with impunity? It is because of the support it enjoys from the Western States Members of the Organization. It is because words of comfort are flowing from a prominent Member which has declared the racist régime a friendly ally at a time when Pretoria is increasing its oppression and aggressive acts against neighbouring independent African countries. Even during this debate it has been suggested that we should allow South Africa in our midst in the Assembly. Yet South Africa has not taken any steps to address itself to the very reasons for the rejection of its credentials. To those who view the problem of racism and *apartheid* as a choice between white and black, we can only say, in the words of my Minister of State for Foreign Affairs in his statement to the General Assembly, that:

“In the landscape of southern Africa, there is no fence on which to sit, and there is no middle ground for equivocation. The choice in southern Africa is between the forces of oppression and racism and the forces of freedom and dignity. To speak of neutrality is to add a voice in support of the system of *apartheid*.”
[14th meeting, para 265.]

260. South Africa's policies of *apartheid* have resulted in a threat to international peace and security, in a breach of peace and in continuing acts of aggression. My delegation believes that the Security Council is duty bound to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

261. I wish to commend the front-line States for their unswerving commitment to the cause of justice and freedom, despite the heavy cost to their economies. We commend their efforts to disengage themselves from dependence on South Africa. In this connection we recall the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference, held in Maputo in 1980, and appeal to those who pledged to contribute towards the economic development and stability of the countries concerned to honour and increase their pledges.

262. In conclusion, I wish to reaffirm the unflinching commitment and support of the Government and people of Uganda to the liberation movements of South Africa.

263. Mr. LOBO (Mozambique): First of all, my delegation would like to welcome the delegation of Antigua and Barbuda to the Assembly. We feel that their rightful place in this international body is now being occupied by men who, together with all of us, will do their best to find solutions to the problems facing the whole of humanity today.

264. We come from a country whose boundary lies between liberty and oppression, between human dignity and *apartheid*. We participate in this debate in the name of the children, women and men who are the daily victims of the most varied forms of humiliation and massacre.

265. As neighbours to the vicious *apartheid* State of South Africa, Mozambique and all other front-line States

have the terrifying experience of enduring the activities perpetrated by South Africa. These horrible activities range from political subversion, propaganda and manslaughter to economic sabotage.

266. *Apartheid*, which the General Assembly has condemned several times through its various resolutions, is now trying to buy a new face: the face of the bantustans, through which the master-minds of *apartheid* believe they will overcome ever-increasing mass resistance and the struggle for human dignity.

267. The victims of *apartheid* and racial discrimination by South Africa are Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Mozambique and in particular the majority of the people of South Africa and the people of Namibia. In fact, the black populations of South Africa and Namibia constantly experience massacres, unjust imprisonment and persecution—all this simply because of their colour, only because they are black in colour. In the country of *apartheid*, colour determines where a person eats, sits, sleeps. South Africa is a country where the majority of the people are foreigners in their own motherland. It is against this situation that the people of South Africa, led by ANC, are resisting and fighting.

268. The workers in the mines and on the plantations, students and pupils, men and women, all say “enough of *apartheid*”, and often they face military barbarism with their bare hands. Between the choice of living as a slave and dying for freedom, the people prefer the latter—that is, to die for freedom. The people have decided to fight for their emancipation and for their fundamental rights. It is an unequal struggle because the *apartheid* régime is the owner of the biggest military apparatus in the whole of Africa, but we are sure that the people will win, because theirs is a just struggle. South Africa shall be freed from the policy of *apartheid*, and Namibia shall be independent, just like Zimbabwe today.

269. The régime of Botha is trying to stop the march towards liberty by the people, attacking and invading the front-line States. It is in this context that the South African régime still occupies a considerable part of the People's Republic of Angola, a sovereign State and Member of the Organization. Angola is continuously the victim of massive bombardment and the destruction of its social and economic infrastructure, of which the most recent example is the attack perpetrated against the refinery in Luanda two days ago, 30 November. The objective of the aggression against the front-line States is politically and economically to destabilize those States so that they will refrain from supporting ANC and the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], thus destroying the national liberation movement which has been leading the struggle against *apartheid*.

270. *Apartheid* exists because it relies on the support of imperialism, particularly the support of the new American Administration. The arrogance and intransigence of the illegal régime of Pretoria, and the crimes perpetrated by that régime, constitute one of the most brutal manifestations of imperialist aggressiveness. Imperialism preoccupies itself not with the destiny of the people but rather with the resources existing in various regions of the world. It is not the victims of Soweto and Langa who preoccupy imperialism, but rather gold, uranium, diamonds and chromium. That is why it arms the *apartheid* régime, which plays the role of loyal policeman of imperialism.

271. This is a planned, systematic and continuous action against the independence of peoples and against the national reconstruction efforts of our countries, aimed at perpetuating the whole situation of economic dependence that colonialism left behind. It is in this context that the most recent mercenary aggression perpetrated against the Republic of Seychelles took place. The mercenary coup attempt orchestrated by South Africa and certain Western Powers envisaged the overthrow of the Government led by President Albert René, which, even though burdened with economic difficulties, has always said "no" to *apartheid* and imperialism.

272. On this particular question of the armed aggression against Seychelles, Mozambique regrets the way some members of the news media have portrayed the occurrence. First, they reported it as if the only crime committed by the South African commandos was that of hijacking an Indian airlines plane. Secondly, they tried to project an image of a great sense of responsibility on the part of the South African régime. We ask, then, is there no limit to the degree to which the media can keep on misinforming and misleading the opinion of the international public? The People's Republic of Mozambique vigorously condemns this barbaric act, which violates the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and manifests its solidarity with the people and Government of Seychelles.

273. Some countries tell us that the *apartheid* régime is not so bad, because it is making some reforms. For Mozambique, *apartheid* cannot be dealt with by petty reforms; *apartheid* must be destroyed. That is why the international community demands that measures be taken in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

274. The aggressions perpetrated by South Africa must be answered by political, economic and diplomatic measures. To the violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola, we must respond not only with simple denunciations but also with consistent solidarity with the people of Angola. The South African régime must get out of Angolan territory and must pay indemnification to that country.

275. Aggression against Angola and other front-line States will only cease with the independence of Namibia and the conquest of freedom by the people of South Africa. As far as Namibia is concerned, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the plan endorsed by it constitute the political and legal framework for a proper transition of the Territory of Namibia towards independence, and for the people of Mozambique, SWAPO is the sole representative of the people of Namibia, and our solidarity is with them.

276. ANC is a national liberation movement which has always had the admiration and respect of the people of South Africa, as well as of the whole international community. SWAPO and ANC are the only two liberation movements which guarantee freedom, peace and progress in Namibia and South Africa, respectively. Botha's régime represents repression and terror. Once again, we are confident that the Assembly will, as usual, render its support to the people of Namibia and South Africa and will vigorously condemn the *apartheid* régime of Pretoria. *A luta continua.*

277. Mr. MAHMUD (Bangladesh): *Apartheid* in South Africa, despite three decades of systematic and universal condemnation, remains more deeply entrenched and re-

pressive than ever. It is an affront to the conscience of the civilized world.

278. As the world community grapples with the choice of further action, be it peaceful or punitive, Bangladesh believes that certain truths are self-evident. The struggle in South Africa must be viewed essentially within its dual context—the human rights aspect of the problem and its fundamental political dimension. The two components, humanitarian and political, cannot be treated in isolation.

279. The human rights dimension of the problem needs no elaboration. It is now universally recognized that the maintenance of the system of *apartheid* is a negation and antithesis of the common standard of civilized conduct by all peoples and nations envisaged in the Charter and elaborated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The General Assembly has condemned *apartheid* not only as a crime against the conscience and dignity of mankind but also as a crime against humanity, seriously disturbing and threatening international peace and security.

280. The Special Committee against *Apartheid* has made an exhaustive compilation of the extent and escalation of this policy annually, a policy the guiding motivation of which is segregation through the perpetuation of white supremacy and the objective of which is the eventual creation of a racial federation or confederation between white areas and racially defined homelands, or bantustans. This policy pursued with unrelenting ferocity has meant the usurpation of 87 per cent of the most productive agricultural land, the denial of political representation to more than four fifths of the population, economic discrimination and exploitation on an unprecedented scale, dispossession and forcible transfer of millions of Africans, and dismemberment of the country.

281. The inevitable fall-out of that premeditated policy of racism is a legacy of violence and disruption. Resistance, long non-violent, has hardened into implacability, fueled by years of denial and heart-breaking sacrifice. The memories of Sharpeville and Soweto are indelibly imprinted in history. They are grim milestones in the march towards decolonization and along the hard road to freedom, equality and human dignity. It draws momentum from the memory of all the innumerable silent victims of *apartheid*, all those who have risked their lives in the cause of human dignity. It derives strength from the spirits of martyrs such as Steve Biko, Solomon Malangu and countless others who have died in the cause of freedom.

282. The call for action in the face of those developments has now become an imperative. For over 30 years the United Nations has sought a wide variety of avenues for a peaceful resolution of the problem of *apartheid*, the essential prerequisite for which was encouragement of the right of the people of South Africa as a whole to decide the destiny of the nation. South Africa has spurned with impunity all such attempts. The Lusaka Declaration adopted in 1970 at the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries sought to stem the tide towards violent upheaval by proposing a workable framework for a just and lasting solution: a framework that envisaged amnesty for all political prisoners, negotiation with the liberation movements, the abandonment of the separate homelands policy and the extension of human rights in accordance with the common standards laid down by the United Nations. Recommendations to convene a national convention composed of genuine representatives of all South African people was mooted as early as 1964. Those conditions remain perti-

ment, indeed imperative, but continue to be flatly rejected by the racist minority régime of Pretoria.

283. The last few years have seen the launching by the international community of perhaps the most concentrated exposé of and assault on South Africa's policy of institutionalized racism. This momentum must be maintained and international pressure further mobilized and co-ordinated. For its own part, Bangladesh is irrevocably committed to the eradication of *apartheid*. Bangladesh cannot accept any solution tantamount to a modification of racism or the imposition of unilateral solutions denying the people of South Africa as a whole the right to determine its future.

284. All necessary steps must be taken to ensure the transfer of all powers to the people of South Africa as a whole, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete freedom and independence. Bangladesh, accordingly, reaffirms its recognition of the legitimacy of the liberation struggle in South Africa. We welcome the presence of their representatives in our midst. We believe that a concerted campaign must be directed towards the complete and total isolation of the *apartheid* régime on all fronts—military, political, economic, social, cultural, sports and other fronts. International efforts must also be directed towards the sustenance, development, education and training of South African refugees displaced from their homeland; they constitute a crucial vanguard in the dismantling of *apartheid*.

285. My delegation would like to pay a special tribute to the Chairman and the members of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* for their painstaking and exhaustive work. We believe that the time has come for the Security Council to consider more forthright action in pursuance of the steps that it has already taken, and to examine the Committee's and, through it, the General Assembly's recommendations.

286. South Africa's record constitutes one of the bleakest chronicles in human history—a permanent blemish on the conscience of mankind. It is now obvious that the anguish of the international community cannot be assuaged by anything short of the total eradication of *apartheid* and the transfer of power to the people of South Africa as a whole.

287. Condoning *apartheid* seriously jeopardizes the moral and intellectual fabric of our global society. It is our hope and expectation that the community of interests that now irrevocably binds us all will see the demise of this practice for the benefit of Africa and humanity at large.

288. Mr. SANNEH (Gambia): It was at its first session in 1946 that the Assembly first considered the racist policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa. The intervening 35 years have witnessed the adoption of innumerable resolutions and declarations articulating the rejection by the world community of this abhorrent system and calling on the authorities in Pretoria to abandon their inhuman policies. The Gambia has consistently condemned this unique and barbarous system of institutionalized racial discrimination, declared in the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*, adopted by the General Assembly in resolution 3068 (XXVIII), to be a crime against humanity.

289. In 1980 the international community witnessed a determined effort on the part of the racist Pretoria Government to present an acceptable face of *apartheid*. As anticipated, the well-orchestrated reforms were purely cosmetic in nature and involved no fundamental transformation of the *apartheid* policy. Any uncertainty the world community may have felt over the political direction of South Africa in 1980 will have been firmly dispelled by developments over the past few months. The racist régime has relentlessly pursued its final solution, the policy of bantustanization, by which black South Africans are stripped of their citizenship and exiled to barren tribal homelands. In spite of the failure of both Transkei and Bophuthatswana to win international recognition, Pretoria appears determined to proceed with the charade of granting independence later this week to the Ciskei homeland, in total disregard of the clear opposition of the 5 million Africans involved.

290. On the international level, meanwhile, South Africa has maintained its illegal occupation of Namibia, in flagrant violation of relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. The racist régime has at the same time resorted to increasingly adventurous armed attacks against independent African countries.

291. As the white minority seeks to consolidate its stranglehold on the country, the valiant resistance of the oppressed African, Coloured and Asian populations has evolved. The 1976 student uprising proved a watershed in the history of militant resistance to *apartheid*. Since the heroic protest of the students of Soweto, the rest of the non-white population has been galvanized into organized revolt against racist oppression. The last two years have, therefore, witnessed the crystallization of the struggle by black trade unions articulating the economic and political demands of their workers, by community groups protesting exorbitant rent and transportation costs and by student organizations campaigning against the inferior education system designed for blacks. These confluent currents have been complemented by the steadfast support of various church organizations inside South Africa. This crystallization of the resistance to *apartheid* was exemplified by the nationwide boycott in May of the festivities marking the twentieth anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of South Africa.

292. Meanwhile, the armed liberation struggle by the people of South Africa has escalated rapidly, with an unprecedented number of terrorist and sabotage attacks recorded over the past year. The Gambia pays a tribute to the heroic struggle being waged by these various strata of the black population, particularly ANC and PAC. Formidable though the enemy may be, the momentum of history which crushed white minority rule in Mozambique, Angola and Zimbabwe is on the side of the oppressed masses.

293. The racist régime in Pretoria, however, appears oblivious of the march of history and has responded to the resistance of the black population with increasingly repressive measures. In the last year alone hundreds have been arrested and banned, or detained without trial, while thousands have had to endure the physical brutality which characterizes the police State.

294. The obdurate intransigence of the Pretoria régime cannot be isolated from the attitudes of its Western and other partners. Continued trade and investment, the lifeblood of *apartheid*, have made it possible for the racist régime to survive the economic disruption resulting from

mass industrial action. However innocent those countries consider their economic activity inside South Africa, such activities were put into their proper context by the statement made in 1972 by the then Prime Minister John Vorster that "Each trade agreement, each bank loan, each new investment is another brick in the walls of our continued existence".

295. Sporting contacts with the racist régime undermine international efforts to isolate South Africa diplomatically and in fact confer a *de facto* respectability on the *apartheid* system. In this regard, my delegation deplores the overseas tours made earlier this year by the Springbok rugby team.

296. The significance of military co-operation between certain Western and other countries and the embattled *apartheid* régime hardly needs emphasis. Those countries, whose generous supplies of military hardware to South Africa are reliably reported to include both conventional and nuclear equipment, must assume direct responsibility for the savage repression being meted out by the butchers of Pretoria against the oppressed African population.

297. It is, however, in the international political arena that the collusion between certain influential Western countries and the *apartheid* régime is the most damaging. Those Governments have repeatedly prevented the international community from taking effective action against South Africa. In the view of my delegation such indulgence can only encourage the criminal aggression of the racist Pretoria régime, thus further endangering international peace and security. There is thus a direct correlation between the failure of the Security Council to respond decisively in April to Pretoria's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and South Africa's massive invasion of the People's Republic of Angola in August. Similarly, the abortive mercenary coup launched against Seychelles last week from South Africa must be interpreted against the background of the failure of the Security Council even to condemn the South African invasion of Angola last August.

298. South Africa has already been declared guilty of a crime against humanity and has demonstrated repeatedly that it represents a dire threat to international peace and security. The Charter of the United Nations, meanwhile, prescribes specific measures for such contingencies. In the view of this delegation, the provisions of the Charter leave the Assembly no option but to endorse the calls for the imposition of comprehensive, mandatory sanctions made by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa in Paris last May.

299. Before concluding, I wish to pay a special tribute to the very commendable work carried out over the year by the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, under the chairmanship of Mr. Maitama-Sule, the representative of Nigeria.

300. Mr. AL-ZAHAWI (Iraq): I should like first to express our thanks to the distinguished Chairman and the members of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* for the excellent report submitted to the General Assembly at this session and for the valuable work they have accomplished during the past year. I should also like to express our deep satisfaction with the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, in which the Iraqi delegation took an active part. We welcome and support the convening of such special conferences. Since non-governmental organizations, parliamentarians, scholars, clergy-

men and other dignitaries also participate in the work of these conferences, the results greatly help in disseminating the facts about *apartheid* and the policies of South Africa to a much wider audience. As the international public becomes better acquainted with the evils of *apartheid*, Governments become more convinced of the necessity of adopting effective measures against the minority régime in Pretoria, which is following policies of racial discrimination and *apartheid*.

301. As far as Iraq is concerned, combatting *apartheid* and the racist régime in South Africa is not simply a matter of principle, solidarity with our African brethren or the implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions. Iraq is motivated by all those considerations and more: for us it is a matter of national interest, inasmuch as it involves a struggle against a common enemy. To put Iraq's position in its proper perspective, I should like to refer to a statement made by the Israeli Ambassador to South Africa to the Pretoria Press Club in July 1979. The Zionist emissary said: "I believe it is in the national interest of Israel to see South Africa as a strong country, with not just military muscle, but a viable economic structure and society where people have an equal share in its survival".¹¹ That statement was quoted in the report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* at the thirty-fourth session of the Assembly. That report is of special relevance to the present session in view of the scurrilous attack mounted by the Zionist representative in his statement to the Assembly at the 76th meeting, against the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and its current report about relations between Israel and South Africa in document A/36/22/Add.1.

302. The report submitted at the thirty-fourth session contained other statements made by the Zionist emissary to South Africa and by Begin himself which show the true nature of the relations between the two racist entities, notwithstanding the hypocritical words uttered by the Zionist representative during the present debate. The contents of the Special Committee's report are neither "irrelevant information" nor "secondhand speculation", as the Zionist representative alleged. The report quotes facts and statements issued by highly responsible officials of the Zionist entity.

303. For example, the Israeli Ambassador to South Africa is quoted further as saying in an interview published on 27 July 1979:

"I cannot stress sufficiently how we in Israel cherish relations with South Africa, which has been consistent in her friendship towards us . . . We carefully refrain from joining in the sterile symphony of blanket condemnation of South Africa that emanates from the United Nations . . . South Africa must be seen as having special values for the free world . . . to have the immense natural mineral wealth and other assets of South Africa fall into the hands of dictatorial radical or communist régimes, would be a frightening situation—one that would make any discussions about racial equality, or even improvements in the racial situation, completely irrelevant. It would be a disaster if South Africa were lost as a constructive and active member of the free community of nations."¹²

So much for the Israeli representative's claim that "Israel has always opposed racism and racial discrimination, including *apartheid*" and that Israel has been "in the vanguard of every struggle against the evil of racism in all its manifestations" [76th meeting, paras. 51 and 52]. The

Zionists consider the mineral wealth and other assets of South Africa to be of far greater importance than the racial situation or the amelioration of that situation.

304. As for Mr. Begin, his views were expressed in the advice that he gave to a delegation from United Israel Appeal of South Africa on 11 February 1979, that "the free world was shrinking and that free men stand together to resist the onslaught".¹³ It is a strange "free world", one in which the whites can enslave the blacks in South Africa and in which the Zionists can enslave the Moslem and Christian Arabs in Palestine.

305. What is even more outrageous is that these racist régimes are regarded in certain influential Western circles as "democracies" and bastions of Western civilization. So much the worse for this so-called democracy and for Western civilization.

306. This community of interest between the two racist régimes and their close co-operation are not only the source of misery and injury for millions of black Africans and Palestinian Arabs; they are the ultimate insult to the memory of the Jews who perished under the Nazis. The Zionist representative deemed it yet another appropriate opportunity to exploit the fate of the non-Zionist, assimilationist Jews who fell victim to Nazi racism; he did so in order to cover up the racism which is the very foundation of Zionism. He reminded representatives of "the maniacal and methodical massacre of 6 million Jews whose only crime was to have been born Jewish" [*ibid.*, para. 52]. He and other Zionists conveniently choose to forget, however, that the Nationalist Party, which rules South Africa today, had among its leaders and followers well-known anti-Semites who collaborated with the German Nazis. A number of them were gaoled by the Government of Field-Marshal Smuts for their pro-German activities during the war.

307. In 1953, Dr. D. F. Malan, the then Prime Minister of South Africa, was among the first leaders to visit Israel, where, in spite of his anti-Semitic past, he was warmly received and his name later inscribed in a so-called golden book as one who had proved himself a true friend of Israel. A later Prime Minister of South Africa, Mr. Vorster, was quoted by Cyrus Sulzberger, in *The New York Times*, of 30 April 1971, as saying: "We view Israel's position and problems with understanding and sympathy. Like us, they had to deal with terrorist infiltration across the border and, like us, they have enemies bent on their destruction." Mr. Vorster, too, was regarded as a true friend of Israel. His visit to Israel in 1976 formalized the Israeli-South African axis. Yet it was the same Vorster who was one of those Afrikaaners gaoled for their pro-Nazi activities. It was the same Vorster who declared, according to the *London Sunday Times Magazine* of 10 October 1971, that if he had to live his life again, he would do exactly the same, and that he was quite satisfied that what he did was right.

308. Now, leaving this warm reciprocity of sentiments aside, the most dangerous relationship existing between the racists in Pretoria and Tel Aviv is that of military collaboration. We are particularly grateful to the Special Committee for drawing our attention in its special report to the increasing military and nuclear collaboration between South Africa and Israel. Again the extent of the collaboration is gathered not from "irrelevant information" or "second-hand speculation" but, rather, from statements and actions of responsible South Africans and Zionists. The South African Minister of Labour, Mr. M. Viljoen, speaking at a Nationalist Party rally in Johannesburg, commented on the lessons to be drawn from the

1967 war as follows: "The Middle East war has not only brought the Arab States to a re-evaluation of their position; it also ought to make some of the most loudmouth African leaders, who continuously threaten attack on South Africa, think again". That was quoted in Brian Bunting's article, "The Israeli-South African Axis—A Threat to Africa", published in *Sechaba*, volume 4, No. 4, April 1970, page 19.

309. In April 1968, P. W. Botha, then Minister of Defence, warned the Zambian Government about the danger it ran by supporting "terrorists" and drew the analogy of the Israeli raids against Palestinian guerrilla bases in Arab countries. That was reported in the *Rand Daily Mail* of 4 April 1968.

310. In an interview given by General Hendrik Van Den Bergh, head of South Africa's Bureau of State Security, to the Israeli newspaper *Yediot Aharonot* published in its issue of 16 August 1973, he stated the following: "I went to Israel recently and enjoyed every moment there. I told the Prime Minister when I got back that, as long as Israel exists, we have hope. If Israel should, God forbid, be destroyed, then South Africa would be in danger of extinction."

311. Such is the nature of the ties that bind the two colonial settler-States. Their collaboration is aimed at enabling them to continue to defy world public opinion. They regard their survival only in terms of their ability to continue to subjugate the South African blacks and the Palestinian Arabs and to continue to deny those peoples their inalienable human rights. The survival they think of is only in terms of their racist exclusivist régimes. Anything which threatens this racist exclusivism means to them "destruction", "extinction". When they feel cornered by those who challenge their racist exclusivism, they resort to pre-emptive strikes in the name of self-defence—this policy of preventive aggression and State terrorism. This is the basis of the collaboration between the two racist régimes, which is fully supported by the United States of America.

312. I should like here to refer to the strategic accord concluded between the United States and Israel on 30 November. The accord is, ostensibly, limited to strategic co-operation in the Middle East region. The text of the memorandum signed by the two sides indicates, however, the existence of wider implications. I wish to refer specifically to paragraphs 2(c) and (d) of article III of the text as published in *The New York Times* yesterday, 1 December, which read: "Co-operation in research and development, building on past co-operation in this area" and "Co-operation in defence trade".

313. Now, surely, the outcome of such co-operation in the development and trade of weapons, which is what must be meant by the agreement, cannot possibly be limited to the Middle East region. In view of Israel's growing co-operation with South Africa in these very fields, namely, weapons development and trade, the strategic accord provides South Africa, through Israel, with access to United States developments in the field of weapons research and to United States weapons manufactured under licence by the Israelis. What the United States could not openly do for South Africa, it appears now able to do through Israel. Such is the magnitude of the common dangers that the Africans and the Arabs have to confront.

The meeting rose at 8.20 p.m.

NOTES

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year*, 1382nd meeting, para. 59.

² Expounded in a radio interview broadcast by Riyadh Domestic Service on 7 August 1981. For a transcription of the interview, see Foreign Broadcast Information Service, *Daily Report*, FBIS-MEA-81-153, of 10 August 1981, vol. V, No. 153, p. C 3.

³ *Palestine Royal Commission: Report* Cmd. 5479 (1937).

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Special Political Committee, Annex*, vol. II, document A/927, annexes A and B.

⁵ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973, p. 287.

⁶ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session*, 17th meeting, paras. 12-49.

⁷ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1980*, document S/14009.

⁸ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1981*, document S/14779, annex.

⁹ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1980*, document S/14285.

¹⁰ See A/32/267.

¹¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 22A*, para. 6.

¹² *Ibid.*, para. 8.

¹³ *Ibid.*, para. 5.