



President: Mr. Imre HOLLAI (Hungary).

AGENDA ITEM 31

Question of Palestine (concluded):*

- (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 Assembly will resume its consideration of agenda item 31 in order to proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1, which was circulated on 17 December.

2. I call on the representative of Senegal to introduce the revised draft resolution.

3. Mr. SARRÉ (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): I shall be very brief. Two weeks ago, in submitting to the Assembly draft resolution A/37/L.45, I stressed, on behalf of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, certain pre-conditions which should be met if we really want to bring about a just, stable and lasting peace for all the States in the region. These pre-conditions are, essentially, the participation of all interested parties in negotiations, respect for international laws and conventions with regard to occupation, withdrawal by Israel from all the occupied Arab territories and, finally, the role of the Security Council in the process of the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories.

4. As I pointed out at the 84th meeting, when I had the honour of introducing the report of the Committee on its activities in 1982 [A/37/35], the various approaches and initiatives in 1982 relating to the question of Palestine were taken into account in the preparation of the draft resolution. It was on the basis of all those approaches and initiatives, and also on the basis of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, that the Committee believed that it should prepare draft resolution A/37/L.45.

5. Since its submission, there have been negotiations with various parties concerned in the matter, and in the light of the views expressed by them, and particularly in the light of the primary objective, which is the restoration of peace in the Middle East, we have revised the draft resolution. The revised text is now before the Assembly in document A/37/L.45/Rev.1, which will be voted upon shortly.

6. In comparison with the earlier text, there are not any great changes. The substance remains the same as regards the pre-conditions which have to be met and the appropriate and adequate process which would enable all the parties concerned to restrain their emotions and settle their differences once and for all, and attempt, in a spirit of peace and co-operation, to make joint efforts to bring about a final settlement of this question.

7. In comparison with the earlier text, the few changes relate to paragraph 6, under which the General Assembly would urgently call for the achievement of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace, based on the resolutions of the United Nations and under its auspices, in which all parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO], the representative of the Palestinian people, would participate on an equal footing.

8. On all the other points, the provisions in the revised draft resolution remain the same.

9. I am convinced that, following the broad consultations held with all the parties concerned, this text which we have presented—with, as I have said, the sole objective of restoring peace and stability in the Middle East—will be widely supported by the Assembly.

10. The PRESIDENT: I remind representatives that the debate on this item was concluded at the 89th plenary meeting, on 2 December.

11. I shall therefore now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting.

12. 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". I also remind the Assembly that statements in explanation of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by representatives from their seats.

13. Mr. HØJERSHOLT (Denmark): I speak on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community in explanation of their vote on draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1.

14. In their common explanation of vote on the resolutions already adopted under this item, the Ten once more set out the principles which, in their view, provide the basis for a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute, and made clear that, in taking a position on the resolutions presented, they were guided by these principles, to which they all adhere.

15. Draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1, like General Assembly resolution 37/86 D already adopted, addresses itself to different important aspects of the

* Resumed from the 99th meeting.

question of a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute. The Ten very much welcome the efforts made in this draft resolution to introduce new elements which reflect a more balanced approach to the solution of the Middle East conflict. In the view of the Ten, it would be an important step forward in the consideration of these issues in the General Assembly if the sponsors of draft resolutions under this and other Middle East items would adopt the same approach. At the same time, 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 attach particular importance to the reference in the fourth preambular paragraph to the right of all States in the region to existence within internationally recognized boundaries. The Ten hold that this reference must include Israel. They would therefore have preferred the reference in the draft resolution to be to the right to existence and security of all the States in the region, including Israel, which, in their view, constitutes one of the essential principles for a peaceful solution to the Middle East dispute. Also, they would have liked to see the explicit reference to negotiations in operative paragraph 6 of the original text retained.

16. Mrs. TAVARES de ALVAREZ (Dominican Republic) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Dominican Republic will vote in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1 on the understanding that we consider it indispensable that Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) be respected. For the Government of the Dominican Republic, compliance with the provisions of those resolutions is fundamental to any just solution to the question of Palestine.

17. Regarding the future of the Palestinian people, we support its right to self-determination, which implies—if, indeed, that is its sovereign decision—the establishment of a sovereign State.

18. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): At this session, as in the past, the delegation of Albania has repeatedly expressed the firm support of its people and Government for the inalienable national rights and the just struggle of the Palestinian people.

19. In keeping with that attitude, our delegation voted in favour of the four draft resolutions on the question of Palestine which were adopted by the Assembly [A/37/L.42 and Add.1 to L.44 and Add.1, and L.49 and Add.1] at its 99th meeting.

20. Now, the Assembly is to take a decision on the last remaining draft resolution on this question [A/37/L.45/Rev.1]. Our delegation wishes to state that it will not participate in the voting.

21. This draft resolution contains a number of correct and important ideas, requests and factual statements which we support—particularly those which advocate the need to restore the national rights of the Palestinian people and to solve the Palestinian question as soon as possible.

22. But it also contains certain provisions which we cannot support because they include elements that we find inaccurate in certain cases and complicated in others. The text refers to numerous past resolutions and documents. That creates difficulty for us

because we disapprove of some of those documents and have reservations about others. We also think that the draft resolution before us contains provisions which could be interpreted differently as between now and the future and which, by their implications, leave the way open for possibilities that we do not view with favour, including the possibility of creating situations that we have considered and continue to consider unacceptable and harmful.

23. Mr. AL-ZAHAWI (Iraq): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1. However, the fourth preambular paragraph refers to the "right of all States in the region to existence within internationally recognized boundaries". Now, a State, in terms of international law, envisages sovereignty within certain limited and recognized boundaries. It does not apply to an entity bent upon constant expansion at the expense of the rights of the States and the peoples of the region. The Zionist entity has officially rejected the boundaries delineated and recognized by the United Nations for the Jewish State in Palestine—

24. The PRESIDENT: I apologize to the representative of Iraq for interrupting him, but the representative of Israel wishes to speak on a point of order, and I now call on him.

25. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Mr. President, I would request that you instruct the representative of Iraq to refer to States Members of the Organization by their official designation.

26. The PRESIDENT: I would request the representative of Iraq kindly to take that request into consideration.

27. Mr. AL-ZAHAWI (Iraq): I should like to draw to the attention of the Israeli representative—the Zionist representative—that what he claims to be the State of Israel claims boundaries and claims a capital which have not been recognized by the Assembly. He cannot expect to have such an entity imposed upon the United Nations. The boundaries and the capital that it claims for itself have not been recognized by the Assembly. I would be grateful if he would listen and let me continue to explain why this applies to that entity.

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

29. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I was under the impression that we were at the stage of explanations of vote. The representative of Iraq is apparently making a political statement after the debate has been concluded, and I would appreciate it if you, Mr. President, would kindly remind him of this fact.

30. The PRESIDENT: I am sure that the representative of Iraq will take into consideration that we are in the process of explanations of vote. He may continue his statement.

31. Mr. AL-ZAHAWI (Iraq): The Zionist entity has officially rejected the boundaries delineated and recognized by the United Nations for the Jewish State in Palestine. Furthermore, to this day the Zionist entity has refused to define its boundaries. The international community cannot extend recognition to a State which demands *carte blanche* recognition—

32. The PRESIDENT: I am sorry to have to interrupt the representative of Iraq again, but the representative of Israel again wishes to speak on a point of order, and I call on him.

33. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Mr. President, I thought you had reminded the representative of Iraq of his duty to refer to other States Members by their official name. It is regrettable to see that he seems to be flouting your request. Would you be good enough to remind him again of that request?

34. The PRESIDENT: I am sure that the representative of Iraq will confine his remarks to an explanation of vote in a proper manner.

35. Mr. AL-ZAHAWI (Iraq): I am explaining my vote in connection with a preambular paragraph in the draft resolution which refers to "States in the region". I am explaining our position *vis-à-vis* the use of this expression in that paragraph. I would be grateful if I may be allowed to continue to explain our position on the terminology used in this draft resolution.

36. As for the point of order raised by the representative of the Zionist entity, he should listen and be aware of the fact that the Organization does not recognize the boundaries or the capital that that entity claims for itself. In fact, the General Assembly and the Security Council have repeatedly condemned that entity for having made such claims to that capital and those boundaries. It is an aberration and he should not expect his entity to be treated as a normal State in the Organization.

37. The Zionist entity today occupies and has annexed territories far in excess of those officially recognized by the United Nations for the Jewish State. The principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war clearly applies to the territories occupied by the Zionist entity not only in 1967 but also in 1948 and 1949. Israel has not and cannot acquire sovereignty over territory in excess of the territories delineated for the Jewish State by the United Nations.

38. As far as the United Nations is concerned, the Zionist entity's status in all the territories which it has seized in excess of that allotted to it in General Assembly resolution 181 (II)—regardless of the time of their seizure—is that of a belligerent occupant, and it is a settled principle of the law of nations that a belligerent occupant does not acquire sovereignty over territory by the mere fact of occupation. Neither does the lapse of time legitimize Israel's occupation and annexation of territories in excess of those recognized by the United Nations.

39. We wish to place on record that our vote in favour of the draft resolution is to be construed within the context of the Final Declaration adopted on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez [A/37/696, annex].

40. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic will vote in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1 as a whole. But our delegation wishes to place on record its opposition to the fourth preambular paragraph. If a separate vote were taken on that paragraph, our delegation would have no choice but to vote against it, since it does not include the

principle of complete Israeli withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories—a principle which forms the basis for a just and comprehensive solution to the Middle East crisis. Moreover, that paragraph is not in harmony with the Arab position stated on 9 September 1982 at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez. Indeed, it is in contravention of paragraph 7 of the Final Declaration issued by that Conference [*ibid.*]. That Conference defined the Arab position *vis-à-vis* the Middle East crisis and the basic principles for the solution of that problem. In addition, the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution paves the way for recognition of the Zionist entity, which occupies Palestine and has already annexed Jerusalem and the Golan Heights. That racist, fascist entity does not recognize any borders because it plans to expand from the Nile to the Euphrates.

41. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation is going to vote in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1. The affirmative vote by my delegation does not constitute any change in my Government's often-reiterated position on the question of Palestine. We maintain our reservations regarding such objectionable phrases as "all parties" or other phrases which imply or presume a status for the Zionist usurping elements equal to that of the Palestinian people or which imply any legality or legitimacy for the Zionist entity. We support this or any other draft resolutions only in so far as they support the people of Palestine, condemn the Zionist usurpers and recognize the right of the Palestinian people to repatriation and the restoration of their sovereignty over the State of Palestine, which is now under the occupation of an illegitimate forgery called Israel.

42. Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1 because it places primary stress on basic principles concerning the question of Palestine, which is the core of the Middle East conflict. Most important among these principles is the affirmation of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including its rights to return to its homeland, to self-determination and to the establishment of an independent national State on its national soil, under the leadership of the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. The draft resolution also emphasizes the need for Israeli withdrawal from all the occupied Palestinian territories and condemns all the Israeli policies and practices in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories. Regarding the fourth preambular paragraph, my delegation would like to state that our vote does not in any way imply an implicit recognition of Israel, which was established through terrorism and aggression and which continues to exist on the basis of expansionism and racism at the expense of the rights of the Palestinian people and the other Arab peoples.

43. Mr. BLUM (Israel): As I had occasion to point out in the Assembly on 10 December [99th meeting] in explaining Israel's vote on the other resolutions adopted under this agenda item, the purpose of their sponsors is to sabotage the peaceful solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Nowhere does this objective emerge more clearly than in the draft resolution before us today, which, like its companion resolutions adopted 10 days ago, constitutes a transparent attempt at

political warfare against a State Member of the Organization, is detrimental to the very idea of conciliation and degrades the purposes and principles of the United Nations as enshrined in its Charter.

44. The draft resolution before us seeks to isolate, in a selective and deliberately distorted manner, certain elements of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and represents yet another nefarious attempt to undermine the peace process in our region. As is well known, Security Council resolution 242 (1967), together with resolution 338 (1973), constitutes the only agreed basis and framework for a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Resolution 242 (1967) constitutes a balanced whole that cannot be tampered with in any form whatsoever without upsetting that balance.

45. Draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1 before us not only seeks to tamper with Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which incidentally it studiously ignores among the list of previous United Nations resolutions described as relevant in the third preambular paragraph, but also engages in utter distortion of those principles of resolution 242 (1967) which it ostensibly invokes.

46. The Draft resolution 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 a General Assembly resolution which they both rejected and violently wiped from the slate of history.

47. These patent and fundamental defects of the draft resolution before us certainly cannot be cured by the inclusion within the draft of some ostensibly non-controversial provisions, the sole purpose of which is to mislead certain well-intentioned, if not naive, observers of the Middle East scene. The only realistic manner in which to appraise the various provisions of the draft resolution before us is to evaluate the document as a whole. It is only in this way that its individual provisions can be meaningfully interpreted. If this method is applied, as it has to be, it will become clear that the automatic majority at the beck and call of the enemies of Israel and of Arab-Israeli conciliation in this building has again spun, as is its wont, a web of deliberate lies and falsehoods against my country. If anyone was still in need of being reminded of the intentions of those sponsoring the draft resolution before us, such a reminder was supplied by the representatives of the Takritian and Alawite entities in this Hall. I wish to express to them, as well as to the representatives of Iran and Democratic Yemen, our appreciation for their useful words of clarification as to how the draft resolution before us should be construed.

48. Since the draft resolution before us refers to the right of all the States in the region to existence within recognized boundaries, it would have been useful to

hear also from the representative of the Takritian entity where the boundary line between his country and Iran runs. Is it the thalweg of the Shatt-al-Arab? Or is all the Shatt-al-Arab included within the territory of Iraq, and is Khuzistan part of Iraqi territory?

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

50. Mr. AL-ZAHAWI (Iraq): I thought we were engaged in the process of explanations of vote, and not in the extension of this debate not only to include the agenda item before us, the question of Palestine, but also to revert back to other agenda items. The representative of the Zionist entity should further be reminded that his entity is the only one in this Hall whose claimed boundaries have not been recognized by the United Nations and whose claimed capital has not been recognized by the United Nations. He does not stand on an equal footing with the other Members of the General Assembly.

51. The PRESIDENT: I am sure that the representative of Israel will confine his remarks to an explanation of vote.

52. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Before continuing, I should like to inquire whether the intervention of the representative of the Takritian entity was in the nature of a point of order.

53. The PRESIDENT: I ask the representative of Israel to continue with his explanation of vote.

54. Mr. BLUM (Israel): I thought that the Takritian entity was a State in the region and that therefore I had every right to refer to the boundaries of that country. It seems that the representative of the Takritian entity does not regard himself as belonging to a State in the region and, moreover, that he is unwilling to inform the General Assembly whether his country has recognized boundaries.

55. It goes without saying that the draft resolution before the Assembly deliberately ignores the inalienable rights of the State of Israel and of the Jewish people; hence, in this way as well it violates the United Nations Charter and is thus devoid of any validity. Israel requests all fair-minded States to see this draft resolution for what it really is and to disassociate themselves from aiding in the promotion of Arab warfare against the State of Israel by rejecting it with the opprobrium it deserves.

56. Israel will vote against draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1.

57. Mr. ABADA (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): The Algerian delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1, which is a balanced and compromise text. But it is clear that certain provisions of the draft resolution cannot be understood by my delegation except within the context of the position which Algeria has always taken on the Palestinian question. We would particularly like to make clear that the fourth preambular paragraph can only be interpreted within the strict context of the Final Declaration of the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez. Furthermore, we consider that, among the principles accepted by the international community with a view to a just and lasting solution to the question of Palestine, there must necessarily be the total and unconditional withdrawal from the Arab and

Palestinian territories, including Jerusalem, occupied by the forces of the Zionist entity.

58. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, 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, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution was adopted by 123 votes to 2, with 19 abstentions (resolution 37/86 E).¹

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

60. Mr. NISIBORI (Japan): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1. My delegation appreciates the efforts made by the sponsors to moderate the content of the draft resolution. However, since it does not clearly acknowledge Israel's right to exist, nor does it refer to Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which call for a negotiated settlement of the problem, we do not consider it a well-balanced resolution. My delegation was therefore obliged to abstain.

61. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): My Government and the American people are wholly in support of the peace process looking towards a comprehensive settlement of differences in the Middle East. We are not only wholly in support of the peace process: we are in support of the whole peace process—not selectively, not piece-by-piece, not this

element rather than that. We voted against draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1 because it attempts to select in and to select out. In view of the intervention and the outrageous abuse of the patience and good will of this Assembly engaged in by the representative of Iraq, I want in particular to make note of the fact that my delegation applauds the inclusion of language in this draft resolution specifically and explicitly recognizing the right of all States in the region to existence within recognized borders, even as it also recognizes the need to meet the rights and requirements of the Palestinian people.

62. Mr. BLANCO (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Uruguay voted in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1, as it did on draft resolution A/37/L.47, on the understanding that both undoubtedly imply recognition of the right of the State of Israel to exist, like other States in the region, within secure and recognized boundaries, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). My Government considers that these are indispensable elements for any just solution to the question of Palestine.

63. As for the future of the Palestinian people, we consider that the draft resolutions confirm its right to self-determination, which implies, if that is its sovereign decision, the establishment of an independent State in Palestine.

64. With respect to the representation of the Palestinian people, we repeat what has been stated on previous occasions—namely, that such representation should be decided by the Palestinian people in the exercise of its right to self-determination.

65. With regard to the measures recommended in paragraphs 4 and 5 of draft resolution A/37/L.47, they safeguard the competence of the Security Council in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

66. Mr. ELHOFARI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya did not participate in the voting on draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1. This position stems from our firm support for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

67. We feel that the draft resolution does not ensure all the rights of the Palestinian people to regain their usurped land and their right to self-determination. The position of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya with regard to some of the resolutions referred to in the draft resolution is well known. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya objects to General Assembly resolutions 181 (II) and 194 (III). It has already explained its position with regard to those resolutions on more than one occasion.

68. The fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution implies indirect recognition of a racist, aggressive entity based on terrorism and the policy of expansionism. In addition to its warlike usurpation of Palestine, that entity has annexed other Arab territories and is still committing acts of aggression, flouting the will of the international community, which has condemned and denounced its policy of aggression. We feel that the Zionist entity is a racist entity like the racist entity in South Africa and that it must not be accorded any legitimacy.

69. Mr. VAN BOHEMEN (New Zealand): New Zealand voted in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1 because of the positive elements in both its preambular and its operative parts. In particular, my delegation welcomed the fourth preambular paragraph, which recalls the principles of the right to existence within internationally recognized boundaries of all States in the region and of justice and security for all peoples in the region. We should, however, have preferred to see a reaffirmation of those principles in the operative part of the draft resolution.

70. With regard to the operative part, Israel's withdrawal from the territory occupied since 1967, the role of the Security Council in facilitating the peace process, possibly through the further provision of peace-keeping forces, and an act of self-determination for the Palestinian people are all elements which we would reasonably expect to be part of a comprehensive peace settlement. My delegation does not regard the order in which these elements appear in the text as in any way prejudging the outcome of the negotiations called for in paragraph 6.

71. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): Finland voted in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1 as an expression of our well-known support for the legitimate rights of the Palestinians to self-determination.

72. I wish to emphasize, however, that Finland has conceived and continues to conceive the realization of those rights as a part of and within the framework of a comprehensive peaceful settlement of the question of the Middle East on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), designed to achieve a negotiated settlement.

73. Mr. ELMÉR (Sweden): My delegation supported draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1 because it gives expression to principles that my Government considers essential for the attainment of a just and lasting solution to the Middle East conflict.

74. Those principles are reflected in the fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution and in operative paragraph 1. My Government is firmly of the opinion that a just and lasting settlement must be based on the principles set forth in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), as well as on the recognition of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people. This means, in practice, that Israel and the PLO must recognize one another as parties to negotiations.

75. My delegation would have preferred to see, in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, the explicit reference to negotiations that was found in the initial version of the draft resolution [A/37/L.45].

76. My delegation has reservations, furthermore, in relation to some formulations of the text, such as paragraph 3. It must be pointed out, moreover, that elements of paragraphs 4, 5 and, in its new version, paragraph 6, tend to prejudge the outcome of negotiations between the parties concerned.

77. Mr. AL-QASIMI (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1 because it contains basic elements, including the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and the necessity of Israeli withdrawal from all the occupied Palestinian

and Arab territories. Nevertheless, my delegation does not approve of some of the wording in the fourth preambular paragraph, which indirectly refers to recognition of the existence of Israel, a State based on aggression and occupation. We feel that the reference in that paragraph goes beyond the decision taken at the latest Arab Summit Conference, and especially paragraph 7 of the Final Declaration of that Conference [*see A/37/696, annex*]. If that paragraph had been put to a separate vote, my delegation would have voted against it, in accordance with the principles maintained by my country with regard to the question of Palestine—principles that were emphasized at the Arab Summit Conference at Fez.

78. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who have asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of their right of reply. I would remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements made in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

79. Mr. AL-ZAHAWI (Iraq): The representative of the United States, in his explanation of vote, referred to the intervention and outrageous abuse by the representative of Iraq of our right to explain our vote.

80. The resort to such language shows the total bankruptcy of the arguments put forth by the representative of the United States and his inability to refute what my delegation said in its statement. My delegation simply stated the fact that the United Nations has refused to extend any recognition to the boundaries the Zionist entity claims to itself, as the United Nations has indeed refused to extend recognition to the capital that this entity claims to itself in illegally occupied Jerusalem.

81. I challenge the representative of the United States to refute those facts. The statement of that representative has only betrayed the fact that the United States in fact approves the expansionist designs of the Zionist entity and that the peace process it advocates should be regarded within this context.

82. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): I just want to correct the record. I did not challenge the right of the representative of Iraq to explain his vote. Indeed, I find his explanations of vote endlessly fascinating and instructive.

83. What I did regard as worthy of comment was what I clearly described as his outrageous abuse of the patience and good will of this body.

84. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of the United States has no right to impose its views on the General Assembly. That delegation claims that there has been an abuse of the Assembly. My delegation does not share that view.

85. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX), of 22 November 1974, I call on the Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

86. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Once again, the General Assembly has expressed very clearly its determination to pursue a process for the attainment of genuine peace in the Middle East based on the total and unconditional withdrawal of Israel

from the occupied territories and at the same time, and essentially, the attainment of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people in Palestine.

87. I wish, on behalf of the Palestinian people, to thank the Assembly and to reiterate that the obstacles have been manifested again by those two red lights on the voting board; they are the United States and Israel.

88. I wish to add that there was some distortion or misunderstanding on the part of the representative of the United States. What the resolution in question calls for is "internationally recognized boundaries" and not boundaries recognized only by the United States. There is an element of international recognition involved; I am referring to the boundaries of the Palestinian Arab State in Palestine as well as the other States in the region.

89. The PLO is in full support of demanding and does demand of the Assembly that it help us in the attainment of a comprehensive peace and not a piece-by-piece peace. Here I am addressing myself, through you, Mr. President, to the representative of the United States: it is that country which is playing the piece-by-piece game and not adopting the comprehensive peace approach.

90. Finally, it was really sad to hear a member of the Likud party which co-operated with the Nazis telling us that he represents the Jewish people. He does not. He represents the Zionist movement. If he speaks of Jews, he may be referring to a certain Barros, who was the Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan, but not to Jews like Einstein and others.

91. Suffice it to say that only the other day the World Zionist Organization condemned Israel. This did not receive the space it deserved in *The New York Times*. But the world knows that Israel does not represent the Jews: Israel represents only a gang of Zionist racists who collaborated with the Nazis.

AGENDA ITEM 34

The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General (*concluded*)*

92. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly is resuming its consideration of agenda item 34 in order to take a decision on draft resolution A/37/L.48 and on the amendment thereto, contained in document A/37/L.55.

93. The Assembly will recall that the debate on this item was concluded at the 96th meeting, on 8 December, and that the draft resolutions on the item were introduced at the 108th plenary meeting, on 16 December.

94. I now call on the representative of Cuba, who wishes to make a statement in connection with draft resolution A/37/L.48.

95. Mr. ROA KOURÍ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): As the President has just recalled, I had the honour, at the 108th meeting, to submit on behalf of their sponsors the draft resolutions on the situation in the Middle East.

96. As regards draft resolution A/37/L.48, I requested, on behalf of the sponsors, that the vote be postponed because consultations were taking place among the sponsors and other Member States concerning the drafting of one of its paragraphs.

97. Those consultations have now been concluded, and I should like to inform the members of the Assembly that the following minor amendment has been made to paragraph 5 of the draft resolution: after the words "*Rejects all*", delete "*partial agreements and separate treaties*" and substitute "*agreements and arrangements*". The beginning of paragraph 5 therefore reads: "*Rejects all agreements and arrangements in so far as they...*"; the rest of the paragraph remains unchanged.

98. It is my understanding that with that amendment to paragraph 5, the amendment contained in document A/37/L.55—proposing a new preambular paragraph—will be withdrawn.

99. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt): In a spirit of accommodation, my delegation does not insist on pressing to a vote its amendment in document A/37/L.55, but this should in no way be construed as a change in our constant position on the content of the amendment. Our belief in, and attachment to, the principles embodied in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) remain as strong as ever. We believe that the time will come when those who are doubtful about these two cardinal resolutions will realize their vital role. Egypt will continue to work, with our Arab brothers, towards the goal of the implementation of those principles.

100. We think that the sponsors of draft resolution A/37/L.48 have demonstrated a sense of accommodation by their amendment, just presented by the representative of Cuba on their behalf. This attitude is very significant to the Egyptian delegation, and I am sure that it cannot escape the Assembly's notice.

101. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting on draft resolution A/37/L.48. I again remind representatives that statements in explanation of vote should be limited to 10 minutes and should be made from their seats.

102. Mr. ARTACHO (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): As happened last year with regard to General Assembly resolution 36/226 A, the text of which was practically identical to draft resolution A/37/L.48, my delegation will vote in favour of that draft resolution because we understand it to contain some of the essential elements for a solution to the problem of the Middle East, in particular the following.

103. The first element is the reaffirmation that the acquisition of territory by force is inadmissible under the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law and, accordingly, the requirement that Israel withdraw from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967.

104. The second element is the reaffirmation that the question of Palestine is the core of the conflict in the Middle East, that no comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region will be achieved without the full exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable national rights, and that all the parties to

* Resumed from the 108th meeting.

the conflict, including the PLO, the representative of the Palestinian people, must participate on an equal footing in the search for a just and comprehensive solution.

105. The third element is the reiterated statement that Israel's decision to annex Jerusalem and the imposition of its laws, jurisdiction and administration on the occupied Syrian Golan Heights are null and void. Those measures, in addition to lacking any validity, constitute, together with the continuation of the policy of establishing Jewish settlements in the occupied territories and the intensification of the repression of the Arab population in them, a serious obstacle to the achievement of the comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East to which I have referred.

106. However, our affirmative vote does not mean that my delegation regards draft resolution A/37/L.48 as being completely satisfactory. First, we should have liked it to contain explicit mention of the right of all States in the region, including Israel, to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries. As is known, that is one of the essential principles for the solution of the problem of the Middle East contained in Security Council resolution 242 (1967). That principle has the full support of the Spanish Government. Secondly, my delegation does not agree with some of the assertions in draft resolution A/37/L.48; specifically, we should like to record our serious reservations concerning paragraphs 9 and 10.

107. Mr. GONZÁLEZ CÉSAR (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Mexico will vote in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.48 in spite of our reservations about paragraphs 5 and 9. If either paragraph were voted on separately, the Mexican delegation would abstain.

108. Mrs. CORONEL de RODRÍGUEZ (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Venezuela will vote in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.48, as orally amended. However, my delegation wishes to express reservations about the contents of paragraph 10 and other paragraphs, as the way in which they have been submitted does not contribute to the efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace in the region, with recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

109. Mr. GONZÁLEZ (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Chilean delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.48 because, in general, it meets the essential concerns of my country with regard to the situation in the Middle East. However, we should like to state our reservations about some of the paragraphs in it which do not make an effective contribution to the search for a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the problem of the Middle East. Thus, Chile does not agree with paragraph 9, since it prejudices the scope and effects of an agreement on co-operation between two States.

110. We also have serious reservations about paragraph 10, which refers to the application of sanctions against a State Member of the United Nations, a matter which, as is well known, is within the exclusive competence of the Security Council. Thus, the General Assembly lacks the competence to recommend this kind of measure.

111. Finally, we should like to repeat that only the adoption of resolutions which reflect in a balanced way all the aspects that have so far hindered the achievement of peace in the region can generate a concept acceptable to the international community and serve to establish an appropriate frame of reference for promoting a definitive solution of this important focus of international tension.

112. In this regard, we reiterate our support for Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which, in our view, constitute a juridical and political basis indispensable for the comprehensive solution of the problem.

113. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.48 simply because it supports the Palestinian people. However, we are not quite happy with the following aspects of that draft resolution.

114. In the preambular part, as well as in the operative paragraphs, there are references to many previously adopted resolutions. We should like to declare our reservations regarding those references which implicitly or explicitly suggest recognition of or negotiation with the Zionist usurpers.

115. The two final preambular paragraphs spoil the entire draft resolution. My delegation would have liked them to be deleted. We believe that those two paragraphs are far from being worthy of the moral status of the Palestinians and Palestine.

116. In a draft resolution supporting the Islamic cause of Palestine, it would have been much more appropriate to keep silent about some conferences, and particularly about some majestic members of those conferences, and their peace plans.

117. Paragraph 3 suggests that the Palestinian people recognize the Zionist usurper. This is unjust and un-Islamic. There should be only Palestine in the area, and the Zionist racist elements that have been able to form a base and call it a State must go back to the countries from which they came.

118. Paragraph 4 demands the unconditional withdrawal of the Zionist forces from the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967. My delegation would rather delete the adverbial phrase "occupied since 1967" because we do not differentiate between occupation before and after 1967.

119. My delegation wonders why this specific paragraph is so clear about where the withdrawal is to be from but not about where it is to be to. We therefore believe that that should be clearly specified. That is, this operative paragraph should contain words indicating that the Zionist usurpers must withdraw from the land of Palestine and go back to their countries of origin.

120. The Government and people of the Islamic Republic of Iran do not recognize any occupation and maintain that the sovereignty of the State of Palestine must be restored over the totality of the Islamic territory that is now occupied by that forgery known as Israel.

121. Mr. MONTEIRO (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has already had occasion to stress that as long as there is a hope that efforts

aimed at a negotiated, comprehensive and peaceful solution to the Middle East problem will succeed, we shall dissociate ourselves from any appeal or act that may be prejudicial to those efforts. For that reason, my delegation will not be able to support draft resolution A/37/L.48, in particular because of paragraphs 9 and 10.

122. Mr. CARR (Jamaica): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.48, in conformity with my Government's support for all initiatives designed to achieve a just, durable and comprehensive settlement consistent with all the relevant resolutions of the Organization.

123. We would, however, wish it to be understood that we do not share the view that the arrangement referred to in paragraph 9 would necessarily have an adverse effect upon efforts to achieve a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East or would necessarily threaten the security of the region.

124. Mr. PORTUGAL RODRÍGUEZ (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Peru will vote in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.48. However, we should like to register our objection regarding the meaning that might be attributed to paragraph 5—even in its new version—and to paragraph 9. In view of the gravity and the continued deterioration of the situation in the Middle East, it is our understanding that neither of those paragraphs disregard the importance of any effort or initiative for peace in that region and that explicit references to relations among various States are based strictly upon the question of Palestine being the core issue, respect for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and the need to reject any policies or acts that would run counter to efforts to find a lasting political settlement in the Middle East.

125. Finally, my delegation would have preferred the draft resolution to contain a specific reference to Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) because my country believes that those resolutions continue to provide a just and acceptable basis that would lead the parties involved in the conflict to an agreement.

126. Mr. NDONG BINDANG (Equatorial Guinea) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Equatorial Guinea will vote in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.48. However, were there to be separate votes on paragraphs 9 and 10, we would abstain, since they contain certain criteria that will not help in the settlement of the Middle East problem.

127. Mr. CABELLO SARUBBI (Paraguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.48. However, we should like it to be noted that we have serious reservations concerning some of the paragraphs of the draft resolution, in particular paragraphs 5, 9 and 10.

128. Mr. BLUM (Israel): Just as what passes for a debate on the situation in the Middle East is merely a regurgitation of the Assembly's one-sided deliberations on the question of the Palestinian Arabs, so draft resolution A/37/L.48 is merely a synopsis and pot-pourri of previous anti-peace resolutions which were adopted under the present agenda item as well as under agenda item 31.

129. The purpose of this draft resolution is precisely the same as that of those resolutions—namely, to impede the peaceful solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict. It is intended by its authors to serve not only as a convenient mechanism to impede any movement towards a peaceful solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict but also as an expedient catch-all to a highly selective and biased list of matters which were somehow not covered by other resolutions.

130. The language of the draft resolution follows and exacerbates the formulations which have been advanced year after year on this item. This only goes to prove that its drafters have fallen captive to their own obsessions and slogans.

131. In the tradition of previous resolutions on this item, the draft resolution contradicts Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and the foundations on which it rests. That resolution was and remains the only agreed basis for a negotiated settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. It was and remains one of the few positive contributions which the Organization has made to the cause of peace in the Middle East. The sponsors of the draft resolution before us appear to begrudge the Organization that contribution, and hence seek to undermine it. Consequently, not only is any reference to resolution 242 (1967) conspicuously absent from the draft resolution before us, but, as is well known, attempts made to have such a reference included in the text of the draft resolution—which, in any event, would have been symbolic and devoid of any practical meaning in view of the operative paragraphs of that draft resolution—were brusquely rejected. As a result, the amendment contained in document A/37/L.55 has not been put to the vote. Moreover it must be clear to anyone familiar with resolution 242 (1967) and with the overall lexicon of the Arab-Israeli conflict that the provisions contained in draft resolution A/37/L.48 are patently incompatible with resolution 242 (1967) and are clearly designed to undermine that resolution.

132. Another typical example of the anti-peace leit-motif which pervades the draft resolution is to be found in the welcome extended in it to the so-called Arab peace plan. It is no secret that that extraordinary plan—for which the term "peace plan" is clearly a misnomer—does not even mention Israel and does not envisage any negotiations with Israel. Instead, it lays down once again the well-known Arab demands which in themselves are incompatible with resolution 242 (1967) and which would, if accepted by Israel, constitute a step towards the destruction of my country. The attainment of that goal remains the avowed objective of many, if not most, of the participants in the Fez Conference, as was demonstrated so clearly by the representatives of some of the participants in that Conference in their explanations of vote both before and after the voting that took place here earlier today on draft resolution A/37/L.45/Rev.1.

133. Israel will vote against draft resolution A/37/L.48.

134. The PRESIDENT: Inasmuch as the sponsor of the amendment contained in document A/37/L.55 does not insist that it be put to a vote, the Assembly will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/37/

L.48 and Add.1, as orally amended. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, 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, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Burma, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, Haiti, Ivory Coast, Japan, Malawi, Sweden, Uruguay, Zaire.

The draft resolution, as orally amended, was adopted by 113 votes to 17, with 15 abstentions (resolution 37/123 F).

135. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to explain their vote.

136. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): The United States takes this occasion to reaffirm its commitment to a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East, within the framework established by Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). Those resolutions are at the core of President Reagan's peace initiatives of 1 September². They recognize the prerequisites of any enduring settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict—namely, the right of all countries in the region to live in peace and security among their neighbours, and the creation of a process of negotiation within which the legitimate needs and rights of the Palestinian people will be met. Those are the essential foundations. Upon them were built the major milestones of the Camp David accords and the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty, with United States participation and with whole-hearted United States support.

137. We take note of the fact that language implicitly criticizing Camp David and the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty has been altered. Still, this is an ambiguous statement, containing within it innuendoes which we reject. Accordingly, we oppose the paragraph in question as a whole and in its context, but we welcome the approach to moderation which the revised language may denote.

138. Any resolution of the Assembly which fails to take appropriate account of the building-blocks of the peace process—namely, Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), Camp David and the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty—is not helpful to that process.

Mr. Kirca (Turkey), Vice-President, took the Chair.

139. The resolution just adopted, in its negativism, its lack of balance, its extreme rhetoric, which fuels conflict, contributes nothing to that process. Indeed, that resolution represents, in our view, a step backwards—a reiteration of the inevitability of conflict.

140. My Government and the American people reject such counsel of despair—and draft resolution A/37/L.48 and Add.1 along with it. For our part, we intend to press forward on the road to peace. We invite all nations sharing this aspiration to join with us.

141. Mr. BERNAL BRITO (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Bolivian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.48 and Add.1 on the basis of our traditional and fundamental international position that the occupation of foreign territories by force of arms, or their annexation by that or other means, is totally unacceptable. The peaceful coexistence of States resides in strict respect for these basic principles, one of the most important of which is the inviolability of a State's territorial integrity.

142. However, the draft resolution which has just been adopted contains terms that run counter to international courtesy and distort its underlying principles, which is particularly regrettable to the Bolivian delegation because of the implications those terms could have. Bolivia considers that the United Nations, in compliance with its paramount role of preserving peace and promoting understanding among peoples, should act with impartiality and exercise its natural ability to deal with issues bearing on the basic role of the Organization.

143. Mr. ELMÉR (Sweden): Sweden abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/37/L.48 and Add.1 for the same reasons that caused us to abstain on its predecessor resolutions in previous years, to which it is very similar.

144. Our main objection to the draft resolution is its severe lack of balance. We have especially strong reservations about paragraphs 9 and 10. Those paragraphs have been taken from resolution 36/226 A, but in the case of paragraph 10 an addition has been made that seems to aim at curtailing the right of individuals to move to a country that is willing to receive them.

145. My Government opposes any such attempt at limiting individual rights.

146. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): I wish to explain the vote of my delegation on draft resolution A/37/

L.48 and Add.1, as orally amended. In the statement on the situation in the Middle East that my delegation had occasion to make on 7 December [94th meeting], we said, *inter alia*, that Finland had given its support to all the proposals and initiatives that aim at a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. We also said that we had recently seen some promising departures from previously held rigid positions. A process towards a negotiated settlement seemed to be getting under way, slow and painful though it might be. The statement underlined that it is of the essence that this process be maintained and encouraged.

147. It is against that background that we note that draft resolution A/37/L.48 and Add.1 contains positive elements in this direction, particularly in its last two preambular paragraphs. We regret that the amendment submitted by the delegation of Egypt, which reaffirmed the principles and provisions of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), was withdrawn. We consider those two Security Council resolutions, together with the recognition of the rights of the Palestinians to self-determination, to be basic elements of a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East. We note with satisfaction that a more palatable formulation has been achieved for paragraph 5, which in our view went against this general direction. We regret, however, that this positive trend is not reflected throughout the draft resolution. We take particular exception to some elements and formulations in the preambular part and in paragraphs 9 and 10. For those reasons, my delegation abstained in the voting on this draft resolution as a whole.

148. Mr. ELHOFARI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya voted in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.48 and Add.1. This vote does not imply any change in the policy of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya concerning this question, or any change in its position on some resolutions on which it has objections or reservations; nor does it mean that any international legitimacy is accorded to the aggressor Zionist entity which occupies the Arab territories.

149. My delegation also emphasizes its full support for all the rights of the Palestinian people.

150. My delegation has reservations concerning the eleventh and twelfth preambular paragraphs of this draft resolution.

151. My delegation understands paragraph 5 to include all agreements, including piecemeal agreements and the Camp David accords.

152. Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.48 and Add.1. My delegation would like to emphasize that our vote is based on our understanding that paragraph 5 means primarily the rejection of the separate Camp David accords and the partial agreements from which they stem, as emphasized in the statement issued by the North Arab Summit Conference, held in Baghdad in 1978³, and other Arab summit conferences held since then, and also the decisions of the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Havana in 1979⁴. The Camp David accords, and the subsequent partial treaty, violate the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including

its rights to return to its homeland, to self-determination and to the establishment of its own State on its national soil, under the leadership of the PLO, its sole legitimate representative.

153. Mr. LEE (Singapore): My delegation explained the position of my Government when the Assembly took action on draft resolutions A/37/L.49 and Add.1, L.50/Rev.1 and L.51 and Add.1 to L.53 and Add.1, on the situation in the Middle East [108th meeting].

154. My delegation would like to reiterate that the position of my Government remains the same with regard to draft resolution A/37/L.48 and Add.1, as amended. With regard to paragraph 9, we would like to state that although my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution, as amended, we have reservations on the inclusion of this paragraph.

155. Mrs. MAUALA (Samoa): While my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.48 and Add.1, as we support its thrust, we do have serious reservations on the text of several paragraphs, including paragraphs 9 and 10.

156. Mrs. TAVARES de ALVAREZ (Dominican Republic) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Dominican Republic abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/37/L.48 and Add.1, although we support all attempts designed to restore peace with the consent of the interested parties. Our abstention was based on the fact that we do not entirely agree with the language or formulation of some of the paragraphs.

157. However, we trust that these treaties and agreements between the parties will serve only to complement the peace-keeping operations that, in many crisis situations, have opened the way to a peaceful solution. The activities of the United Nations peace-keeping forces cannot be replaced, but they can be complemented by initiatives that are supported by a consensus of the parties involved in the crisis.

158. Mr. LOĞOĞLU (Turkey): I should like to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/37/L.48 and Add.1 just adopted by the General Assembly as resolution 37/123 F. The reference in paragraph 9 of that resolution to a matter of sovereign prerogative and of concern to the two States involved does not, in our view, enhance the value of the resolution in any way.

159. The delegation of Turkey voted in favour of the draft resolution. That reflects my Government's long-standing position and its clearly established policy in favour of a just, lasting and comprehensive solution to the Middle East conflict and the question of Palestine.

160. Turkey will continue to evaluate this new resolution, as it has done with past resolutions on the same subject-matter, in accordance with the general principles and objectives of its Middle East policy as expressed in statements, official acts and positions of the Government of Turkey.

161. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The position of firm and constant support of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania for the just cause of the struggle for national liberation of the Arab peoples against imperialist Zionist aggression is well known. Our delegation reiterated that support in its statement in the debate on the situation in the

Middle East on 7 December [94th meeting]. We showed that support also by voting in favour of draft resolutions A/37/L.49 and Add.1, L.50/Rev.1, L.51 and Add.1 and L.52 and Add.1.

162. We also support most of the provisions of draft resolution A/37/L.48 and Add.1, which has just been adopted. However, our delegation was unable to support the draft resolution as a whole and therefore did not participate in the voting on it. There are some provisions in that draft resolution—and I am referring in particular to provisions, for example those in the eleventh preambular paragraph, that appear for the first time this year in a draft resolution of this kind—which both in substance and in form are not acceptable to us or on which we have reservations. This prevented our delegation from voting in favour of that draft resolution.

163. Mr. ADHAMI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.48 and Add.1, which has just been adopted. We should like to emphasize that our affirmative vote was based on our understanding that paragraph 5, as amended, includes all partial agreements and separate treaties, foremost among them the Camp David accords and the treaty signed in Washington in 1979, because those agreements were concluded at the expense of the interests and rights of the Palestinian people.

164. Mr. SANZ DE SANTAMARÍA (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Despite the fact that we had reservations on draft resolution A/37/L.48 and Add.1, we voted in favour of it because we consider that it contains valuable elements for the achievement of peace in that region so cruelly afflicted by war. We consider that some of its paragraphs have been drafted in a way that might hamper a rapid and final solution

to the problem. Moreover, we would have liked the resolution to take into consideration Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which remain fully in effect.

165. Mr. ANDINO-SALAZAR (El Salvador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.48 and Add.1, as orally amended, but we have reservations on various paragraphs, particularly paragraphs 9 and 10.

166. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): My delegation voted in support of draft resolution A/37/L.48 and Add.1, as orally amended, in the light of its well-known position on the situation in the Middle East. However, if paragraph 9 had been put to a separate vote, my delegation would have abstained on the grounds that a sovereign State has the right to enter into an agreement with another State. This right is recognized by international law and the United Nations Charter. Any action by the General Assembly which may question such a right has possible ramifications beyond the situation in the Middle East. That is why my delegation requests that its position in this regard should be fully reflected in the record.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

NOTES

¹ The delegation of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

² See *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1982), vol. 18, No. 35, p. 1081.

³ See A/33/400.

⁴ See A/34/542.