

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FOURTH YEAR

UN LIBRARY

2163rd

JUN 4 1982

MEETING: 24 AUGUST 1979

UN/SA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2163)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights: Letters dated 13 March 1979 and 27 June 1979 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13164 and S/13418)	1

UN LIBRARY

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/...) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2163rd MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 24 August 1979, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Andrew YOUNG
(United States of America).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Bangladesh, Bolivia, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Gabon, Jamaica, Kuwait, Nigeria, Norway, Portugal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2163)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights:

Letters dated 13 March 1979 and 27 June 1979 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13164 and S/13418)

The meeting was called to order at 3.50 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights:

Letters dated 13 March 1979 and 27 June 1979 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/13164 and S/13418)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the previous meetings [2155th and 2160th to 2162nd meetings], I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Cuba, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Morocco, Senegal, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber; I invite the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tabibi (Afghanistan), Mr. Roa Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Al-Ali (Iraq), Mr. Blum

(Israel), Mr. Nuseibeh (Jordan), Mr. Southichak (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Filali (Morocco), Mr. Fernando (Sri Lanka), Mr. El-Choufi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Mestiri (Tunisia), Mr. Eralp (Turkey) and Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber; Mr. Fall (Senegal), Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, took a place at the Council table; Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table.

2. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): Today, the feast of Eid Al-Fitar, is a religious holiday throughout the Moslem world. I congratulate all members of the Moslem community on this occasion, one that combines spirituality with dedication.

3. At the outset, I have three apologies to make. I drafted a speech on the rights of the Palestinians but in the light of what I have heard here from members of the Council, I feel that the statement I drafted two nights ago is redundant. I therefore apologize to the interpreters and to the press and to others because I am not going to follow my text. It has been distributed to members of the Council. The crux of that statement was the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and there is no need for an advocate to elaborate on that question. It is a glaring fact.

4. My second apology is that I do not know when I am going to stop speaking. I have told my colleague to hand me a note when I have exceeded half an hour.

5. My third apology is directed to the United States Mission. I should like to apologize to the United States Mission in advance, because the thrust of what I have to say here is to inform public opinion about United States policy in the Middle East. I may irritate some, I may irritate many. But they know that I always speak in good faith. I have had strong, constructive, healthy and, I would say, amicable relations with the United States Mission. They acknowledge that and they know that I am a messenger of moderation and not an advocate of violence. They know that when it comes to the pinch, they will find me on the side of reason.

6. Before going further, I must announce publicly that I am sad. I congratulate the President on the assumption of his duties in the Council this month, but such congratulations are a ritual; they are banal and almost meaningless. Yet I am sad, Mr. President, that you are leaving. The press asked me what I thought of your departure, and I

told them—I am relying on memory—that never in the history of the Atlantic Ocean had the shores of that body of water been closer together politically. Thanks to your efforts, the shores on the African side of the Atlantic and those of the American side have come closer, through your own personal endeavour.

7. I was asked my thoughts with regard to your successor. I said that it would be easy for him, because you had already laid the groundwork for successful progress with regard to African issues. What you have accomplished with regard to African rights to self-determination and on other issues is irreversible on this continent. You have implanted feelings of goodwill towards America in the hearts of the African leaders. In the United States, you have awakened and alerted politicians and public opinion to the importance of becoming more closely involved in the primordial right of the African peoples to justice and self-determination and equity, and in that sense I say that through your endeavours you have brought the shores of the Atlantic closer together politically than ever before.

8. Throughout the history of mankind, there have always been pioneers. There have been mountaineers who have set out to conquer the mountain peaks of Nepal and other places; some of them have died, some have suffered, some have returned intact, safe and unscathed. Such men are pioneers and pioneers have a sense of the sacrifice of pioneers. You, too, are a pioneer for the cause of justice, and—I must say—you are also a casualty in that cause. But you have been a distinguished participant, you have marched for the noble cause of justice. I shall not elaborate further, for you know my feelings. You know that my name has been associated with recent events. But I must in all fairness say to you, Mr. President, Ambassador Andrew Young, that we are not only indebted to you. We take off our hats to you. I speak not only on behalf of Kuwait, not only on behalf of the Kuwaiti people; I speak on behalf of the Arabs, and on behalf of the miserable and aggrieved people of Palestine.

9. Having said that, I come now to the essence of what I am going to say. What is the aim of this debate? Is it to embarrass the United States? Is the aim to isolate the United States or to exert the pressure of the barrel of oil? Is the aim to show that the United States policy on the Middle East is bankrupt? My answer is that the aim is none of those; we have never had that in mind. We have been thinking of one thing, we want just one simple phrase from the Security Council: "recognition of the right of the people of Palestine to self-determination". Is that a big order? Is that something enormous in this mêlée of human conflict over the right to self-determination all over the world? It is not much to ask. The people of Palestine have been suffering for 30 years—suffering aggravation, isolation, displacement, neglect and insult, not to mention Israel's daily campaign of genocide, which we have forgotten about because we have been taken over by publicity over what I would call a storm in a teacup.

10. But that is not important. My battle here, as I said to the press, is not with Israel: in the Security Council my battle is with the United States over the rights of the Palestinians, because Israel does not hold the veto—the United States holds it. My battle with Israel is there, in the

Middle East; it is an ongoing battle. But here the battle is with the United States on the recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and over the fact that the United States holds the power of the veto. I say that neither out of resentment nor out of bitterness.

11. When I, as a member of the Arab community, innocuously, harmlessly, suggested that a diplomat from the United States might have a general conversation with a Palestinian, I thought that nobody would be violating any document. What is this document, which was written by Kissinger in 1975, that we have been talking about? It states that no recognition should be given to the PLO, that there should be no negotiations with the PLO, unless it does such and such.

12. Well, the question is imbalanced; it is illogical. But that is not the point. The point is that you cannot have any serious search for a comprehensive peace unless you talk to the parties concerned. You do not have to negotiate or to recognize. But you should have a general type of conversation. And that is what happened. Is that a big deal? Is that really taboo? Is that really a violation of the essence of the American spirit and Constitution? What is its essence? I am an historian; I know the history of the United States. It is based on dialogue; it is not based on hostility or on alienation. It is based on dialogue, on give and take. And that is what there was.

13. Yet, look where we are now. I personally have been receiving hate mail; I have even curtailed my public appearances in New York: I do not go out of my house unless I am escorted or go incognito. I sometimes wonder what we have come to and what valley of darkness we have arrived in. I have been receiving mail accusing me of communicating and associating with so-and-so, and trying to intimidate me. Well, I am not a man who can mince his words. I do not care. But when we come to such a point, I must question the type of world we live in. We have reached the deepest valley of darkness if that is what is going on.

14. Now, I just want to comment briefly on the memorandum issued by Mr. Kissinger to Israel to the effect that there should be no recognition of or negotiation with the PLO. And I am talking to the American people now. Otherwise, I would have used my academic text about self-determination for the Palestinians. The fact of that memorandum disqualifies—and I want to underline the word "disqualifies"—the United States from any constructive role concerning the right of the Palestinians to the achievement of a comprehensive peace, simply because you cannot achieve peace without talking to the Palestinians. And there are no Palestinians without the PLO—not because I say so academically but because it is a fact.

15. I have been amazed by the attachment of the Palestinians to their leadership, so much so that I think they are perhaps the most monolithic people in the world. When Mr. Terzi speaks for the PLO as the representative of the people of Palestine, we do not take him seriously, but it is a fact. I come from the area. We cannot know the plight of the Palestinians until we take the Security Council to a refugee camp and meet there, at either Beirut or Damascus. Then you will see the plight of the Palestinians. We do not per-

ceive their plight here at the East River, talking academically, metaphysically and abstractly. One must see their plight, as I have seen it—I, who am not even a Palestinian. I have seen the democratization and the democratic spirit of the PLO, the way it commands voluntarily the allegiance of the Palestinian people. I am amazed—so much so that I will challenge 99 per cent of the members of the Council and the Members of the United Nations, to show that their systems are as democratic.

16. The PLO is more representative than the Government of any member of the Security Council or Member of the United Nations, in terms of democracy. I do not mince my words; I speak the truth, on the basis of what I have seen. And here we deride them. Ambassador Blum yesterday called them “international criminals”. I am not going to answer him, because he is not my concern. My concern here is American diplomacy on the Middle East, and I am going to expose it; I am going to expose the bankruptcy of the United States policy.

17. You cannot send Ambassador Strauss or anybody else in an endeavour to achieve a comprehensive peace without talking to the PLO—period. You cannot talk to the Israelis, Egyptians or Jordanians or to the inhabitants of anywhere else about achieving peace in the Middle East unless you talk to the Palestinians. And you cannot talk to the Palestinians unless you talk to their representative, the PLO, and to its representative here.

18. As I said last night on television, Ambassador Strauss’ undertakings are trips of futility. It is amazing that a great country like the United States should have been a captive of semantics. How can you undertake the achievement of a comprehensive peace, such a colossal burden of unprecedented magnitude, in the interest of the United States, in the interest of the United Nations and in our interest as people of the region, without talking to the Palestinians? And how can you talk to the Palestinians without talking to the PLO? Ambassador Strauss has been hunting for what I am sorry to refer to as Uncle Toms—for Quislings—among the Palestinians. But, to the credit of the Palestinians, so far—and, I am sure, even in the future—no Uncle Tom has emerged from among them, because on this issue they have risen to a man in defence of their primordial, sacrosanct right to self-determination.

19. So my message, through the Security Council, to Ambassador Strauss, whom I have never met, is that his trips are trips of futility unless he talks to the PLO, unless he talks to the real, genuine representative and the essence of the Palestinian people, the PLO. The memorandum of understanding is outdated and is unprecedented in diplomacy; it belongs to the Victorian age. The United States is not a bystander, it is an involved party, according to the Camp David accords, or agreements—which I never liked—which stated that the United States was a full partner for the achievement of peace. How can you be a full partner if you do not talk to the party concerned? That is my first point.

20. My second point is that I have heard amazing remarks from the State Department—even from the White House, from President Carter himself. In the Arab world and in my

country we hold President Carter in great respect. He is a man of unmatched integrity, a man who radiates honesty. On “Good Morning America”—and please note that I woke up at 6 a.m., unprecedented for me—President Carter was quoted as having said that the Palestinians want everything or nothing. I say that this is not true. The Palestinians want “something”; not everything, not all. Of course, they refuse “nothing”.

21. What does it say in the draft resolution [S/13514] so ably and eloquently introduced by the representative of Senegal, the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People? I take my hat off to him. Like you, Mr. President, he is a veteran, a champion of the right of peoples to self-determination. That draft resolution refers to the Palestinians’ right to self-determination. I do not want to spill all the beans, but I was instrumental in prevailing on my friend Mr. Terzi to delete the word “statehood” just to make the text palatable to our friends in the United States. That word has become anathema to the United States, although in 1947 that country not only voted for but was instrumental in the elaboration of the partition plan. But that is past history and we do not wish to return to it.

22. Again, the President of the United States was quoted as saying that the Palestinians want everything or nothing. Mr. President, you are Mr. Carter’s close friend—please convey to him that this is not true. The Palestinians are willing to settle for half a loaf. We cannot go back into history to a time when all Palestine was their country. What do they want now? The West Bank and Gaza: less than half a loaf. I am sorry to say it, but President Carter—for whom I and all our countries in the Arab world have unmatched respect—once said that the Palestinians are against a Palestinian State. That is not true. I do not know how many Palestinians President Carter has consulted or how many Arabs.

23. The press has been talking of “unauthorized meetings”. I was tempted to take a helicopter and land on the White House grounds for an “unauthorized meeting” with President Carter to tell him that the Palestinians do want a State of their own—that they want half a loaf. They mean no harm to anyone; they want to coexist; they want to have a sense of identity; they want to have an identity card of their own.

24. I have been asked by the press during these three months of fanfare—by the way, because of you, Mr. President, I have become a celebrity—whether the Palestinians in my country really want to go back to the West Bank. But that is not the point. The point is that they want to bear papers: a sense of identity, a sense of belonging. If I should be fired from my job, I know that I have a country, I know that I have a house. I know where I can go—I do not need a visa to return to my country. But these poor Palestinians need a visa; they are not allowed even to return to their country. Yesterday, the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, Mr. Terzi, said that he cannot return to his birthplace, Jerusalem. He is barred, while American Zionists, any Jew in the United States or anywhere else, can land in Israel and claim citizenship, can claim Mr. Terzi’s house as his own—Mr. Terzi, who was not only born there,

but is the product of a three-centuries-old Palestinian family. The representative of Jordan, Ambassador Nuseibeh, comes from one of the most distinguished families of Jerusalem. For many centuries—how long exactly I do not know, for I am not an expert in Palestinian history—his family held the keys to the city of Jerusalem. And this man, Ambassador Nuseibeh, cannot go back to Jerusalem.

25. Where are we now? Are we in the valley of darkness? I think that we are. The Palestinians are punched in the teeth by everybody. Self-determination is our yardstick; extermination is the Israelis' yardstick.

26. We have really lost track of what is going on in Southern Lebanon. About 70 or 80 Palestinian innocents are killed every day—gunned down. Here in your great country, Mr. President, we find people defending whales, we find people defending birds, but we do not find people defending Palestinians. Again, are we in the valley of darkness?

27. The Vice-President of the United States, Mr. Mondale, went to Geneva last month when a conference was convened on the question of refugees. He was in the forefront; we admire his spirit. We admired what he said about human rights, his genuine concern for equality, for the elimination of the sufferings of man. What did he say at the conference? He said that history will not forgive us if we do not act; that history will forget us if we do not act. Does this not apply to the Palestinians? Do we have doublethink? Do we apply a double standard?

28. You, Mr. President, have been instrumental in bringing about American understanding of the rights of the people of Zimbabwe. You beleaguered Muzorewa and other fictitious creatures of no self-determination and insisted that without the Zimbabwe people's right to self-determination there would be no peace; and the United States accordingly accepted that as its policy. That great achievement of the United States was due to you. That is why I say that you have drawn the shores of the Atlantic closer together politically. But what about the Palestinians? What are the merits of applying a norm or a set of rules to Zimbabwe and others and not applying it to the Palestinians? What have the Palestinians done to the United States? I wonder.

29. I have been asked by the television people: "Is it true that you told Ambassador Young that if the United States does not abstain or vote in favour of the draft resolution you will invoke the 'power of the barrel of oil'?" I said no, I cannot be so naïve as to do that. No Arab leader or diplomat or politician would think of doing that.

30. I am worried about one thing, and you may quote me for I am talking to the people of the United States here and that is why I did not use my text: I do not want to indulge in academic discussions of self-determination. I am worried about the psychological alienation between Arabs and the United States. I shall never forget what happened in my country. In 1908 a group of American doctors landed on the shores of Kuwait. Who wanted Kuwait in 1908? We were in the depths of poverty. Deprivation was our lot. But a group of enlightened Americans—missionaries like you, Mr. Pres-

ident—landed on our shores and established a hospital. I have not forgotten that in 1949 I took my ailing father to that hospital, which has been a landmark of American goodwill and which still retains the same name, the American Hospital, financed and managed by American money. In all fairness, we are not an ungrateful people. I took my ailing father in 1949 to the American Hospital because at that time we had no money. We were poor.

31. But, after all, what are we going to do? When I look at Mr. Terzi, I not only feel ashamed, I feel that there is something wrong with this world when we can talk about the right of everybody, even of rocks in the ocean, to self-determination regardless of their numbers or origin, but when it comes to the Palestinians, they hedge. The United States is not forthcoming. What is wrong? There must be something wrong. The United States has become captive of the Camp David accords, and the language of the Camp David accords not only falls short of what the Palestinians require, it falls short of the norms of decency, which require self-determination, without which there will be no peace.

32. The two major protagonists in the Middle East are the Israelis and the Palestinians. American policy is to support Israel up to the hilt at the expense of the Palestinian people. If the United States wants to be an honest broker, a mediator and a go-between, it has to be fair. Nobody is questioning the right of the United States to support the survival of Israel, but we do question its total indifference to the rights of the Palestinians. How can peace in the Middle East be achieved without talking to the Palestinians and recognizing their right to self-determination? The United States recognizes the right of Israel, not only to self-determination but even to retain the territories occupied by force. I tell you this in all honesty. I am not a man to mince words and I make no bones about what I think.

33. Last month we were irritated by an abstention by the United States. There is no doubt about that. We were also irritated by a remark that the United States was going to veto a draft resolution that never got to see the light of day. We never formulated that draft resolution; it never emerged. But the United States formulates policy without regard to the merits of the question.

34. The President of the United States said that the Palestinians do not want a State. I mentioned that earlier. He said that the Palestinians want everything or nothing. I answered that. What the United States has to comply with is its moral commitment to self-determination for everybody. That is the very essence of the Constitution of the United States. That is the essence of the tradition of the United States. I have been lecturing for eight years in the United States, and there is an irresistible sense of fairness among Americans, regardless of their ethnic origin. They have a sense of fairness if they understand the question. So they have to address themselves to that fact—self-determination.

35. We have not come to debate here to embarrass anybody. We have come here to get one sentence from the Security Council: self-determination is the right of the Palestinians, a primary right, a right that emanates from the Charter, a right that emanates from every international

declaration to which the signature of the United States is affixed. The United States is a party by moral commitment to the Charter and to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The United States is morally bound to acknowledge the right of the people of Palestine to self-determination.

36. Now what benefit can be derived from this debate again? For the first time in the history of Palestine, the American people have started to question the merits or the futility or utility of their policy on the Middle East. They have realized that without talking to the Palestine Liberation Organization there will be no peace. They have realized that without recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people there will be no peace. They have realized that they have to act in accordance with their moral commitments as well as with their interests.

37. This is an historic occasion for the people of Palestine, and for the Americans, to understand the crux of the matter. The Palestinians do not want to push anybody into the sea. They want to coexist. They do not want to deprive anybody, but they want to live in decency and dignity. Thirty years have passed. It is a legend, an epic of suffering, deprivation and torture. But I must say that I take off my hat to the Palestinians for their patience, for their hope. Their expectations as to the future are unmatched. They show pure magnanimity in the most indescribable circumstances of torture, misery and grievance.

38. I could continue, but this is not the right time to do so. I shall stop now in the hope that I may speak later.

39. Mr. HULINSKÝ (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, it is with a feeling of profound respect that I congratulate you on occupying the responsible post of President of the Security Council for this month. Your political farsightedness, diplomatic skill and humanity have lent you authority among your colleagues in the United Nations. I should also like to take this opportunity to thank your predecessor in the post, Mr. Richard, for the way in which he conducted the work of the Council in July. His presence among us will be sorely missed.

40. There is hardly anyone who could today seriously deny the fact that the crux of any political solution of the Middle East problem is the Palestinian question and the exercise by the Palestinian people of the right to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty in Palestine. Can any right-thinking politician deny or challenge the fact that the Arab people of Palestine is one of the principal parties in the establishment of a just and durable peace in the Middle East or that the Palestine Liberation Organization should participate on an equal footing with other parties in all international efforts, discussions or conferences on the Middle East held under the aegis of the United Nations, in accordance with its earlier decisions?

41. Again and again the world has seen proof of the fact that attempts of any kind to settle accounts in the absence of the payee, such as the attempts of those who have initiated various kinds of separate deals to be concluded behind the back of the Arab peoples, are doomed to failure.

42. Let us take the example of the Camp David transactions. Those who participated in them, *inter alia*, negotiated

with Israel regarding the advantages that Israel stood to gain concerning the territories it had seized as a result of aggression and from which it should rightfully depart. But is Israel entitled to propose to the inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories any sort of autonomy or "self-determination" in a territory that is not actually a part of Israeli State territory? The attempts that have been made to present those people with some sort of truncated self-determination are sufficient by themselves to prove Israel's intention to annex those territories. The so-called framework for the West Bank and Gaza represents a sly attempt to circumvent the relevant decisions of the United Nations on the Middle East problem and, in particular, to avoid the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories.

43. The lack of realism in the Camp David deals can be seen in the very fact that those who are responsible for them have attempted to consolidate the flouting of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, ignoring the United Nations resolutions on the Middle East problem and the question of Palestine. The point of the so-called autonomy for the Palestinians envisaged in the Camp David deals is precisely virtually to inhibit the Palestinian Arab people's enjoyment of their right to self-determination and sovereignty in Palestine and to perpetuate Israel's colonization of the occupied Arab territories. It is therefore not surprising that the Arab countries have so resolutely rejected those attempts.

44. At the recent meeting of the Central Council of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the Chairman of its Executive Committee, Yasser Arafat, once again rejected the policy of those who participated in the Camp David talks, which has led to an increase in repression against the Palestinian patriots in the occupied Arab territories and to intensified Israeli aggression against independent Lebanon. The Central Council of the Palestine Liberation Organization unanimously and resolutely opposed the sort of solution to the Palestinian question that would overlook or infringe the national rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

45. The Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic supports the vital demands that have been made by the Arab people of Palestine. The position of Czechoslovakia was confirmed, once again, in the joint Czechoslovak-Syrian communiqué of 24 May of this year, which was adopted during an official visit by the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Gustáv Husák, to the Syrian Arab Republic. That communiqué condemned the ongoing Israeli occupation of the Arab territories and the denial of the rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to return to their homeland, their right to self-determination and their right to create their own independent State on their own soil.

46. There is no just and durable peace in the Middle East region, nor can there be unless there is a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East question, unless Israeli troops are withdrawn from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967, unless the Arab peoples of Palestine are able to exercise their national rights, including the right to create their own State, and unless the independent existence and security of all the States of that area are guaranteed. Such a

settlement can be achieved only in accordance with resolutions of the United Nations and only with the participation of all the interested parties, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole representative of the entire Arab people of Palestine.

47. The Czechoslovak delegation is ready to support the draft resolution [S/13514] that has been introduced by the representative of Senegal, the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which confirms the rights of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination, to national independence and to sovereignty in Palestine. The creation of their own State would fulfil the aspirations of the Palestinians, a third generation of whom are still without a homeland. Historical justice stands on the side of the Arab people of Palestine.

48. Mr. KAISER (Bangladesh): Mr. President, please accept our warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency for this month. I take the opportunity to pay you a tribute for your personal attributes of courage, compassion and justice, which have so greatly contributed to the cause of larger understanding particularly of third world concerns. We are confident that under your leadership the Council will be able to discharge its responsibilities effectively. Your departure from our midst will be deeply felt, but your presence and contribution will not be forgotten.

49. I wish to take this opportunity also to reiterate our grateful thanks to your predecessor, Ambassador Ivor Richard, who so efficiently and ably presided over our affairs in the month of July. His presence too will be missed, not only because of his exemplary capabilities but also because of his companionship and humour. We wish him all success for the future.

50. We are meeting at a critical time, when the attention of the world is directed as never before to the outcome of our deliberations. The heart of the matter is simple. A people deprived of their birthright, dispossessed of their lands, forcibly uprooted by aliens, demand the correction of a grave injustice. In essence, it is a political problem—the struggle of a people for their right to self-determination and the achievement of their inalienable national rights. That reality, however, has been deliberately obscured by the treatment of the problem, not on a political but on a humanitarian plane. For 25 years, that fictive approach was pursued despite two important resolutions of the General Assembly—resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947, which contained the partition plan for Palestine and resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948, which established the Conciliation Commission for Palestine and recognized the right of the Palestinian refugees wishing to return to their homes and live in peace with their neighbours to do so or to be justly compensated if they chose not to return. Since then, the rights of the Palestinians have been ignored, their existence as an entity denied, their status as a people obliterated. They were instead, in disregard of all norms of human rights, treated with indignity like hapless refugees. Those who remained behind in the territory or became victims of further illegal occupation were reduced to second-class citizens and live under the glare of permanent hostility resulting from an armed occupation.

51. After a quarter of a century of diffused and piecemeal deliberations on the problem of Palestine, the General Assembly, in 1974, finally dealt with the question in its totality encompassing all aspects, historical, political and juridical. Thus the Assembly by its resolution 3236 (XXIX) unambiguously spelt out the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty and to return to their homes and property from which they had been forcibly dispersed. The resolution overwhelmingly endorsed the right of the Palestinian people to present their own case and participate in any peace negotiations through their legitimate representatives, the Palestine Liberation Organization, which had already secured such specific recognition as full membership in the 86-member non-aligned Conference, the Islamic Conference, the League of Arab States and, through General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX), the status of permanent observer at the United Nations.

52. In 1975, the General Assembly by resolution 3376 (XXX), established the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. In subsequent years, through its resolutions 31/20, 32/40 and 33/28 respectively, the Assembly endorsed and adopted as its own the recommendations contained in the Committee's report and repeatedly extended the Committee's mandate to promote the implementation of those recommendations. The role assigned to the Security Council was preponderant. It is primarily in pursuance of the mandate entrusted to the Palestine Committee that the Council is meeting today. However, above and beyond this is the pressure of a burgeoning global consensus that the Council must face fairly and squarely the issue of Palestinian rights. Over the past few years, there has been a crystallization of views by the world community on the content and direction—the essential parameters—of an equitable settlement in the Middle East.

53. My delegation wishes to pay a tribute to Ambassador Fall and the members of the Committee who have contributed so greatly in that process. We have consistently held that the Committee's recommendations do indeed represent a balanced prescription for peace whose fundamental substance must find reflection in a unanimous Security Council pronouncement. We are particularly struck by the guiding motivation of the members of the Committee that the implementation of their recommendations should constitute a contribution within the framework of the United Nations and should complement efforts towards the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the region.

54. The Council cannot continue to impede and ignore the wishes of the international community without imperiling peace and compounding injustice. It has now become obvious that an equitable solution cannot remain confined within the hidebound perimeter of resolution 242 (1967). There has been substantial forward progression in the dozen years that have intervened. There have been qualitative changes universally recognized by our global society. Four million Palestinians cannot be simply wished away as non-people. They are a reality recognized by the great majority of mankind. Nor can resolution 242 (1967) itself be stretched to justify illegality and expansionism or cloud through sophistry the cardinal principles of the Charter—

principles which stipulate that no country can be permitted to embark on a policy of conquest and aggrandizement, that no country can be allowed to enjoy the fruits of its aggression and that no people can be denied their inalienable right to a homeland.

55. Independent moves towards a so-called comprehensive settlement which circumvent the central issue of the Middle East conflict—the implementation of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people—are tantamount to inviting violence and condoning illegality.

56. Bangladesh particularly notes that, notwithstanding the pursuit of its own independent prescription for peace, Israel follows a policy which is the very antithesis of peace. In violation of the Charter and the decisions of the United Nations, Israel continues illegally to occupy the Arab lands and engage in repeated and wanton acts of aggression in Lebanon. It has continued to build new settlements on land which clearly belongs to the Palestinian people. It has continued to engage in flagrant violation of the fundamental human rights of the Palestinian people and to deny them their inalienable right to statehood. Israel has embarked on a deliberate programme to alter the Islamic and Arab character of Jerusalem. We cannot but denounce Israel for its actions. We note that both Egypt and the United States have voiced their disapproval of Israeli actions on all those questions. It is evident that Israel's aim is not a comprehensive peace in the Middle East. Its aim is clearly to pursue a policy outside the ambit of the United Nations and thereby to render United Nations resolutions and decisions on the Middle East problem infructuous.

57. Bangladesh's position on what constitutes a just, equitable and durable solution of the Middle East problem has been repeatedly enunciated in the Security Council and the General Assembly. Bangladesh is firmly convinced that a fair and lasting solution demands a complete and immediate withdrawal of Israel from all occupied territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, the restoration of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to their own independent State and the acceptance of the Palestine Liberation Organization as the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

58. We have heard in the Council the statements of the PLO representative and his impassioned cry for justice. It is our expectation that the Council will act to reverse the trend that is being reinforced to deny the people of Palestine their inalienable rights to self-determination and national sovereignty. It is our belief that the Council will meet the challenge of the occasion, respond to the pleas of a dispossessed people, help them regain their legitimate rights and thus contribute to a just and comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East. The Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People once pointed out:

“Never in the history of nations have the actions of an international organization had such a decisive effect on the destiny of a people as those of the United Nations on that of the Palestinian people.”

59. The actions of the Security Council are all the more potent. We are now presented with a crucial opportunity to

chart a realistic path to a durable and just peace through timely and concerted action or, by failing to do so, to open the door to further conflict and global conflagration. Bangladesh is confident that the choice for peace can and must prevail.

60. Mr. CHEN Chu (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Mr. President, first of all, on behalf of the Chinese delegation, I would like to extend our warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the current month. At the same time, we deeply regret your imminent departure and wish you happiness and success in your future work.

61. The situation in the Middle East has been a question of universal concern, and the question of Palestine is an important and integral part of the whole Middle East question. Since the Israeli Zionists unleashed their first war of aggression against Arab countries in 1948, they have stubbornly persisted in their policies of aggression and expansion, illegally occupied the whole of Palestine and large tracts of Arab territories and driven more than a million Palestinian people from their homelands. Thousands upon thousands of Arab and Palestinian people have been deprived of their means of livelihood. Homeless and destitute, they are in dire misery. These criminal acts committed by the Israeli authorities have been severely condemned by the people of the whole world. However, instead of showing the slightest repentance, the Israeli authorities have obstinately clung to their course of hostility to the Palestinian people and the Arab people as a whole.

62. In the furtherance of their policies of aggression, expansion and annexation, the Israeli authorities have in recent years tried by hook or by crook to stamp out the national liberation cause of the Palestinian people. They have repeatedly invaded Southern Lebanon on a massive scale, attacked the camps of the Palestinian armed forces and brutally slaughtered innocent civilians, thus inflicting heavy losses upon the lives and property of the Palestinians and the people in Southern Lebanon. At the same time, the Israeli authorities have gone ahead with the establishment of more settlements on the Arab territories they forcibly occupy, trying by every means to change the legal status, geographical nature and demographic composition of the whole occupied area and thus legalize their occupation of those territories. The above facts only testify to the dogged persistence of the Israeli authorities in their reactionary position of continued occupation of Arab territories and opposition to the restoration of the national rights of the Palestinian people. This reveals the hollowness of their high-sounding call for a “lasting peace in the Middle East”.

63. The Israeli aggressors have become so truculent and bold because they have the overt or covert backing of the super-Powers. In their rivalry for spheres of influence in the Middle East and for global hegemony, the two super-Powers, each using its own means, either openly shield Israel or actually connive at its evils and concentrate on sowing discord among the Arab States, in an attempt to obstruct a comprehensive solution of the Middle East question. Obviously, to achieve a real solution of the Middle East question, it is imperative, on the one hand, firmly to oppose and exclude superpower meddling and sabotage

and, on the other, to strengthen the unity of the Arab world in a common struggle.

64. Over a long period, the Arab and Palestinian peoples have waged an unrelenting struggle against Israel's aggression and expansion and for the restoration of the national rights of the Palestinian people and the recovery of the lost Arab territories. Their struggle has won the broad sympathy and firm support of the Chinese people and of people all over the world. Since 1965, the Palestinian people under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization have waged armed struggle under the most complex and arduous conditions. Fearing no sacrifice and fighting valiantly, they have kept dealing heavy blows at the Israeli aggressors. General Assembly resolutions 3236 (XXIX) and 3376 (XXX) rectified the erroneous approach in earlier resolutions which called the question of regaining the national rights of the Palestinian people a refugee question. The two resolutions reaffirmed the Palestinian people's right to self-determination without external interference and to national independence and sovereignty, recognized their right to regain their inalienable rights by all means and appealed to all States to extend their support to the struggle of the Palestinian people. Such a change reflects the just demand of the Palestinian and Arab peoples and has been brought about as a result of their unity and persistent struggle. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People which has been established pursuant to resolution 3376 (XXX) presented its report and we are in favour of those elements in it that reaffirm or conform to the aforesaid two General Assembly resolutions. In our view, the Security Council should now unhesitatingly adopt a resolution to confirm the correct principles embodied in the aforementioned two resolutions and reaffirmed in the report of the Committee, so as to facilitate a just solution of the question of Palestine and the whole Middle East question.

65. The Chinese Government and people have always unswervingly supported the just struggle of the Arab and Palestinian peoples. We have steadfastly stood for the recovery of the occupied Arab territories and the realization of the Palestinian people's national rights, including the right to return to their homeland and establish their own State. A real solution of the Middle East question depends on the great strength of the unity of the Arab people. We sincerely hope that the various quarters in the Arab world will show mutual understanding and unite against the common enemy so as to hasten the achievement of their victory.

66. Mr. LÉPRETTE (France) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, you are going to leave us. This gives the duties you are performing for the last time as President of the Security Council a particular and special meaning, importance and, I would even say, gravity.

67. For nearly three years, you have given such proof of your devotion to the United Nations and to the cause of peace that my delegation feels a great and sincere regret at seeing you leave us. We will cherish the memory of the personal contribution you have made to the greater part of the major issues that have been brought to the attention of our Organization. To the solution of these questions, to the lessening of many tensions and to the improvement of

certain situations, you have generously applied the resources of your intelligence, your heart, your character. That will not be forgotten.

68. As the representative of a great country to which we are bound by close and age-old ties, you have added lustre to your activities here. Allow me to express my best wishes for your personal future and for the success of the missions that will be entrusted to you.

69. I should like to add a personal word of tribute to last month's President, Ambassador Ivor Richard. For five years he brought to his duties not only the authority and eloquence acquired from his parliamentary experience and the precision inspired by his legal training but also a sense of humour, sometimes dry but always smiling, which so often refreshingly broke the monotony of our debates. May I request the chargé d'affaires of the United Kingdom to convey to him my best wishes and my friendship.

70. In meeting to consider the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, the Security Council is resuming a debate already taken up several times but interrupted in October 1977. I shall not repeat my Government's reservations regarding the work of the Committee which, in our opinion, did not always take sufficiently into account all the facts pertaining to a particularly complex situation. However, I listened with great interest to this morning's statement by Ambassador Fall.

71. The fact is that the Security Council, the principal organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, today is called upon to debate the question of Palestinian rights. No doubt, it would have been desirable to have an over-all discussion of the entire question of the Middle East, but we understand the impatience of the Palestinians with the situation that has been created for them, and our debate at least has the merit of drawing attention to an essential element of this problem.

72. The French delegation, for its part, has repeatedly stated its position before the Council, notably in January and in June 1976, on the conditions to be met for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. In our view—and I should like to recall it here clearly—the various components of a genuine settlement cannot be dissociated from one another and must all be taken into account. At issue for the Arab States is the right to recover their territorial integrity, which requires the evacuation of the territories occupied by Israel since the 1967 conflict. Also at issue is the right of each of the States of the region, including Israel, to live in peace within secure, recognized and guaranteed boundaries. At issue, similarly, is the right of the Palestinian people to a homeland.

73. The Council is in duty bound to seek to reconcile these elements, if it is to live up to the hopes placed in it. It has already adopted fundamental texts on two of them—namely resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973)—which are still fully valid. By contrast, the third element—the right of the Palestinians to a homeland—has not yet found a generally accepted definition or expression. True, it is not up to us to decide for those concerned the nature and status of such a

Palestinian homeland. But it is quite clear, nevertheless, that any settlement must take that element into consideration equally with the others.

74. Finally, as to the return of the Palestinian refugees, I wish to reaffirm the position of France as stated very clearly before the Council in 1976 by my predecessor: namely that, in our view, that return is of a secondary nature in comparison with the three essential elements of the settlement, from which it cannot be dissociated, any more than the elements can be dissociated one from the other. It seems to us, indeed, that the modalities for the exercise of all of the acknowledged rights of the Palestinian people must be decided within the framework of a negotiated peace settlement.

75. May I recall, as prior speakers have done, that the responsibility and duty of the Council, which for more than 30 years has been grappling with the conflict in the Middle East, is to bend every effort to facilitate the quest for a comprehensive settlement which alone can bring a just and lasting peace to the region. It will be up to the international community which we represent to take the necessary measures in due course to guarantee the implementation of that settlement and to contribute to the creation of the atmosphere of confidence necessary for the security of all the parties involved. I confirm that my country, as a permanent member of the Council, remains willing to participate in the provision of such guarantees.

76. Mr. MANSFIELD (United Kingdom): First, Mr. President, thank you for the kind words you addressed yesterday to Mr. Ivor Richard. I have already conveyed them to him, and I will do the same with those addressed to him by the representative of France.

77. Secondly, my delegation is indeed glad that you are presiding over the Council this month, and in particular over the important deliberations on the Middle East situation. You are exceptionally well qualified for this task; we are therefore sorry that this will be the last month that you do so. But you will leave behind you a great reputation, and there will be many in the United Nations who will miss your sincerity, your good humour and your courage. We wish you every success in your future activities.

78. The aim of the British Government in the Middle East is to promote just and lasting peace. Our concern is to avoid all actions and decisions which might make the search for peace more difficult. We continue to believe that the basis for the attainment of a just and lasting comprehensive settlement is the full implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), as called for in resolution 338 (1973). Resolution 242 (1967) sets out the requirements for peace. It calls for the withdrawal of the Israeli occupying forces and reaffirms that Israel, like all States in the area, is entitled to live in peace with its neighbours within secure and recognized borders. Those principles represent a balance which must not be impaired. Our commitment to their implementation remains total.

79. Resolution 242 (1967) is concerned with how the Arab States and Israel can live in peace together. It does not deal with the question of the Palestinians. It takes no account of

their belief that they are a separate people with political rights which go well beyond their status as refugees—a status that was recognized in resolution 242 (1967)—a people distinct from the peoples of the countries where they now live. It takes no account of the need for the Palestinian people to be given the opportunity to express their national identity and to have a proper place in the international community. The international community has increasingly come to recognize the validity of their claim and to acknowledge their legitimate rights.

80. My Government is convinced that the Palestinians are a central issue in the Middle East conflict. They must be able to see a future for themselves in the area. They must be fully involved in any settlement and be able to participate in its negotiation. A settlement which does not command the broad assent of the Palestinians will not last. In sum, my Government believes that a settlement must satisfy the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to a land of their own. This is not only a political fact. My Government fully sympathizes with the plight of the Palestinians, particularly those who continue to live under foreign occupation and those who have lived as refugees, in some cases for 30 years. This humanitarian problem cannot be left untackled indefinitely.

81. We should not lose sight of the fact that a serious effort is currently being made to tackle the problem. The current negotiations of the future of the occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip are concerned with the Palestinian issue. We wish the negotiations well and hope that they will succeed. My Government believes that if the result is genuine autonomy for the occupied areas as a transitional stage towards the final determination of their status, that would not only help to alleviate the position of the inhabitants but could also be a further step on the road to a comprehensive settlement.

82. The Security Council has long played a role in Middle East affairs which gives it a capacity to influence the course of events. It is therefore right that the Council should attempt to refine the principles on which a settlement must be based. But what has been achieved in the past must not be wrecked now. We must be sure that the Council's influence is used positively and helpfully. A principal concern of my Government throughout has been that resolution 242 (1967) should be supplemented, not replaced, amended or distorted. Its principles must remain a starting point for peace negotiations, together with the need to meet Palestinian aspirations.

83. We are also aware that resolution 242 (1967) and the principles it embodies have not been accepted by all those who wish to be regarded as parties to the dispute with a right to be involved in negotiations. This has constantly bedevilled the search for peace and for a means of involving the Palestinians in the determination of their own future. As I have said, my Government accepts that resolution 242 (1967) on its own is not sufficient for the Palestinians. But we believe the Palestinians and those who claim to speak for them should accept unequivocally the principles contained in that resolution, in particular the right of all States in the area, and this must include Israel, to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

84. If the Palestinians are to exercise self-determination, this must be clearly in the context of a peace settlement in which Israel's right to peaceful and permanent existence is confirmed, and if necessary guaranteed. That is why my Government hoped that those who have not yet done so would have indicated that they accept without qualification that Israel has the right to exist and that they are committed to a negotiated settlement on this basis. My Government would like to urge the Palestine Liberation Organization once again to take that step. We believe it is fundamentally wrong to see this as a bargaining card. It is an essential step if peace negotiations are to be successful. And no step could do more to establish the credentials of those wishing to represent the Palestinian people.

85. By the same token, my Government would urge on the Government of Israel whole-hearted recognition of the fact that the legitimate rights of the Palestinians must be satisfied if a lasting settlement is to be achieved. I do not believe it is in the interests of peace for the Government of Israel to refuse to face this. Palestinian rights cannot and will not be ignored. Ultimately, the Palestinians and Israelis will have to sit down together to negotiate. The longer that is delayed, the more difficult such a negotiation is likely to be and the higher the casualty list from continuing violence will become.

86. An important step forward is in our grasp. Our efforts should continue to be devoted to making such a step possible.

87. Mr. MATHIAS (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, we now know that your presence as President of the Council is more fleeting than that of any of us who occupy that chair for a month. All the more, therefore, do we wish to express to you our esteem and respect on the eve of your departure and to say to you how much we have appreciated your warm human qualities and your great professional skills. Your battle for your ideas and your convictions and the devotion with which you uphold them are an example which we shall long remember.

88. I also wish once more to express my appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Ivor Richard, who presided over our work in an exemplary way during the month of July with the brilliance and intelligence which we all know him to have.

89. The position of my country regarding the situation in the Middle East, and in particular regarding the rights of the Palestinian people, has already been stated in the United Nations and before the Security Council. I shall therefore reaffirm once again that my country supports a just and lasting peace in the region and that we believe that this can only be attained by taking into account the legitimate political rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination and therefore to a land of their own. We can well imagine the suffering, the woe, the bitterness of their exile and we believe that the solution to the problem is becoming increasingly urgent. The conscience of the international community, which in a way we represent here, requires it.

90. It seems to us an accepted fact that the establishment of this peace requires the implementation of resolutions 242

(1967) and 338 (1973). And thus, with respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of each State in the region, after Israel withdraws from the territories occupied during the 1967 conflict—for that occupation is unacceptable and illegal—it will be possible for everyone to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

91. The right of the Palestinian people to a land of their own goes hand in hand—as far as my Government is concerned—with the defence of the existence of the State of Israel, and we wish to affirm without ambiguity that this should be accepted unequivocally by all the parties concerned, in the interests of peace, for which no effort should be spared.

92. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

93. Mr. SOUTHICHAK (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic would like first of all to convey to you its sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of August. Your experience and your skill will help the Council, in a spirit of reason and justice, to find a solution to the problem which it now has before it. My delegation would also like to express its thanks to you and through you to all the members of the Council who have allowed my delegation to participate in the debate.

94. I should also like to pay a tribute to Ambassador Ivor Richard, representative of the United Kingdom, for the very skilful way in which he conducted the debates in the Council during the month of July.

95. The question of Palestine is one that has been a constant source of concern. In fact, it is of particular importance because it has been recognized by our Organization as being at the very heart of the problem of the Middle East and we cannot conceive of any solution of the problem without taking into account the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

96. The delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic is happy that these sessions of the Council have been convened. They have been long awaited, in fact, since the first meetings were held in October 1977 and were adjourned to permit fresh consultations. Since then, the international community has constantly reminded the Security Council of the need to find appropriate measures to deal with the Palestine question on the basis of the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People which were endorsed by the General Assembly at its thirty-first, thirty-second and thirty-third sessions.

97. It should be noted that in the meantime we have witnessed events which, far from bringing us closer to a just and equitable solution of the Palestinian question, have made it more remote, first because of the intransigence of Israel, which is continuing its illegal occupation of Palestinian territory and, secondly, because of imperialist manoeuvres to drag out a solution of the problem of the Middle East

and of Palestine. The Palestinian people themselves who for decades now have undergone indescribable suffering because of the expansionist policies practised by Israel have been forced to abandon their homes and their property, their historical inheritance and to become refugees.

98. The Israeli leaders, with unlimited knavery and insatiable expansionist designs, have committed act after act of indescribable aggression against the Palestinian people both in the territories that they have occupied and wherever those people are to be found, thus deliberately violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the States which gave them shelter. After four wars of conquest, Israel has more than quadrupled the area of the lands it controls and quite recently the Israeli leaders have been brazen enough to declare that the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip, which Israel has occupied by force since 1967, constitute the very heart of their country and that they claim the sovereign right to establish settler colonies there. That language resonant with force and defiance has clearly shown that Israel places its right of conquest above the inalienable rights of peoples, and in particular of the Palestinian people, and this represents a serious challenge to the international community and to the resolutions of the United Nations as well as a threat to peace and security in that area.

99. It is profoundly to be regretted that, in the face of such deliberate defiance, the Security Council has proved, at least to date, that it is both weak and incapable of taking the appropriate steps to put an end to Israeli aggression and repression. The fact that the Council has thus been immobilized has made the international community an implicit accomplice of the cynical designs of Israel, which, as can be seen daily, continues to commit ever more acts of aggression and to pursue its intention of denying the Palestinian people their inalienable rights. The continuous attacks carried out by Israeli forces in ever intensified degree against the Palestinian refugee camps, causing so much loss of life and suffering by innocent people, have shown once again Israel's arrogant attitude towards the United Nations and its stubborn intention to pursue to the very end its policy of expansionism which merely serves to perpetuate tension in that part of the world.

100. Recently, there have been attempts to settle the Middle East question the motivations behind which do not respond to the rights and interests of the Palestinian and Arab peoples. My delegation has followed those manoeuvres aimed at bringing about a so-called peace by separate agreements with growing concern, and we have regarded that formula as being one that is essentially in contradiction to the international consensus reached on the Palestinian problem, and therefore one that cannot be considered as a basis for producing a just and lasting settlement of the Middle East crisis. These agreements have already aroused violent opposition on the part of the Arab countries, an opposition that has been expressed in forceful language by the Council of the League of Arab States, which, during its Baghdad meeting last March, adopted resolutions calling on all countries to refrain from supporting a treaty that constitutes "an aggression against the rights of the Palestinian people and the Arab nation and a threat to peace and security in the world". [S/13216 of 3 April 1979, annex, para. 7.] We consider that any attempt at reaching a settle-

ment, at reaching a just and lasting solution, should be based on those principles enunciated in United Nations resolutions and, in particular, in General Assembly resolution 33/28 A which declares in paragraph 4 that

"the validity of agreements purporting to solve the problem of Palestine requires that they be within the framework of the United Nations and its Charter and its resolutions on the basis of the full attainment and exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right of return and the right to national independence and sovereignty in Palestine, and with the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization".

101. The deteriorating situation in the Middle East which may at any moment explode is a direct consequence of the attempt to reach a settlement in the Middle East that has denied the fundamental rights of the Palestinian people. That attempt has encouraged Israel deliberately to oppose the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. The immoderate declarations made by Israeli leaders to the effect that Israel will never withdraw to the frontiers existing prior to 1967, that Jerusalem will forever be the capital of the Israeli State and that there will never be a Palestinian State on the West Bank of the Jordan or in the Gaza Strip unambiguously confirm the avowed intent of Israel to oppose the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council and to establish itself once and for all on the territories that it has acquired by force.

102. The Security Council, in which the Palestinian people and the international community have placed their hopes, after waiting for so long, should this time be in a position to take appropriate steps in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. In that connexion, the Council has before it a draft resolution, which was introduced by the representative of Senegal [S/13514], whose contents we believe are at least in keeping with the international consensus reached on the question of Palestine. It is the hope of my delegation that the Council will discharge its responsibilities in accordance with the desires expressed by the entire international community by adopting this draft resolution.

103. The Palestinian people, which have for more than 30 years been subjected to humiliation, have suffered greatly from Israel's atrocious acts of repression, intimidation and aggression. In view of that situation, it is perfectly obvious that the struggle of the Palestinian people to recover their inalienable rights to self-determination, independence and national sovereignty is a just struggle that is ceaselessly gaining ever greater support from forces throughout the world that prize peace, freedom and justice. The delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic would like once again to reaffirm its whole-hearted support for the just and heroic struggle of that people under the leadership of its sole authentic representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization; it is our conviction that this struggle will inevitably be crowned with a glorious victory.

104. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

105. Mr. EL-CHOUI (Syrian Arab Republic): Mr. President, I want at the outset to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. The courage you have shown cannot pass without the appreciation of all who are oppressed. Your stand has indeed shown remarkable courage, understanding and sensitivity to the plight of the Palestinian people. I feel moved and sad in anticipating your departure from the United Nations. I am sure that you will leave the same sad emotion among all your colleagues in the Organization. We do wish you all the best.

106. Allow me at the same time to pay due respect to your predecessor, Ambassador Ivor Richard, of the United Kingdom, for the efficient manner in which he presided over the work of the Council last month.

107. Again the question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable national rights is on our agenda, and, while the issue is hardly a question of debate for us, we appreciate the fact that once more we are faced with a stark reminder that a grave and long-standing injustice has yet to be redressed by the international Organization.

108. We recognize with appreciation how the United Nations has accepted, recognized and supported the struggles of other peoples who have desired their freedom from colonial domination. It has welcomed them to its ranks, as newly independent States, and by continuing to do so it may eventually come to be truly representative of the world community. But, again, it is painful to note that, with respect to the Middle East, the United Nations has so far failed to exert its full power and authority in helping the Palestinian people to acquire their national independence. This failure casts a gloomy shadow over the cause of world peace because, should it persist, the possibility of another major global confrontation looms before all of us. It is therefore not only a matter of adhering to a noble principle; it is also a matter of necessity that the United Nations should begin to take up its task by extending full and unconstrained support to the just struggle of the Palestinian people for freedom and national independence.

109. The Middle East conflict hinges on the most important problem: the denial of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. It is that simple and fundamental element that is the crux of the problem. No one among us seeks any privileged position or special treatment for the Palestinian people. All we ask is that the Palestinian people be accorded their basic national rights, rights that have been accorded to all other peoples, and that they receive redress for all the cruelty and injustice that they have suffered in the past decades. All that is needed is an elementary sense of justice, a basic notion of right and wrong.

110. The Palestinian people, who were forcibly expelled from their homeland—whether in 1948, 1956 or 1967—have the right to return to their homes. Yes, we all know of the many resolutions that the United Nations has already adopted to that effect but, again, they have been seen only on paper and have yet to be translated into concrete action.

111. The Palestinian people do not need any more sympathy. They are waging a life-and-death struggle, and it is

not enough to shed a tear for them once in an opportune while. Sympathy merely assuages the pain but does not heal the wound. It is high time that we commit ourselves to the task of healing the wound and make our profound expressions of sympathy come alive for the Palestinian people.

112. In doing so, we should not only be rising to meet our moral obligations to the oppressed Palestinian people, we should also be fulfilling a responsibility we all share as States Members of the international Organization. Needless to say, maintaining the world's confidence in the viability and prestige of the international Organization requires concrete and decisive action in ensuring international peace and security. To perpetuate the denial of the national rights of the Palestinian people is to abandon our very vision of international peace based on justice and equality. Such perpetuation would entail acceptance of the aggressor's principle of peace based on "might makes right". It would constitute the very desertion of our own norms of justice based on the Charter and commonly agreed principles as embodied in what is known as international law.

113. Any people struggling for freedom and independence becomes steeled in the very action of their national liberation movement. From the throes of that battle emerge valiant sons and daughters who take up the responsibility of advancing their people's progress to final victory. The Palestinian people have produced their leaders in the Palestine Liberation Organization.

114. But, while the United Nations has accorded recognition to many of those national liberation movements, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, it is conspicuous that the colonial Powers, old and new, have desisted from according legitimate recognition to the Palestine Liberation Organization. In particular, the United States of America has even gone so far as to declare that it will never recognize the Palestine Liberation Organization unless that organization accepts certain pre-conditions. We think that the imposition of such pre-conditions is unjust and that, furthermore, it reveals an irresponsible stand by a great Power. It is crystal clear that the Palestine Liberation Organization is indeed the sole representative of the Palestinian people. Without its participation on an equal footing, there cannot be any practical progress. We fail to understand how the United States can seriously justify such an unjust stand.

115. We believe that the Palestinian people are entitled, under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, to their right to self-determination, and I shall unequivocally state here that in that belief we are ready to accept whatever future direction the Palestinian people decide upon for themselves. We believe that anyone who professes any concern on this issue must accept the Palestine Liberation Organization as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. Consequently, anyone who speaks of a peaceful settlement must accept negotiations with the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, the Palestine Liberation Organization. That is why we oppose and shall continue to oppose the shameful treaty between Egypt and Israel, which was sponsored by the United States of America. The signatories to the treaty usurped the rights of the Palestinian people. They made

themselves representatives of the Palestinian people. And to what effect? They anticipated only permanent subjugation of the Palestinian people. They assigned the role of managing the sewage system in Palestine to the Palestinian people.

116. We regard the Camp David accords and the so-called peace treaty between Israel and Egypt, and any other agreements that may emerge, as null and void. Furthermore, we regard denying the Palestinian people their inalienable rights as an insult not only to the Palestinian people but to the Arab nation and to the United Nations. The signatories at Camp David designed for themselves the role of arbiters who can shape the history of the Middle East and who can impose their authority on the United Nations. We should condemn that design. We shall struggle against it and we think that the United Nations must do the same. It is already very clear that the shameful treaty has resulted in further deterioration of the situation in the Middle East. It has added more bitterness, hatred and suspicion to the political scene in the Middle East. It is clear that the treaty has become the real obstacle to achieving a just, comprehensive and durable peace in the Middle East. It has freed the criminal from any accountability. It has encouraged that same criminal, that is Zionist Israel, to carry out its expansionist schemes by persistently colonizing Palestinian and other Arab territories and by its almost daily murderous raids against the innocent population in Southern Lebanon. In fact, while we are speaking here today, Israel is bombarding most of Southern Lebanon.

117. Let us face it—there can never be a just peace in the Middle East without the active participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization in negotiating, arranging and concluding the terms of such a just peace. Furthermore, the Camp David accords and the separate peace treaty further endanger the situation in the Middle East. In order to revive the process for a just, durable and comprehensive peace in the Middle East, the beginning must be the undoing of the Camp David accords and their consequences. The United Nations is, in our opinion, the only proper forum for achieving such a peace.

118. I realize that some Powers, in particular the United States of America, have some reservations on that point. They have put forward certain criteria to justify their hesitation to recognize the Palestine Liberation Organization. They argue, for example, that the Palestine Liberation Organization has not been freely elected. Here, I should like to pose a challenge to the United States: recognize the Palestinian people's right to self-determination, hold free and internationally supervised elections, and we shall all be committed to the outcome of such elections. The Palestinian people will decide on who should be their leaders. But first recognize their right to self-determination.

119. The majority of mankind, represented by the majority of the Member States of the United Nations, has condemned Israeli aggression many times. They have already roundly condemned the threat which Zionism poses to world peace and security. They have rightly identified Zionism with racism and *apartheid*. They have seen how Zionist Israel is a mere metamorphosis of Nazi Germany. That international verdict was not achieved easily.

120. The history of the people of Palestine has been written in blood since 1948. And the Middle East will know no peace until the fundamental issue, that is, the acceptance of the right of self-determination for the Palestinian people, is resolved. It is clear for all of us that the Security Council has been paralyzed and it is likely that it will remain so by virtue of the negative vote of the United States. We believe that the misuse of the veto power inflicts not only further injury, bloodshed and suffering on the Palestinian and Arab peoples, but also enormous damage on this very Organization of the United Nations and the Charter. It is high time for all Council members to recognize the explosive situation in the Middle East. It is high time for the international Organization to avert another tragedy in the Middle East which can hardly be limited to our area. On the contrary, a new tragedy in the Middle East might very likely threaten the peace and security of the whole world. From this stand, we appeal once again to Council members to act in accordance with their responsibility and with their powers and to undo the injustice, condemn the aggressor, enforce Israel's withdrawal from all the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories and, finally, ensure that the Palestinian people are able to exercise their inalienable rights, including their right to self-determination and a sovereign independent State.

121. Finally, we feel grateful to Ambassador Fall of Senegal, and indeed to all the members of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, of which he is Chairman. The Committee has once again acted with admirable responsibility, impartiality and courage. We do hope that the Security Council will act in the same manner.

122. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Morocco. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

123. Mr. FILALI (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like first to congratulate you, on behalf of the delegation of Morocco, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of August. This is a tribute to your country, with which Morocco has relations of co-operation and friendship which date back for many years.

124. I have had a relationship of trust, with you and I have thus been able to appreciate your political courage, your great moral spirit and your outstanding intellect. All of us have feelings of respect, admiration and esteem for you. The lucidity of your judgement, the speed and sharpness of your intelligence, your analysis of international problems and particularly the problems of the third world lead me to believe that your forthcoming departure will leave a tremendous gap in our midst. We extend to you our best wishes for your future activities.

125. I should also like to pay a well deserved tribute to your predecessor as President of the Council, Ambassador Richard, for the outstanding manner in which he discharged his responsibilities as representative of the United Kingdom to the United Nations.

126. Finally, I should like to thank all the members of the Council for allowing me to speak on behalf of Morocco, in

its capacity as President of the Islamic Conference, as well as on behalf of the Jerusalem Committee, the President of which is His Majesty King Hassan II. There is no doubt that the problem of the Middle East and particularly the question of Palestine represent a principal subject to which the Islamic Conference attaches the utmost interest. It is because, in fact, the Palestinian question has reached an historical turning point of exceptional gravity.

127. We have noted with satisfaction the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.¹ That report has been very carefully drafted and is directed towards future action. Its recommendations have a legal foundation and are based on equity. In our view, they should serve as a basis for the initiation of any solution acceptable to all because they bring closer the possibilities of peace and promote the achievement and recognition of universally accepted rights.

128. I should like in passing to extend my warm congratulations to the members of the Committee, and in particular to its Chairman, my friend Ambassador Fall, whose eminence as an experienced diplomat is known to all. We are all aware that the United Nations archives are filled to overflowing with documents containing the various formulas the Security Council and the General Assembly have adopted in the attempt to arrive at a just solution of the Palestine problem, a solution that has unfortunately eluded the international community for more than 30 years. It is truly painful to speak for decades about a perfectly clear and unassailable question only to realize, in the end, that we are caught in a vicious circle and locked in a state of chronic immobility. That is where we find ourselves at the present time, because the crux of the Middle East problem—the Palestinian question—has always been ignored.

129. And yet, there has been no lack of precedents. In the past, both the Security Council and the General Assembly have taken decisions on other, similar cases. Many countries that are Members of the Organization today have been able to become a part of it by exercising their right to self-determination and owing to the recognition of that right by the appropriate United Nations bodies. Why is it that what was good for a certain number of States in the past does not hold good for the Palestinian people? We feel that this is an injustice that must be redressed. We believe that it must be redressed for two basic reasons, the first of which is that the Security Council adopted resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) on the situation in the Middle East. We also believe that no definitive solution to the situation in the Middle East can be found until the Council realizes that, in order to implement both resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), a third element must be added, one that in our opinion is essential: the granting to the Palestinian people of their right to self-determination. How, indeed, can any just and equitable peaceful solution to the problem be possible without reference to the Palestinian people and to its legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization?

130. On behalf of the entire Islamic nation, I should like to state here our determination and devotion to the need for a

just and global solution to the problem that concerns the entire Moslem world. We must also reaffirm that the Palestinian question is at the core of the Middle East problem, and that any solution that does not take the Palestinian cause into account and that does not entail the restitution of occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem, is of necessity partial and unacceptable to the Moslem world.

131. It is inadmissible that Israel should continue to agitate throughout the world for recognition of the right of all Jewish citizens in other countries to emigrate from those countries to Israel, even though such Jews have never seen Palestine nor trod its soil in the past, while at the same time it continues to deny to the displaced Palestinians the right to return to their country and in practice to prevent them from exercising that right.

132. We cannot continue to ignore the heroic struggle the Palestinian people have been waging for more than 30 years under the leadership of its sole representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization, in their attempt to regain the exercise of their inalienable rights. We know that such rights are not negotiable and cannot be subject to barter. They have been solemnly recognized in General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX) and Security Council resolution 452 (1979). We reaffirm that the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people to return to their homes and to achieve independence and national sovereignty must be supported and guaranteed by all. That, in our opinion, is the key to any solution to the Middle East problem.

133. The Islamic Conference has always vigorously denounced the expansionist policy of Israel and has demanded its withdrawal from all Arab territories, as well as the recognition of the Palestinian people's right to return to their homeland and to self-determination. It has also called for the creation of an independent Palestinian State on its own land and led by that same organization, the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

134. The Moslem nation has also reaffirmed at all Islamic conferences, and particularly at the meeting held at Fez in May 1979, its devotion to the Arab character of Jerusalem, and its determination to liberate that Holy City and to re-establish Arab sovereignty over it.

135. Through its various spokesmen, Israel reaffirms that Jerusalem will never be restored to Arab sovereignty and that it will forever remain the capital of Israel. In so doing, Israel is simply defying the Islamic nation and conscience, by rejecting all the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions that particularly recognize the Arab character of Jerusalem. That position is all the more incomprehensible in that Israel states that it abides by resolution 242 (1967). That resolution clearly calls for withdrawal from all occupied territories, including Jerusalem.

136. Is there any need to remind Israel that above all else, the Holy City of Jerusalem represents an indestructible focal point of spiritual values for the entire Moslem nation? Must we remind it that hundreds of millions of Moslems are singularly concerned with the future of the religious magnetic pole that Jerusalem has always been for them?

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Supplement No. 35.*

137. I should like to refer to resolution No. 2 adopted by the Jerusalem Committee that met at Fez on 2 and 3 June 1979. The Committee invited the Security Council

“to take practical steps to ensure the realization of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people and to put an end to the continued aggression against the Holy City of Jerusalem and other occupied Palestinian and Arab territories”.

138. The Security Council has before it today a draft resolution prepared by the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People [S/13514]. We welcome this draft, although its substance does not fully respond to the legitimate aspirations of the Moslem nation regarding the Palestinian cause, and we hope that it can lead to a process of reconciliation between conflicting views and that the Council will receive it favourably.

139. In conclusion, we believe that Israel must at last realize that the policy it has persistently advocated and practised leads but to a deadlock; it cannot refuse to others what it constantly claims for itself. Realism and wisdom compel us to affirm once again that a just and comprehensive peace in that region can only be achieved by allowing the Palestinian people to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

140. The Middle East, as everybody knows, is going through a dangerous period of crisis; from one moment to another that crisis could degenerate into an even more deadly conflict than those of the past. Accordingly, we believe that the Security Council, the organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, today more than ever has the obligation to come up with guidelines for a satisfactory solution in conformity with the aspirations of the peoples of the region. It is the duty of the Council to make that effort to render justice to the Palestinian people, who for 30 years have been living in exile; the Council must do so, if it is to live up to the expectations of the international community which, today more than ever, calls for the restoration of the national rights of that dispersed people. Otherwise, the Council will dash the hopes of all and the Middle East crisis will only become more inextricably confused.

141. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Turkey, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

142. Mr. ERALP (Turkey): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to pay a tribute to the efficient and capable manner in which you have been conducting the proceedings of the Security Council on this very important and delicate problem. I should also like to express my regrets that you have chosen not to remain with us any longer and I would wish you happiness and success in any new endeavour on which you may wish to embark.

143. The Palestine problem, which is the core of the Middle East issue, was inherited by our Organization in its first years of existence through the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 181 (II) in 1947 which sought the creation of two States in Palestine. Since then, the tragic

plight of the people of Palestine has endured and their resolute efforts to achieve self-determination have continued for more than 30 years. The Palestinian issue, in spite of the major important developments achieved towards the international recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, still remains an incessant source of suffering and wrongs. There can certainly be no durable peace in the Middle East without justice, and justice requires the recognition and fulfilment of the national rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination and to establish a State of their own.

144. After many years during which the issue of Palestine was considered exclusively within the context of a refugee problem, its basic political dimension has finally been accepted and defined in various resolutions by the General Assembly. An overwhelming majority of the international community supports the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to establish an independent State.

145. General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX) is of historic importance in that regard. That resolution, while confirming the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to return to their homes, emphasizes at the same time that the Palestinian people is one of the main parties directly concerned in the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Later, the Assembly, further elaborated on the question and in its resolution 3375 (XXX) decided to invite the Palestine Liberation Organization, as the sole representative of the Palestinian people, to participate in all international efforts relating to the Middle East on an equal footing with the other concerned parties. Turkey has supported those resolutions. Our support in that regard has been based on the universal recognition of the right to self-determination and on respect for the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

146. With a view to translating into action the provisions of those resolutions and in order to draw up a programme for the implementation of the Palestinian rights enumerated in General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX), the General Assembly established the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, of which Turkey is a constituent member. That Committee has already recommended a programme which was endorsed by the Assembly in 1976, 1977 and 1978, during its last three consecutive sessions.

147. Some difficulties have been encountered in taking concrete action in the Security Council with a view to implementing the recommendations of that Committee over the past two years. In spite of those difficulties, however, we believe that those recommendations, already endorsed by the General Assembly, have produced a significant impact in focusing attention on the necessity of a just solution of the Palestinian issue. We feel it is high time for the Council, which is in session at present, to address itself to the issue of Palestine, the very essence of the Middle East question, and to the recognition and realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

148. As has been stated on several occasions in different organs of the Organization by my delegation, Turkey firmly

believes that a just and lasting solution to the Middle East question can only be found by taking into consideration the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arab people, including their right to decide their own future and to have their own State. We believe that a constructive conclusion of the present debate in the Security Council will certainly constitute an important contribution to the search for such a comprehensive solution to the Middle East question.

149. I should like to conclude my remarks on the question by repeating the principles and fundamentals which we believe should underlie such a just and lasting solution. A political settlement in the Middle East should be based not only upon Israel's withdrawal from all the Arab territories it occupied in 1967, including Jerusalem, but also upon the recognition and realization of the national legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinians, including their right to establish a State of their own, as well as on the principle that the Palestine Liberation Organization is the sole legitimate representative of the people of Palestine.

150. Turkey will continue to support and welcome any peace initiative in the region which conforms to the above-mentioned principles.

151. The PRESIDENT: I propose now to make a statement in my capacity as representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

152. The Security Council and the United Nations as a whole have debated the Palestinian question for over 30 years. We are all in agreement that resolving the Palestinian issue is central to settling the Arab-Israel conflict and that the principles of the Charter are relevant and must be applied if solutions are to be found. Although there remains a wide diversity of views on how to resolve the issue, the debate has confirmed the importance of moving forward.

153. For too long, too little has been done to move beyond rhetoric and violence to a process of discussion and negotiation, which alone can bring about the recognition and realization of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. As a result, the problem of the Palestinians remains unsolved. That need not be so. For its part, the United States has committed itself to the search for peace in the Middle East, including the resolution of the Palestinian question in all its aspects.

154. That search for peace has reached its first historic conclusion—the Egypt-Israel peace treaty—and we will redouble our efforts to achieve further results within the framework of the Camp David accords.

155. The United States attitude here in the Council, and towards the process of discussion and consultation which has led to this meeting, reflects our conviction that the Palestinian people must be brought into the peace process if in the end it is to succeed. Peace with justice must apply to all peoples in the area.

156. Thus, it is important that the Council understand our basic approach to securing a comprehensive peace in the Middle East, for that basic approach will guide both our actions with respect to the countries and peoples of the area and our response to proposals for action by the Council.

157. First, the current stage of the peace process, now centred on negotiations between Egypt, Israel and the United States, needs a chance to succeed. Secondly, the basis for making peace is Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) in their entirety. Thirdly, the right of Israel and its neighbours to live in peace, within secure and recognized borders, is fundamental. And fourthly, the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to participate in determining their future, must be realized.

158. On the basis of that approach, we are now deeply engaged in the pursuit of peace in the Middle East. Negotiations to create full autonomy for the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza are now proceeding between Egypt, Israel and the United States. We believe that this realistic step can help to achieve the goal of peace with justice which we all share. For the first time in more than 30 years, negotiations are under way which directly address the Palestinian question, and Palestinians are invited to take part in those negotiations.

159. In addition, there should be—as the Charter demands—an end to all acts or threats of violence in the area on all sides, as a step towards negotiations and a peaceful resolution of disputes. The philosophy and the practice of non-violence and the peaceful settlement of conflicts have broad support in the United States and deep roots in the United Nations system.

160. We do not counsel inaction. The question cannot be: should action be taken? Rather it must be: how should we act, and what course is most effective at a given time? We are convinced that the dynamic of the current process in the Middle East is a basis for hope. Our position is not a counsel of despair; we hope it will be seen as a promise that the course which marks our efforts is one which will lead to peace with justice.

161. Finally, may I say that we appreciate the significance of the debate, and the statesmanship shown throughout.

162. May I take the liberty of speaking for a few moments not as the representative of my Government but in my capacity as a friend and colleague of all of you who are present. I take this liberty because it was not my design that I should be leaving the Council at a time when I was serving as its President. I hardly anticipated that this would occur, and yet I have no regrets about what has occurred; in fact, I see it as a part of the work of the Council with which I intend to be associated for long after I have left you.

163. It has indeed been a pleasure—and many of you have referred to that fact—that we have in many respects reversed our relationships with much of the rest of the world. That is certainly most obvious with Africa, but it is probably just as true in terms of our relationships in the early days of my presence on the Council, when the so-called “gang of five”—or the European and Western members of the Council—worked together to begin to bring about a peaceful transition to majority rule for the nation of Namibia.

164. Our relationships with Latin America have certainly been improved, not so much as a result of my work, but as a result of a national policy which began almost immediately

in this Administration to negotiate an agreement with Panama on the utilization and the transfer of responsibility and authority on the question of the Panama Canal. As a result of that, our relations with Latin America have been greatly improved, we find ourselves in this hemisphere with a kind of respect and partnership in development that we have long sought and are very pleased to have been a part of. I should say that even our relationship with the Soviet Union in the past two and a half years has taken a very definite step forward, as we have sought to negotiate strategic arms limitation treaties and to come to a new understanding of how we might work together in the world to realize fully the principles which we share and also to avoid conflicts in areas where we might disagree.

165. We have seen also an improvement in our relationship with the People's Republic of China, and our involvement in South-East Asia has emerged on a new and improved basis, in spite of the tensions and problems which still exist there.

166. I think that our relationships with the Arab world have made this kind of debate and dialogue possible, and the progress that we are making in the discussions around the Security Council table is part of a long period of conversations and negotiations which have gone on for many years and which I think are just beginning to bear fruit.

167. Most important, I think, is the fact that we have been able to maintain our friendships with and our responsibilities towards our allies and the nation of Israel, while expanding our communication and our involvement with new friends and partners in the search for peace, security and development in the world.

168. I think the thing that I am perhaps most proud of in my association with the Security Council and especially with my Government over the past two and a half years is that for the longest time in my lifetime, my nation has gone about its business in the world, has advanced its interests, and none of our soldiers has had to kill anyone else; neither has any of our young people been called upon to die in the uniform of his country. I think that is a testimony to our desire to search for peace and to bring about peaceful solutions to problems, problems that we as nations have been struggling with for many, many decades.

169. I must say that I have no quarrel with this Administration. In fact, I am quite proud of it. I have no quarrel with the President or the White House. In spite of petty differences with the Department of State, there have been no differences with the Secretary of State and, overwhelmingly, I would say that we basically share a sense of conviction and direction about the way things should move in today's world. I do not think that I was "set up" by my Arab or my Israeli friends. I think that whatever happened leading to my resignation was something that I entered into very much with my eyes open and came not out of any quarrel with any person or any institution, but rather out of a fundamental disagreement with a policy, one that I have sought to run from for two and a half years, for I never agreed with it.

170. And yet, when I found myself taking on the presidency of the Security Council and being faced with an issue

which required a certain level of communication and understanding, I thought that there was no particular risk involved in that communication, beyond the risk of my job—and my job has never been particularly important to me. My responsibilities to my country, my responsibilities to the ideals and principles in which I believe are important to me. And so it was no great decision on my part to visit the home of my friend and to meet another friend, and I hope that in some small way it may have opened up a question to the American people that will call attention to some of the tragic history of our nation as a result of the refusal to communicate.

171. It was a result of the refusal to communicate with the People's Republic of China and a denial of the existence of 800 million people for almost 20 years that led us into escalations of tension and war in Korea. It led us into war with Viet Nam. We could not end that war in Viet Nam until we started talking and communicating with the People's Republic of China. We are not any weaker nor is the world any the worse a place because we have opened up a dialogue and communication with the People's Republic of China. And perhaps there would have been 100,000 or more American men and women whose lives could have been saved, had we been talking with the People's Republic of China in 1951 and 1952.

172. The same might be said of the situation in the Middle East, and it was because I felt that not talking would contribute to violence and bloodshed that I believe that the risks of talking to the PLO were nothing compared to the risk of bloodshed, violence and the possible destruction and disruption of the relationships that we enjoy with many, many people in that region of the Middle East.

173. I have said that it is a ridiculous policy not to talk to the PLO, and I believe that it is a ridiculous policy. But if it is ridiculous not to talk to the PLO on the part of the United States and the nation of Israel, it is also ridiculous for many States represented here not to have good relations with the nation of Israel. For ultimately, if we are to have peace in that region, people have got to approach each other as friends and as brothers, and not as enemies blood-thirsty for the destruction of each other. And so there has to be a renunciation of violence on all sides and a beginning of communication about the possibilities of peace in the region. One of our colleagues in the Secretariat who has been moving back and forth between Israel and the PLO regarding the situation in Southern Lebanon made the matter-of-fact remark: "It's amazing how similar they are—the people around Weizman and the people around Arafat. If they could ever get together they would be a powerful combination". I believe and hope that we will live to see that day, the day when people in the Middle East can recognize their common heritage of values, whether it be from the Judaeo-Christian side or from the Christian-Moslem side, and somehow bring together those values and ideals that we share across cultures and faiths and that make it possible for us to exist together in this Organization.

174. And so I would say that in the experience of my nation, though many in my nation would not agree with me, that violence has almost always failed and that I even have some questions as to who won the Second World War,

looking at the present economies of the various nations involved. But I would say that that is also true in the Middle East. I would say that the violence of the Arab world has failed to destroy Israel, and the attempt to destroy Israel has been at great cost to the moral basis of the existence of a Palestinian people. The strength of Israel in its early days was, in a sense, that it was based on a moral foundation. And yet Israel now is rapidly spending its moral capital, wasting it in pursuit of violence and destruction in Lebanon and in the building of settlements, where perhaps, while affirming resolution 242 (1967), in the very act it is violating that resolution.

175. Somehow I think we have created a situation, not through any doing of mine—I feel that I am an innocent bystander being swept along by the forces of history, and I go gladly—in the course of which we may come to a more realistic understanding of how the Security Council might work. I think violence has failed on both sides. Actually, it is counter-productive. I think isolation of the PLO has certainly failed, and isolation of Israel has failed. Talking has not yet had a chance to succeed. And yet I think that in the kind of statesmanlike deliberations that have gone on around this table on the question, on the question of Namibia and on questions of our relationships in many parts of the world we see a faint glimmer of hope that talking might succeed. And so after these long hours that we have gathered together, going over the course of the struggles in the world, I really do not give up, for I think there is an educational process, a process of calling to the attention of the court of world opinion the reality of justice and injustice in the world in which we live.

176. Therefore, I leave the Council with great faith in the work of its members, knowing that I will continue to be a part of it in some way, but with no regrets for the fact that perhaps we broke with comfortable diplomatic channels and violated some agreements made long ago that are ridiculous. I do so in the hope that the work of the Council will continue, will progress and that we all may succeed in living up to the standards that made the Organization possible.

177. I should like to thank all of you for the privilege of working with you. I must say that I have learnt a great deal from each of you and from those members of the Council who served in previous series of meetings. I shall always count you as friends and colleagues and I hope that I will always be included in your work and in the work of the Secretariat. Forgive me for taking these liberties with the Council's time, but I felt that the situation almost required it.

178. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): Mr. President, what I am going to say after your eloquent statement will be an anticlimax, but I want to make a brief statement for the record.

179. The benefit of the Council's debate is that it has alerted public opinion in the United States to the utility, or futility, of American diplomacy with regard to the rights of the Palestinians. Americans have started to question the benefits, advantages and disadvantages and demerits. We hope that this public debate in the United States will continue, and we will do our best to encourage it.

180. No one is "off the hook" because a vote was not taken this evening. We did not use—as we were accused of using—the diplomacy of the barrel. But, unfortunately, we found that United States diplomacy on the Middle East was over a barrel.

181. Some people may ask how we came to this conclusion without taking a vote. I am not going to disclose what has happened over the past three days of intensive consultations, but we worked hard with the people concerned who have a stake in the outcome of the debate not to blemish your image, Mr. President, with a veto. We were concerned that Mr. Young, who has served the cause of human rights in the United Nations and outside it unmatchably and with an impeccable record, should emerge from his term as President unblemished and spotless as a fighter for human rights. Definitely, had the veto been cast, people in Kuwait would have asked me: "What about your strong advocacy of Ambassador Young? You told us this, and yet he cast a veto". We worked hard to forestall that.

182. During our contacts with members of the United States Mission and with others, I approached the PLO representative and sent a message to Chairman Arafat, and this was his answer: "We cannot let circumstances lead us to push Ambassador Young, a great man, into a veto".

183. I should like to say that the Palestinians have been patient for 30 years. They have been magnanimous in their co-operation, and they have been unmatchable in their hope.

184. Mr. President, I bid you farewell and I hope that we shall be seeing you soon as a fighter for human rights. Last December, we had a meeting in my home at which Mr. Qaddoumi of the PLO was a participant, as well as a distinguished American citizen, not an official. We were talking, and Mr. Qaddoumi said sadly, "Brzezinski once said, 'Bye-bye, PLO', but he did not have the courtesy to say, 'Bye-bye, PLO. See you later' ". Mr. President, we shall see you later, and I hope that you will continue your fight and endeavours for human dignity.

185. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization has expressed a desire to speak. I now call upon him.

186. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Mr. President, after your kind words I do not have much to say. I should just like to have it on record that your talking to me, even in the line of duty, has cost you your job but you have kept your honour and your integrity. We do recognize and respect men of honour, and we know how to reciprocate because we too are men of honour. Andy, *au revoir*.

187. The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers. Accordingly, if no other representative wishes to speak at this stage, I propose to adjourn the meeting. The date and time of the next meeting of the Council for further consideration of the item on the agenda will be fixed following consultations among the members of the Council.

188. Before adjourning the meeting, I wish to draw the attention of the Council to the many reports we have received of intense military activity over recent days in Southern Lebanon. I am informed that the Commander of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon has been instructed to make every effort to arrange an immediate cease-fire in the area.

189. The members of the Council will recall the Secretary-General's own recent appeal for restraint on the part of all the parties. In my capacity as President of the Council, I appeal for restraint on the part of all concerned so that the hostilities may be brought to an end.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استلم منها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购买联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经销处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
