



Friday, 10 December 1982,  
at 11.20 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

*President:* Mr. Imre HOLLAI (Hungary).

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

**AGENDA ITEM 31**

**Question of Palestine (continued):\***

- (a) Report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People;
- (b) Report of the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on the Question of Palestine;
- (c) Reports of the Secretary-General

1. The PRESIDENT: This morning, the General Assembly is resuming its consideration of agenda item 31 in order to proceed to the vote on all the draft resolutions relating to the item. I would like to remind representatives that the debate on this item was concluded on 2 December, at the 89th meeting.

2. I call first on the representative of Malta, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/37/L.47.

3. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): On behalf of the sponsors, I have the honour formally to introduce draft resolution A/37/L.47.

4. We believe that the text of the draft resolution is self-explanatory. It recalls the fundamental resolutions relevant to the question of Palestine, including, of course, those of the Security Council, and also takes fully into account the events on the spot that have occurred since then and up to the present time. It also takes note of the very latest and important declaration of the Palestine National Council, reiterated most recently in the message of Chairman Arafat on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, to the effect that the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO] is determined to pursue its role in the solution of the question of Palestine on the basis of the attainment by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights in Palestine, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. The draft resolution also notes that the Security Council has yet to recognize unanimously the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people which the General Assembly, by overwhelming majorities, has endorsed year after year. Finally, it reiterates the request already made by the General Assembly to the Security Council to implement that part of the plan concerning the partition of Palestine which so far remains unfulfilled, despite the urgings of the Assembly. The sponsors hope that this draft resolution will receive the unanimous support it merits.

\* Resumed from the 89th meeting.

5. Mr. President, while I am speaking I should like, with your permission and that of the Assembly, to ask for a postponement of the vote on draft resolution A/37/L.45. The reason for this request is that the sponsors have been approached by a number of interested countries that have made suggestions for modifying the present text. Consultations have been initiated in an effort to reach agreement, but they have not yet been concluded and hence a little more time is required. I would therefore appreciate it if that draft resolution were not voted on today.

6. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting on any or all of the five draft resolutions. Representatives will also have an opportunity to explain their vote after all the votes have been taken.

7. I should like to remind the Assembly that under rule 88 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, "The President shall not permit the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment".

8. Mr. HØJERSHOLT (Denmark): I speak on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community in explanation of their vote on the draft resolutions before us.

9. The principles which, in the view of the Ten, provide the basis for a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute have been set out in the Venice Declaration of 13 June 1980<sup>1</sup> and in their subsequent statements on the issue and are, we trust, well known. Most recently, in their statement in Brussels on 20 September 1982 [see A/37/473, annex], they said that such a settlement should be based on the principles of security for all States in the region, including Israel's right to exist; justice for all peoples, including the right of self-determination for the Palestinians with all that this implies; and mutual recognition by all the parties involved.

10. In their common statement in the debate which took place in the Assembly under this item [87th meeting], the Ten reiterated that their commitment to the right of Israel to live in security and peace is fundamental and unwavering, and they equally stressed their commitment to the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination with all that this implies. They also made clear their wish to see the Palestinian people in a position to pursue their demands by political means and by negotiation. For negotiations to succeed, the Ten believe that the Palestinian people must be able to commit themselves to them and thus to be represented at them. Consequently, the position of the Ten remains that the PLO must be associated with the negotiations.

11. In voting on the draft resolutions before us, the Ten are guided by these common principles to

which they all adhere. In particular, draft resolution A/37/L.47 addresses itself to different important aspects of the question of a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute. It will be clear that the Ten have important reservations on those elements in the draft resolution which are not in accordance with their common position regarding principles for a comprehensive peace settlement. The Ten consider that the approach in this draft resolution to a solution of the Arab-Israeli dispute should have been more balanced.

12. With specific reference to draft resolution A/37/L.42, the Ten note that an additional paragraph, operative paragraph 2, has been included in this year's draft resolution endorsing the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and drawing attention to the need for action by the Security Council on those recommendations. As in the case of draft resolution A/37/L.47, the Ten have important reservations on those elements in the recommendations of the Committee which are not in accordance with their common position regarding principles for a comprehensive peace settlement.

13. Regarding paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/37/L.42, the Ten wish to stress the Committee's responsibility, in view of the difficult financial situation of the United Nations and in line with the example set by other United Nations bodies, to conduct its business in a way which avoids placing unnecessary burdens on the United Nations budget.

14. Concerning draft resolution A/37/L.44, the Ten repeat, as stated in their common explanation of vote on the adoption last year of the corresponding resolution—resolution 36/120 C—that they have no objection in principle to the holding of international conferences. They continue to believe, however, that the convening of an international conference on the question of Palestine would be worth while only if it were likely to assist progress towards a just, lasting and comprehensive peace settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute. In this context, the Ten have serious doubts concerning those recommendations contained in the report of the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on the Question of Palestine [A/37/49 and Corr.1] which are not in accordance with the need for a balanced and constructive approach to the complex issues involved.

15. Mrs. NOWOTNY (Austria): The position of Austria on questions pertaining to the situation in the Middle East and to the fulfilment of the rights and aspirations of the Palestinian people is well known. We had the opportunity of restating that position in the General Assembly only a few days ago [94th meeting], and there is no need to reiterate it now.

16. Austria will vote for draft resolutions A/37/L.45 and L.47. Our affirmative vote is based on the following understanding. The draft resolutions recognize the right of all States in the region to exist within secure boundaries. They recognize the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people, including the right to their own State. They reiterate the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and, on this basis, demand the withdrawal of Israel from the territories occupied in 1967.

We consider the reference to General Assembly resolution 181 (II) a reaffirmation of those principles. Lastly, draft resolution A/37/L.45, in particular, calls for negotiations aimed at a comprehensive, just and lasting peace based on United Nations resolutions, in which all parties concerned, including the PLO, participate on an equal footing. These elements are essential to any settlement of the conflict which aspires to justice and durability and, as such, have been emphasized by Austria for several years.

17. In the light of these considerations, my delegation would have preferred to see a reference in the operative part of the draft resolution, in more affirmative language, to the recognition of the right of all States in the region, including Israel, to exist within secure boundaries. We interpret the general reference to United Nations resolutions, which should constitute the basis for negotiations, as referring in particular to the relevant resolutions of the Security Council. We are also of the opinion that the territorial aspects form part of those negotiations, and we would therefore have preferred less sweeping language in paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/37/L.45.

18. Our vote in favour of the two draft resolutions should be seen as recognition of the efforts made by the sponsors to arrive at a constructive text and to incorporate those essential elements on which there is wide agreement in the international community.

19. Mr. HARLAND (New Zealand): New Zealand continues to support Security Council resolution 242 (1967) as the basis for a comprehensive Middle East peace settlement. We support the affirmation in that resolution, which applies equally to Israel, that every State has the right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force. New Zealand considers that a key element in the negotiation of a Middle East peace settlement must be the recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including their right to establish their own State if that is their wish. Events in Lebanon this year have reinforced our view. New Zealand accepts that the PLO plays an important role in reflecting the hopes and wishes of the Palestinian people, and we believe that that organization should participate in Middle East negotiations along with the other parties directly concerned.

20. For these reasons, my delegation regrets that it is not able to support any of the draft resolutions that are to be voted on today. Draft resolution A/37/L.42 endorses recommendations included in previous resolutions on which New Zealand has abstained. Those recommendations do not, in our view, adequately reflect the balance of principles embodied in Security Council resolution 242 (1967), nor does draft resolution A/37/L.47. Accordingly, my delegation will abstain in the voting on those two draft resolutions. We also have some reservations about draft resolution A/37/L.43, and particularly about the escalating cost of the activities of the Division for Palestinian Rights. We note from the report of the Secretary-General on the programme budget for the biennium 1982-83<sup>2</sup> that those costs are estimated to be about \$US 2.5 million. My delegation will therefore abstain in the voting on that draft resolution as well.

21. Mr. DE PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/37/L.42 to L.44, in line with its firmly established policy of support for the just cause of the Palestinian people, a policy which I had occasion to outline in my statement [89th meeting] in the debate on this item.

22. With regard to draft resolution A/37/L.45 in its present form, my delegation is in a position to support that also, but we are receptive to the request of the representative of Malta and, in the circumstances, the Assembly might perhaps decide to postpone voting on that draft resolution, in which case we shall reserve our position until we see the new text when it is submitted to the Assembly.

23. My delegation will also vote affirmatively on draft resolution A/37/L.47, on the understanding that if we were able to vote separately on operative paragraphs 4 and 5, my delegation would abstain on those paragraphs because we believe it is the Security Council, and the Security Council alone, which can adopt appropriate measures in cases which jeopardize international peace and security. If it were a mere recommendation, as is indicated in Article 10 of the Charter of the United Nations, we would have no difficulties in accepting those paragraphs.

24. Mr. HUTCHENS (Australia): The Australian Government remains deeply concerned about the question of Palestine and the fate of the Palestinian people. The recent tragic events in Lebanon have only served to highlight the enormity of the problems in the region.

25. The Australian Government believes that a resolution of the Palestinian issue is central to the future stability and peace of the Middle East and the long-term security of all States in the region. We believe that a comprehensive settlement of Middle East problems should be based on the principles expressed in Security Council resolution 242 (1967). These include the recognition of the right of Israel and other States in the area to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries and the withdrawal of Israel from territories captured in 1967. Such a comprehensive settlement should also be based on the recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to a homeland alongside Israel, with the corresponding responsibility to live in peace with their neighbours, and the right to participate directly in decisions affecting their future.

26. We have welcomed and supported President Reagan's initiative,<sup>3</sup> which seeks to reconcile Israel's legitimate security rights with the legitimate rights of the Palestinians and to bring the parties involved into direct negotiations. We are also pleased to note that the recent Arab proposals as set forth in the Final Declaration of the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez [see A/37/596, annex], also support the goal of a negotiated settlement. The major significance of these initiatives, as well as of the Venice Declaration,<sup>1</sup> is that, while they contain specific proposals which may not be acceptable to one or another of the parties, in general terms they all favour a negotiated settlement. The Australian Government believes that the very fact that negotiations are envisaged is an essential element if a settlement is to be attained.

This makes it inappropriate for Australia to pronounce itself on the specific terms of such a settlement. It believes that these should be negotiated directly by the principal parties to the dispute.

27. From what I have just said, it will be clear that my delegation is unable to support all the draft resolutions on which we are about to vote. We are concerned that the formulations employed in some of them are couched in terms which will not assist in constructive efforts to resolve the problems. We believe it inappropriate for the General Assembly to attempt to prejudge the outcome of the negotiating process.

28. My delegation believes that it is incumbent upon the parties directly involved to seize the present opportunities, and we regret that the draft resolutions on which decisions are about to be taken will not aid this endeavour.

29. Mr. CARR (Jamaica): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolutions pertaining to the question of Palestine and will welcome their adoption and speedy implementation. This position is entirely in accord with the policy of the Government of Jamaica, which has consistently advocated the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all territories occupied since 1967, recognition of the legitimate rights and aspirations of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination, independence and statehood, the speedy attainment of a peaceful, just and lasting settlement of the Palestinian problem and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace and security within internationally recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force.

30. Mr. ELMÉR (Sweden): I wish to explain Sweden's vote with regard to two of the draft resolutions before us and, indeed, to a third one which we seem now not to be voting on.

31. Sweden has abstained in previous votes in the Assembly relating to the forthcoming International Conference on the Question of Palestine. In spite of our continued reservations with regard to the basis for the Conference, as provided for in resolution 36/120 C, my delegation hopes that the Conference, now that a decision has been taken to hold it in August 1983, will indeed, as suggested in draft resolution A/37/L.44, provide an opportunity to heighten awareness of the underlying causes of the question of Palestine. With those considerations in mind, my delegation will vote in favour of that draft resolution.

32. Sweden will also be in a position to support draft resolution A/37/L.45 in its present form if it is put to the vote. We can do so because we strongly support the concept of negotiations on a comprehensive, just and lasting peace. Such negotiations are called for in operative paragraph 6 of that text. In the fourth preambular paragraph, principles are recalled that should, in our view, form the basis for negotiations. On the other hand, my delegation finds that operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 tend to prejudge the outcome of the negotiations which are called for. We must therefore reserve our position with regard to those three paragraphs.

33. On the other new text of this year, draft resolution A/36/L.47, Sweden intends to abstain for reasons related to those that would cause my delegation to support draft resolution A/37/L.45. Draft resolution A/37/L.47, while containing some positive elements, ignores the need to arrive at a solution to the conflict through negotiations. For that reason, and some others, my delegation is unable to support it.

34. Mr. DESKER (Singapore): The question of Palestine is at the core of the Middle East conflict. We will therefore vote in favour of the draft resolutions before the Assembly today, as we regard them as positive contributions to the search for a solution.

35. My delegation is of the view that a just solution to the question of Palestine must, at one and the same time, vindicate the rights of the Palestinians and preserve the legitimate rights of the State of Israel. In this respect, we would suggest the exchange of mutual recognition by Israel and the PLO. In order to encourage Israel and the PLO to move in this direction, the international community should urge them to pursue a course of mutual accommodation and compromise. Those who continue to urge Israel not to have any dialogue with the PLO are not helping the process of mutual accommodation. On the other hand, those States which continue to deny the right of Israel to exist are also not helping the cause of peace. My delegation therefore appeals to both Israel and the PLO to recognize each other's rights.

36. With regard to operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/37/L.45 and operative paragraph 5 of A/37/L.47, it is the understanding of my delegation that these paragraphs refer to the Israeli-occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip. We support the establishment of a Palestine homeland in these territories and cannot accept the annexation of territories occupied by force by Israel. My delegation fully supports the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, particularly resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which established the fundamental basis for a stable and lasting peace in the Middle East. A key element in the search for a lasting peace would be the recognition of the right of all States in the region, including Israel, to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force.

37. Mr. KERGIN (Canada): This important debate will doubtless end in the adoption of four and possibly more resolutions which must now be added to the long list of resolutions on this subject since the question of Palestine was first included in the agenda of the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session, in 1974. These resolutions deal with the tragedy of peoples that are caught in the vicious cycle of conflict; their repetition over the years is due to the failure of the parties concerned to engage in productive dialogue and negotiation; their result is to lead the United Nations to spawn a proliferation of documents, reports, new infrastructures, projects and work programmes. Yet, despite all the intense effort involved and the adoption of these resolutions by large majorities each year, an end to this tragic situation continues to elude our grasp.

38. I should like to make a general comment on the draft resolutions before us, specifically the various

references to the rights of the Palestinians. As is well known, my Government has maintained that both the Israelis and the Palestinians have legitimate rights and concerns that must be taken into account in any settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Among the most important Palestinian rights, in our opinion, is the right to a homeland within a clearly defined territory, the West Bank and Gaza Strip. However, my Government holds the view that the nature of the homeland and its relations to its neighbours should be decided by the parties to the dispute through negotiation. We oppose attempts to prejudge the outcome of negotiations by, on the one hand, actions on the ground—such as Israeli settlements—and, on the other, one-sided resolutions in international forums, such as some of the texts before the Assembly today.

39. We cannot, therefore, subscribe to resolutions which attempt in various degrees to commit the Assembly to one or other of the options open to the parties to the negotiations that will eventually have to take place to settle this dispute. In the cases before us, we cannot support all the recommendations in the report of the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, as is suggested in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/37/L.44, even though we have no objection to some of them. Nor can we support the objective of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine which the Preparatory Committee has recommended, as is suggested in operative paragraph 2 of the same text; nor reaffirmations of certain political objectives, such as are contained in the omnibus draft resolution A/37/L.45, as originally presented, and in the new draft resolution A/37/L.47, which is especially devoted to the establishment of an independent Arab State in Palestine.

40. On draft resolution A/37/L.45 as we have it before us now, I should like to commend the sponsors for the step forward they have taken by including in the fourth preambular paragraph the reference to "the right to existence and to security of all the States in the region". My delegation interprets the reference to include the State of Israel and, under this interpretation, applauds the sponsors for this constructive addition, which we hope will be built on in the future and will be included in future resolutions.

41. Having said that, I must add that it is the view of my Government that the basis of the eventual settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute lies in the principles so painstakingly worked out in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). Demands that "Israel should withdraw completely and unconditionally from all the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since June 1967", contained in draft resolution A/37/L.45 as currently drafted, do not, in our view, reflect the spirit or letter of resolution 242 (1967) and, as such, will not promote a negotiated settlement. We cannot, therefore, endorse them, even though we fully agree that withdrawal of Israeli forces must be a key element in any settlement. We regard the repeated assertions by Israeli spokesmen that Israel will never withdraw from the occupied territories as very unhelpful to the peace process.

42. The same remarks, of course, apply to draft resolution A/37/L.47. I should add with regard to that draft resolution that we find the reference, at this time,



to implementation of the 1947 partition plan inappropriate.

43. Regarding draft resolution A/37/L.43, we continue to have reservations regarding both the usefulness and the appropriateness of the activities to be undertaken by the Division for Palestinian Rights.

44. In the light of the foregoing considerations, my delegation will abstain on draft resolutions A/37/L.42 and L.44 and will vote against draft resolutions A/37/L.43 and L.47. We shall wait to see if a new text of draft resolution A/37/L.45 emerges and decide our vote then in accordance with the remarks I have made in this statement.

45. Mr. MONTEIRO (Portugal): During the recent debate on the question of Palestine, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Portugal stated:

"The position of my Government on this issue is based on three fundamental principles of our foreign policy: first, respect for human rights; secondly, the implementation of the right to self-determination; and, finally, the condemnation of all forms of armed intervention in territories that face internal political instability." [85th meeting, para. 34.]

This definition of the Portuguese Government's position concerning the question of Palestine leads my delegation to support draft resolutions A/37/L.42 to L.44.

46. With reference to draft resolution A/37/L.45 as it stands now, I should like to underline the importance of the preamble, and particularly the fourth preambular paragraph. It is the view of the Portuguese Government that, of all the directives issued from the Assembly, two principles emerge that are fundamental to the solution of the question of Palestine: the right of all peoples of the region, including Israel, to live in peace and security within internationally recognized boundaries, and recognition of the right of the Palestinian people freely to determine their future.

47. We regret that we shall have to abstain on draft resolution A/37/L.47, owing to procedural and conceptual reservations in relation to operative paragraphs 4 and 5.

48. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): The question of Palestine continues to be at the core of the Middle East problem and a threat to world peace and security. It is a deplorable fact that Israel still defies world opinion in continuing its illegal presence in the Palestinian and the other Arab territories occupied since 1967, thereby forcing countless numbers of the Palestinian people to become homeless. Moreover, the recent situation in Lebanon has further highlighted the tragic plight of the Palestinian people. Such unilateral acts carried out by the occupying Power as the establishment of settlements in the occupied territories, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations, international law and the relevant United Nations resolutions, have further undermined the prospects for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. It is the position of Thailand also not to recognize Israel's annexation of Jerusalem or the claim for it to become Israel's capital. It also considers any change in the legal or demographic status of the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, as being contrary to United

Nations resolutions and not in conformity with international law.

49. My delegation's position on the question of Palestine has been consistently repeated and is on record. Thailand fully supports the framework for a comprehensive, peaceful settlement as contained in the various relevant United Nations resolutions—namely, the immediate and unconditional withdrawal by Israel from all occupied territories, including Jerusalem, and the recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination without external interference and to national independence and statehood, and their right to return to their homes and properties.

50. It is my delegation's firm belief that the solution of the question of Palestine must be found through a peaceful negotiated settlement with the participation of all concerned, including the PLO, as the sole representative of the Palestinian people.

51. At the same time as the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people are recognized, including the right to statehood, the legitimate right of the State of Israel to exist within secure and recognized borders must also be recognized.

52. In the light of the foregoing, therefore, my delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions on this question now being put to the vote and would be able to support draft resolution A/37/L.45 if it were also put to the vote today.

53. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The Assembly has before it four draft resolutions under agenda item 31. Taken together, they are purposely calculated by their sponsors to sabotage the peaceful solution of the Arab-Israel conflict. All these draft resolutions engage in undisguised political warfare against a Member State of the Organization, are detrimental to the very idea of conciliation and degrade the high purpose of the United Nations, if not its current status. They should therefore be rejected.

54. The guiding theme of these draft resolutions has been inspired by the so-called Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. From its very inception and from the time it submitted its first recommendations six years ago, that Committee has pursued a policy which is both utterly biased and irresponsible. It has placed itself at the disposal of international terrorism and has become its tool and proxy mouthpiece in the Assembly. Any lingering doubt that might still have existed in this regard must surely have been dispelled last week when the Chairman of the Committee in question had the audacity to refer to the Negev, which comprises more than half of Israel's territory, as a territory "occupied" by Israel, thus fully identifying himself with the pernicious thesis that Israel is an entity without rights and, in fact, without territory of its own. This thesis, it may have been noted, was also fully illustrated in the obliteration of Israel from the map displayed in the exhibition which the PLO recently had the temerity to stage in this building under the auspices of the Organization, and more specifically of the notorious PLO committee.

55. On the basis of past performance, the Chairman and members of the Committee will presumably con-

tinue to engage in innumerable junkets to distant parts of the world. This, of course, will again be done not at the expense of the Arab oil producers or of the terrorist organization in question, but on the current account of and at the expense of the international taxpayer, that is, in practical terms, at the expense of the taxpayers in those countries which contribute the bulk of the United Nations budget and which have consistently voted against the activities of the Committee as a waste of money. It would seem that it is the inalienable right of the members of the PLO committee to be rewarded with inalienable travel facilities on the flimsiest of pretexts. That the United Nations should also bury its head in the sands of "non-recognition of" and "non-negotiation with" Israel continues to be patently absurd.

56. Draft resolution A/37/L.44 provides for an "International Conference on the Question of Palestine", another act of narcissistic excess, with a great deal of valuable money blown away on sightseeing excursions by various PLO propagandists and their fellow travelers. The financial implications of this junket of the United Nations to Paris are of the order of \$5.7 million. To recall a popular motto of the Second World War, "Is this journey really necessary?"

57. Draft resolution A/37/L.43 should be seen in the same light. The unjustified upgrading of an illegitimate unit into a division of the Secretariat would be a heavy drain on the resources of the Organization at the best of times; it is particularly so at a time of severe financial constraint, quite apart from the fact that it also severely compromises the standing and integrity of the Secretariat.

58. Today is the thirty-fourth anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In an era when grave problems of human rights, of repression and oppression occur all around the globe, greater attention should have been paid to the festering sore of Afghanistan and other similar problems in countries like Kampuchea, Syria, Iraq and Libya, rather than catering to the anti-Israel whims and obsessions in the Assembly. Draft resolution A/37/L.43 demonstrates clearly the imposition of the Arab sense of self-righteousness on the Assembly, as well as the diversionary tactics of the supporters of Israel's enemies.

59. It is unjustified to continue the drainage of the financial resources of the United Nations into an illegitimate and completely superfluous division of the Secretariat when other, by far more important and urgent, tasks are left unattended.

60. Draft resolution A/37/L.47 attempts, in fact, to set back the clock of history 35 years. As I have already had occasion to point out to the Assembly, the Arabs cannot now ask for what they destroyed by armed force in 1947 and 1948. The spurned proposals of General Assembly resolution 181 (II) cannot now be resurrected into a reality of 1982. The fact that the Arabs failed in their armed aggression aimed at destroying Israel in 1948 does not and cannot legitimize their violation of international law. At the same time, that armed aggression precludes them from invoking now in any form the benefits of the General Assembly resolution which they both rejected and violently wiped from the slate of history.

61. Those points are equally true for draft resolution A/37/L.42. For 23 years, the Arab world ignored the "Question of Palestine". In 1974, following the defeat of the Arab aggression of 1973, they brought this question back to the United Nations, resolved to continue the path of war by other means. In doing so, they thus once again set back the course of conciliation and the achievement of peace between Israel and its Arab neighbours.

62. It goes without saying that all these draft resolutions deliberately ignore the inalienable rights of the State of Israel and of the Jewish people. Hence, in this way also, they violate the United Nations Charter and are thus devoid of any validity. It is only fitting to emphasize these inalienable rights of the Jewish people to self-determination, sovereignty and independence in the Land of Israel on the day on which the people of Israel and the Jewish people around the world usher in the festival of Chanukah. Chanukah commemorates the victory of the Maccabees 22 centuries ago over a foreign empire of another age. Had the Maccabees lived today, no doubt they would have been condemned by the numerical majority as Zionists for taking a stand against imperialism. But the Jewish people for over 2,000 years have been commemorating the victory of the Maccabees, the defenders of their rights and the avengers of their wrongs, and celebrate the victory of the weak over the strong and of the few over the many. This is the strength of the Jewish people, deriving from its unswerving attachment to its land, the Land of Israel. Many foreign empires have ruled over that land. They have come and gone. They have been vanquished and they have vanished from the face of the earth. But one small nation, more ancient still, has outlived them all and today again enjoys national sovereignty in its patrimony. That nation will not waver and will not falter in the face of obscenities, rhetorical abuse and condemnation in this Hall. The paroxysms of hatred against my people in this building cannot and will not hurt the Jewish people, but they will further erode whatever little respect, resonance and prestige the United Nations may still enjoy.

63. Israel requests all fair-minded States to see these draft resolutions for what they really are and to dissociate themselves from aiding in the promotion of Arab warfare against the State of Israel by rejecting them with the opprobrium they deserve. For our part, we reserve our right to explain in due course our vote on draft resolution A/37/L.45.

64. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now take decisions on the various draft resolutions before it. We turn first to draft resolution A/37/L.42 and Add.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Demo-

cratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:* Israel, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Australia, Austria, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 119 votes to 2, with 21 abstentions (resolution 37/86 A).<sup>4</sup>*

65. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/37/L.43 and Add.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:* Canada, Israel, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Australia, Austria, Belgium, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal

Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 121 votes to 3, with 18 abstentions (resolution 37/86 B).<sup>4</sup>*

66. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution A/37/L.44 and Add.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:* Israel, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 123 votes to 2, with 17 abstentions (resolution 37/86 C).<sup>4</sup>*

67. The PRESIDENT: In connection with draft resolution A/37/L.45 and Add.1, I wish to remind representatives that the representative of Malta, in his statement this morning, requested, on behalf of the sponsors, that voting on this draft resolution not be taken today.

68. We therefore turn now to draft resolution A/37/L.47. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El

Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:* Canada, Costa Rica, Israel, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Australia, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 113 votes to 4, with 23 abstentions (resolution 37/86 D).<sup>4</sup>*

69. The PRESIDENT: I now call on those representatives wishing to explain their vote.

70. Mr. NISIBORI (Japan): I should like briefly to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/37/L.47, which has just been adopted.

71. Although my Government holds the view that the right to establish an independent State is included in the concept of the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people, my delegation was obliged to abstain in the vote on that draft resolution because it does not refer to Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). Furthermore, we do not believe that this is a well-balanced draft resolution since it neither specifies the geographical area of the proposed independent State nor refers to Israel's right to exist.

72. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): I wish to explain my delegation's negative votes on the draft resolutions that were submitted.

73. In his recent report on the work of the Organization, the Secretary-General drew attention to "what are productive and what are counter-productive approaches to the different aspects of our work". He went on to observe that:

"... a parliamentary debate may generate rhetoric, and sometimes even a touch of acrimony. But negotiations and the resolution of urgent problems require a different approach. Debate without effective action erodes the credibility of the Organization... It is insufficient to indulge in a course of action that merely tends to strengthen extreme positions." [See A/37/1, p. 4.]

74. Probably no other agenda items have generated more rhetoric of a more acrimonious nature than the items on the situation in the Middle East and the ques-

tion of Palestine. Few debates in the Assembly have contributed less to solutions of the problems dealt with than those two agenda items. Few debates have led to less effective action or to a greater erosion of the credibility of the United Nations or to more extreme positions than have the debates on these items.

75. Are we doomed to continue endlessly the fruitless debates of the past three and a half decades on these matters—debates which, indeed, have not been just fruitless but, to borrow the Secretary-General's words, have been decidedly counter-productive, adding annual coatings of new concrete to the rigid positions of opponents and thereby ensuring against any flexibility in those positions? Is it too much to hope that the Organization might handle disputes in such a way that all parties involved are satisfied that their genuine concerns have been adequately taken into account and are therefore prepared to work with other interested parties in an atmosphere of understanding, accommodation and compromise to bring about a solution of the problems?

76. Unfortunately, these are attributes which have been conspicuous by their absence in this year's debates on the question of Palestine and the situation in the Middle East and in the draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 31. The debates and the draft resolutions, instead of reflecting efforts to seek new approaches and new language that might bring the various interested parties together in the search for peace, have instead repeated language which, however satisfying to the speakers in rhetorical resonance, is clearly unacceptable to one or more of the interested parties. All too frequently, one encounters in draft resolutions language known to be anathema to one or another interested party and therefore perhaps not just inserted to score a debating point but quite possibly deliberately intended to prevent one or another delegation from moving from the "No" column to the "Abstain" or "Yes" column. Such practices can only help to solidify antagonism and strengthen the tendency, regretted by the Secretary-General in his report, for the Organization to be "set aside or rebuffed... in situations in which it should, and could, have played an important and constructive role" [*ibid.*].

77. There are instances of exceptions to these unhelpful practices. For example, we have taken note of the absence from draft resolutions submitted so far this year of condemnation of "all partial agreements and separate treaties". We should like to think that this represents recognition of the substantial advance effected by the Camp David accords in moving matters along the road towards an eventual comprehensive settlement. Pejorative mention of agreements on strategic co-operation have also failed so far to appear in this year's documentation. We appreciate these changes and are hopeful that they represent the beginning of a more generalized effort at accommodation. We have also been pleased to hear, in the course of the debates on these items, favourable mention of the proposals made on 1 September 1982 by President Reagan.<sup>3</sup> We hope for continued growth and recognition of the positive contributions we feel we have made and plan to continue to make in this area.

78. Turning to the draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 31, we find that the first three—A/37/



L.42, L.43 and L.44—deal with three entities of recent creation whose functions appear to contribute not to solutions to the complex problems of the area but to increasing the level of solution-inhibiting acrimony which surrounds them. One such entity is the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, whose report this year confirms our fears about this entity's partisan and therefore unhelpful nature. Another is the Division for Palestinian Rights, promoted from Special Unit for no merit apparent to us. It is a slight improvement that this year's resolution eliminates mention of specific tasks for this "division" to accomplish. But it is regrettable that this entity has been perpetuated at all, since its sole function in the past has been to generate a great deal of acrimonious and increasingly irrelevant rhetoric. It is doubly regrettable that the Assembly has again endorsed an international conference on the question of Palestine, a propaganda exercise that can only foster continuing animosity and confrontation.

79. Almost all the parties involved in the Arab-Israeli dispute have acknowledged that the path to peace and a realization of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people must lie through negotiations among the concerned parties. The commitment of the United States to resolve this issue through negotiations is well known. It was set forth boldly in President Reagan's statement of 1 September 1982, and it is unfortunate that the proposed conference on the question of Palestine will divert diplomatic energies from the real task of compromise and accommodation.

80. The other two draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 31—A/37/L.45 and L.47—seek to deal with the broad issues of a Middle East peace. As originally submitted, draft resolution A/37/L.45 has a number of elements the appearance of which in the deliberative history of this issue we welcome. For instance, we welcome the fourth preambular paragraph, and particularly its emphasis on the right to existence and to security of all the States in the region, and justice and security for all the peoples. We also welcome the emphasis on the need for negotiations aimed at a comprehensive, just and lasting peace. However, there is a contradiction in calling for negotiations and at the same time adopting a one-sided, inflexible position—as is done in both draft resolutions A/37/L.45 and L.47—regarding the outcome of those negotiations by reaffirming the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and prejudging the outcome of an act of self-determination.

81. Draft resolution A/37/L.47, in particular, seeks to define in advance the nature of the ultimate Middle East solution, when realistically this can only come through negotiations of the parties. It speaks of the need for an "unconditional" Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories, and it asks the Security Council to establish a plan, including an independent Palestinian State. In fact, Israeli withdrawal will be part of a comprehensive peace worked out by the parties in accordance with the principles of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). The Council, at this juncture, cannot and should not dictate the final outcome of those negotiations. Furthermore, there is a decided lack of balance in both of the draft resolutions, making demands on and ascribing sinister motives to one party, while affirming alleged rights of another party and

failing to call upon any other party to make the concession necessary to enable negotiations to commence. And finally, of course, for reasons stated above, we strenuously oppose the endorsement of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, which we feel can only add to the difficulties of negotiating the issues.

82. We look forward to the day when debates and resolutions on these issues in the General Assembly will be designed to improve the atmosphere for rational, calm discussion and thus facilitate compromise. Until that time comes, we feel it will serve no genuinely useful purpose for us to support resolutions which cannot promote solutions to problems but can indeed inhibit solutions.

83. Mr. SKOGMO (Norway): The Norwegian delegation abstained in the voting on all the draft resolutions before us on the question of Palestine. In this connection, I should like to stress the following points which remain at the core of my country's position on the Palestinian issue.

84. First, Norway stands firm on the principles of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). The rights of all States, including Israel, to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized boundaries is a vital element in this context. We are particularly glad to see this principle explicitly mentioned in one of the draft resolutions submitted to the General Assembly on this item.

85. Secondly, Norway has long been on record as supporting the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination. In our opinion, this principle must be transformed into reality through a process of negotiation between the parties concerned.

86. Thirdly, I should like to stress that the four draft resolutions, taken as a whole, do not reflect the mutual balance between the interests of the parties which, in the opinion of my Government, would be necessary to achieve a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

87. Mr. BURWIN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/37/L.42 to L.44 and L.47. At this stage, we wish to explain our votes and mention that they were based on reservations concerning certain paragraphs in the draft resolutions which we in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya do not accept—references to General Assembly resolutions 181 (II) and 194 (III). We also oppose any other reference which may, directly or indirectly, be construed to imply recognition of the Zionist entity, because it is an expansionist, terrorist, racist entity that does not respect human rights. For our part, we reaffirm respect for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people in Palestine.

88. Mr. ARAPI (Albania): In accordance with the well-known position of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania in support of the just cause and the liberation struggle of the Palestinian people, the Albanian delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/37/L.42 to L.44 and L.47. However, my delegation would repeat that it has reservations on some paragraphs and provisions of those draft resolutions. We made those reservations known in the past at the time of the adoption of the previous resolutions to which those just adopted

refer. Our delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.47 with some difficulty. That text, among other things, refers, without making clear the distinctions, to "the relevant resolutions of the United Nations", which, as we know, are numerous and different. It also mentions, without any specific definition, implementation of the plan for settling the Palestinian question.

89. My delegation has always made clear that the Socialist People's Republic of Albania disagrees with or has reservations on some resolutions adopted in the past in the framework of the United Nations in connection with the Palestinian question and the Middle East, as well as on the various plans presented within and outside the United Nations system.

90. Therefore, the Albanian delegation wants to make clear that although it voted in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.47 out of support for its main thrust, we have our own opinions and reservations with regard to some parts of the text, and specifically to operative paragraphs 1 and 5.

91. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic voted in favour of the various draft resolutions that have just been adopted. Nevertheless, we should like to clarify our understanding of draft resolution A/37/L.44. The understanding of my delegation of the third preambular paragraph and of operative paragraph 1 is that the establishment of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East must be based on two fundamental and inseparable principles: first, the Palestinian people must be allowed to exercise their legitimate rights, as stipulated in General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX) and other relevant resolutions, including their right to self-determination and their right to return to Palestine and to set up their national State there; secondly, the need to compel Israel to withdraw completely and unconditionally from all occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem.

92. We wish to draw the attention of the Assembly to operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of draft resolution A/37/L.47. Paragraph 2 reaffirms the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force; paragraph 3 reaffirms once again that a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East cannot be established without the unconditional withdrawal of Israel from the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and without the exercise and attainment by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights in Palestine in accordance with the principles of the Charter and the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

93. What I also wanted to say is that there is a strong link between draft resolutions A/37/L.44 and A/37/L.47. We interpret draft resolution A/37/L.44 in the light of operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of draft resolution A/37/L.47.

94. Miss SENCIÓN (Dominican Republic) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to postpone its explanation of vote until the Assembly knows the content of draft resolution A/37/L.45.

95. Mr. URBINA ORTEGA (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Costa Rica abstained in the vote on draft resolutions A/37/L.42 to L.44 because our Government cannot approve the

work done by the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the Division for Palestinian Rights, both of which, we understand, were created fundamentally to contribute to bringing about a lasting peace in the region.

96. With regard to the work of the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Costa Rica voted in favour of the convening of that Conference, but we have noted with surprise that the work of the Committee seems to be proceeding in such a way as not only not to contribute to peace in the region but also to tend to exacerbate tensions there.

97. Finally, our delegation voted against draft resolution A/37/L.47 because we thought that the Assembly was calling on one of the parties to withdraw unconditionally, and this is interference with the work of the Security Council and is not in line with the search for a constructive solution within the framework of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

98. Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolutions on the question of Palestine, but this must not be taken to prejudge the basic policy pursued by my Government on that question, which we have reiterated on many occasions. Our position on the problem is well known.

99. Democratic Yemen reaffirms that the question of Palestine is the core of the Middle East conflict and that no just and lasting peace in the Middle East region can be achieved without complete Israeli withdrawal from the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories and the restoration of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to return to its homeland, its right to self-determination and its right to establish its independent national State on its national soil, under the leadership of the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

100. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): The fact that my delegation voted in favour of draft resolutions A/37/L.42 to L.44 and L.47 does not indicate any change in my Government's position on the question of Palestine. We simply believe that Israel is not a State; it is a political forgery which must be removed. The sovereignty of the State of Palestine must be restored in the whole of the occupied land, part of which is illegally called Israel.

101. As my delegation understands it, the establishment of justice and lasting peace in the Middle East simply implies the elimination of the result of the original aggression, which was the illicit creation of the Zionist base in the area. My delegation strongly condemns all forms of conspiracy on the Camp David model against the Palestinian people or against other Muslims in the area.

102. Mr. SALONEN (Finland): Finland's position on the question of Palestine is well known. The need to reach a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East through negotiation is imperative. In our opinion, such a solution must be based on Security Council resolution 242 (1967). The right of every State in the area, including Israel, to live within secure and internationally recognized boundaries must be guaranteed.

103. At the same time, Israel must withdraw from Arab territories occupied since 1967. Simultaneously, the legitimate rights of the Palestinians, including their right to national self-determination, must be fully taken into account.

104. The PLO, as the most significant representative of the Palestinian people, must be given the right to participate in all negotiations on that people's own future, within the framework of a comprehensive settlement.

105. Unfortunately, the draft resolutions on which we have just voted fail to represent the kind of balance which Finland considers to be a prerequisite for a negotiated settlement. We therefore had to abstain on them when they were put to the vote.

106. I would add that we would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.45 in its present form in spite of our reservations concerning operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5, because of its main thrust as expressed in operative paragraph 6, which calls for negotiations aimed at a comprehensive peace. We regret that that draft resolution was not put to the vote.

107. Mr. GHIKAS (Greece): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/37/L.47 because of the wording of paragraph 5. The position of the Greek Government with regard to the question of Palestine remains crystal clear and unchanged, and as it has been formally stated on many occasions—that is, we support the establishment of an independent State of Palestine in accordance with the inalienable right to self-determination of the Palestinian people. At the same time, the Greek Government maintains that Israel should live sovereign and secure within the boundaries which had been shaped before 1967.

108. At this juncture, I should like to stress that on this matter the Greek Government has consistently followed a realistic policy aimed at a solution of the Palestinian problem, which has been pending for so long, in accordance with the principle of self-determination, with all its implications, thus contributing also to the efforts to restore peace in that troubled area.

109. The PRESIDENT: The observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization has asked to make a statement. I call on him in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX) of 22 November 1974.

110. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Once again, the international community has come out in this Hall very clearly for peace in the Middle East and we have seen, as Christmas draws near, the beautiful green lights on the voting display despite the fact that the two permanent obstacles to peace have repeated and reaffirmed their positions. I am referring to the two red lights resulting from the votes of the representatives of the United States and Tel Aviv.

111. The fact that all those draft resolutions were adopted by at least a 30 to 1 majority of votes affirms that we are on the right path. I shall not go into the details of any of those draft resolutions. We have heard in the Assembly some excuses by representatives that they could not vote in favour of the establishment of a Palestinian State in Palestine because the borders of that State have not been delineated or spelled out. But those same people who have resorted to that excuse have established what they call good relations—political, economic and military relations—with those

people in Tel Aviv who have refused so far to present a constitution to this Assembly and to tell us what their borders are.

112. We recall that in 1947 the General Assembly requested that both the Arab Palestinian Government and the Jewish Government in Palestine present a constitution and safeguards for their citizens before their applications for membership could be considered. In the case of Israel, the Assembly has so far failed to get a response, yet the Assembly ignored its own request and considered and accepted the application of Israel despite the fact that those pre-conditions were not met. Even now, the frontiers are not mentioned in draft resolution A/37/L.47.

113. Are we practising some type of selectivity regarding the criteria or are we really on the path towards peace, a path which, according to them, excludes the Palestinian people?

114. I can understand the concern of many representatives who claim that there is no reference to the right of States to live within secure and recognized boundaries. Again, perhaps that is a challenge to the Assembly. What are the recognized boundaries of Israel? The other day we had a map of Palestine as it is known to the United Nations. That is the only map of Palestine that we know of. If the Assembly can produce another map of Palestine, then perhaps we can consider it. But we cannot really undertake to guarantee the security of anybody within recognized boundaries until they tell us what those boundaries are. Since that monster called Israel was created by the United Nations with some boundaries, I wonder whether the Assembly will keep to its word and commitment and maintain that monster in its cage, that is, within the boundaries that were outlined in 1947.

115. We are not insisting on anything. We are just saying: "Let the Palestinians enjoy their rights and have their own State in any part of their country". We are not demanding that the United Nations should go beyond that. Yet we are faced again with people who cannot make up their minds and who tell us that they are concerned about the secure and recognized boundaries of Israel. Are they not really concerned about the security and the lives of the Palestinian people? After all, the item is entitled "Question of Palestine" and that question, basically, is a question of human beings: it is a question of people; it is not a question of a few yards to the east or to the west but of what to do with 4.5 million Palestinians. Are they to be condemned to perpetual exile?

116. Then we are told that some work in the Secretariat is a drain on the resources of the United Nations. I wonder whether people are thinking of the hundreds of millions of dollars that the United Nations, that the taxpayers of the world, are paying to send a United Nations peace-keeping force to the area as a result of Israel's aggression, violations and acts of genocide. Are we thinking in terms of \$5.8 million or should we think more constructively of how to make it unnecessary to have that tremendous budget of hundreds of millions of dollars for what is known as the peace-keeping force, where Israel has been the violator and Israel has constantly been condemned? Yet the representative of the United States has reminded us of the regret expressed by the Secretary-General that the

Organization has been ignored or rebutted in situations in which it should and could have played an important and constructive role.

117. Shall I recall the summer of 1982, when the United States cast a negative vote in the Security Council every time there was an attempt to bring the war in Lebanon to an end. Every time it was suggested that the United Nations should send not forces but only observers, the United States representative used his veto to prevent the Council from taking action. Let us call a spade a spade. Who prevented the Security Council from taking action?

118. What was really more disastrous was the statement by the representative of the United States that his delegation had to cast a negative vote because there was no reference to the elimination of Palestinian armed elements—elimination of people, Sir. I cannot imagine anything more fascistic, more anti-human; yet a United Nations force to bring the war to an end was vetoed, being replaced by a multinational force, a force which by neglect of its duties and undertakings led to the holocaust of Sabra and Shatila. Such are the undertakings of the multinational force, and particularly and specifically of the Government of the United States, which obstructed the work of the Security Council, in order to send those Marines to prepare the ground for the holocaust in Sabra and Shatila. How can they think in those terms? I wonder.

119. The United States attacks the idea of an international conference on the question of Palestine and at the same time says, "Let us deal with the matter through negotiations". We read this to mean that the United States is obsessed with omnipotence and not with negotiations. It wants to have a Pax Americana in the Middle East.

120. But the people of Palestine will continue in their fight and their struggle to regain their rights to bring peace and to live in peace in their own homes in Palestine.

121. We are told that President Reagan's statement of 1 September was a bold programme that might bring

peace. I wonder if I might be permitted to ask in this Assembly: "Who rejected Reagan's statement of 1 September? What was the reply of those spoiled babies of Washington?" More settlements; that was the affront that President Reagan received. Not one word was said about the response of Tel Aviv to Reagan's statement, and yet it was a statement by Mr. Reagan designed to undermine the Fez plan.

122. We hear some objection to the draft resolution because it speaks of the need for an unconditional Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories. But, after all, if we permit military conquest to be the order of the day, there is no sense in the dictum, the principle, confirming the inadmissibility of conquest. It is proposed here to allow those who have made conquests to impose conditions—that is what the United States feels like doing. It is objecting to the word "unconditional". What does it want? Does it want the people to say that they accept the Israeli conquest?

123. Finally, there is a misquotation by the United States representative—I wonder if it is a malicious misquotation—when it says that the draft resolution asks the Security Council to establish a plan. No, Sir: it asks the Security Council to implement a plan, a plan which, if I may say so, was forced on this Assembly in 1947 thanks to the efforts of the United States. The words are not "to establish" but "to implement".

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1980*, document S/14009.

<sup>2</sup> See A/C.5/37/64, annex, table 1.

<sup>3</sup> See *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1982), vol. 18, No. 35, p. 1081.

<sup>4</sup> The delegations of Bolivia, Samoa, Seychelles, and Trinidad and Tobago subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.