



## General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/43/PV.82  
12 January 1989

ENGLISH

---

Forty-third session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Thursday, 15 December 1988, at 2 p.m.

President:  
later:

Mr. CAPUTO

Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vice-President)

(Argentina)  
(Vanuatu)

- Question of Palestine [37] (continued)

- (a) Report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People
- (b) Reports of the Secretary-General
- (c) Draft resolutions

---

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 2.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 37 (continued)

QUESTION OF PALESTINE

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE EXERCISE OF THE INALIENABLE RIGHTS OF THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE (A/43/35)
- (b) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/43/272 and A/43/691)
- (c) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/43/L.50 and Corr.1, A/43/L.51 and Corr.1, A/43/L.52 and Corr.1, A/43/L.53, A/43/L.54)

Mr. GYI (Burma): The search for peaceful solutions to regional conflicts and disputes is the foremost endeavour of the United Nations in its primary task of maintaining international peace and security. The United Nations has been dealing with the question of Palestine since the Organization came into existence over 40 years ago. The search for solutions has resulted in the adoption of scores of resolutions by the Security Council and the General Assembly, and international conferences have been held under United Nations auspices. All such efforts indicate that the United Nations has been fulfilling its responsibilities in assuming its historic role to find a just and comprehensive solution.

Despite such efforts to bring about reconciliation between the parties concerned, the problem remains intractable, and constitutes one of the most difficult and perplexing issues of our time. The problem that the international community is facing in dealing with the Middle East is indeed complex. It is an issue of a political nature which needs to take into account the security interests of all the countries and peoples of the region. Past developments have only served to show that wars and conflicts do not resolve anything, but only compound the problems, and that the way to a lasting solution lies in a negotiated settlement between the parties concerned.

(Mr. Gyi, Burma)

The right to enjoy security and to live in conditions of peace and freedom is the inalienable right of all nations and peoples. In the Middle East, as in the world in general, there is a need to define security in its broader concept. Security must be seen in its indivisible sense, which implies that no nation or people should claim for itself a right to security and a right to nationhood that would at the same time deny such rights to others.

Under the terms of resolution 181 (II), the General Assembly decided upon the partition of Palestine into two States, one Jewish and the other Palestinian. The State of Israel has now been established for well over four decades, while the creation of a Palestinian State, for which there is a United Nations mandate, is still an unrealized goal. It is therefore incumbent upon the United Nations to fulfil the terms of the mandate relating to the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to a homeland, which constitutes a prerequisite for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

The serious turn of events in the past year or so has also served to show that maintaining the present status quo through the use of force can only prolong the conflict and lead to a further deterioration of the situation which has gravely affected the lives of the people in the occupied Palestinian territories.

During its forty-third session the General Assembly has expressed in its relevant resolutions its concern over the grave situation resulting from measures taken by Israel which are incompatible with its responsibilities as an occupying Power under the 1949 Geneva Convention. This expression of international concern shows that the tragedy affecting the Palestinian people urgently requires solutions based on justice and equality under conditions of freedom.

(Mr. Gyi, Burma)

The central issue that needs to be addressed with regard to the occupied Palestinian territories rests upon the principle of international law that no territorial acquisition by force should be recognized as a fait accompli. Accordingly, Burma has joined other nations in the call for withdrawal from territories occupied by Israel since 1967. Burma has also been opposed to the establishment of Israel's settlements in the occupied territories, since they constitute a serious impediment to the peace process in the Middle East.

Burma considers the Palestinian question to be the key to the solution of the Middle East problem. It believes that the search for solutions should be based on the principles of respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity and the political independence of all States in the region and on the inalienable rights of the Palestinians in Palestine, including their right to national independence and sovereignty. Accordingly, the proclamation of the independent Palestinian State is recognized as a step that has been taken for the restoration of the rights of the Palestinian people to establish its own State, and is therefore welcomed.

The international consensus on Palestine has been expressed through the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, of which Security Council resolution 242 (1967) embodies the principles necessary to find a comprehensive, just and lasting solution in order that all the peoples in the region can live together in peace and harmony. The resolution provides a basis for accommodation and compromise, the key elements of which are mutual respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all States in the region and their right to live in peace and within recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force.

(Mr. Gyi, Burma)

Two decades have passed since that resolution was adopted in 1967. However, in all these years time has not healed old wounds, and conflicts and violence have aggravated mutual mistrust and lack of accommodation. In this state of affairs the international community is now witnessing important developments of a positive nature which hold the prospects of breaking the impasse that has persisted for so long.

The Palestine National Council Declaration adopted in Algiers has indeed opened up new possibilities of breaking the stalemate in the Middle East. The Declaration reflected the will of the Palestinians to exercise their right to a national identity and their positive attitude towards a just and peaceful settlement. The endorsement of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) as a basis for negotiation in an international conference implies acceptance of the right to security and existence of all States in the region, an important factor which constitutes an essential prerequisite to a Middle East settlement.

The peace process in the Middle East has been long and difficult. It has been a history of lost opportunities, for over these years mistrust and incomprehension have prevailed over understanding and compromise. We believe that the Algiers Declaration provides fresh opportunities in the search for peace, that the moment is opportune for a positive response from the other side, and that what is needed is the political will to begin the process of a genuine dialogue. In this connection, we are encouraged by the latest development - the positive statement made by the United States.

Now that all the parties concerned have stated their acceptance of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) as the basis for negotiations, and as the problem requires a lasting and comprehensive solution, the way to a negotiated solution lies in an international peace conference, with the participation of all the

(Mr. Gyi, Burma)

parties concerned on an equal footing, under the auspices of the United Nations, which bears a historic responsibility.

Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): Since 1947, Peru, which was a member of the principal United Nations Commission on Palestine, has consistently maintained a clear position on the question of Palestine, in accordance with the norms and principles of international law, the right of peoples to self-determination and the majority will of the international community, expressed repeatedly in United Nations resolutions adopted since then.

For the past four decades, therefore, Peru has consistently recognized the national rights of the Palestinian people and the validity of resolution 181 (II) as the basis for the creation on the former territory of Palestine of two States, one Jewish and the other Palestinian.

Since the 1967 war, new and complex elements have been added to a situation which has become one of the most sensitive focal points of conflict in contemporary international relations.

In this context, Peru has always stated that a just and lasting solution to the problem of the Middle East is to be found in the implementation of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), and that it should take into account the fact that the central element of such a solution is the restoration of the national rights of the Palestinian people. Since 1967 it has consistently maintained that any solution must involve the return of the Arab and Palestinian territories occupied since 1967, the realization of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the establishment of its own national State and recognition of the right of all the States of the area, including Israel, to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized boundaries.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

Hence the people and Government of Peru welcomed the results of the recent meeting of the Palestine National Council: the Declaration of an independent State of Palestine and a vitally important Political Communiqué in which the PLO fully accepted Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) as the legal framework for the search for a peaceful, just and lasting solution through an international conference on the Middle East, whose convening Peru supports and endorses.

Of similarly vital importance are the decisions of the Palestine National Council implicitly recognizing the State of Israel, and unequivocally condemning the use of terrorism in all forms, including State terrorism.

These definitions mark a true historical landmark in the evolution of the situation in the Middle East; they are significant and dramatic steps towards peace talks, which the Government of Peru truly appreciates. They also offer the options of negotiation, openness and understanding. In short, they augur well for the peace and security we all yearn.

This complete and consistent position of Peru's is contained in the communiqué issued by the Peruvian Government on the 12th of this month.

The recent declaration made by the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO, Yasser Arafat, during the meeting held in Stockholm with representatives of the Jewish community of the United States in order to overcome any ambiguous interpretation of the definitions adopted by the Palestine National Council in Algeria - that the PLO unequivocally recognizes the existence of the State of Israel and condemns terrorism - confirms the trend towards peace and understanding that is starting to emerge. We hope it will soon come to fruition with the convening of the International Conference on the Middle East.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

The important statement made yesterday before the Assembly reassures us in this belief.

At a time when the emergence of a new atmosphere of détente holds out the promise of settling a conflict that only a few months ago seemed to be entering a phase of major escalation, we are convinced that the search for peace must be guided in the near future by the international conduct of all States involved in the problem of the Middle East.

This applies particularly to the Powers which are also permanent members of the Security Council: their special responsibilities for international peace and security present them with a historic challenge that the conscience of mankind requires them to confront.

The recent decision by the Government of the United States to start a direct dialogue with the PLO is a constructive step in that direction and opens up a new chapter in the history of the process.

No other conflict in the world cries out more loudly for a peaceful settlement than the conflict in the Middle East. But we are convinced that peace will remain elusive until all peoples of the region are able to exercise their national rights. We are delighted that this process has begun. We hope it will not be interrupted and that it will proceed to a successful completion.

Mr. LEORO (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): Once again we are considering one of the most important topics on the agenda of the General Assembly, the "Question of Palestine". The search for a peaceful solution to the serious and complex problems besetting that region, deplorably causing more and more human and material losses, continues to be a matter of profound concern that must be squarely addressed by the General Assembly.



(Mr. Leoro, Ecuador)

At the same time, a number of events, particularly during the past year, have brought about a rarely-experienced climate of détente and rapprochement, that has evoked a welcome note of optimism in the world. There have been peaceful settlements of a number of other serious, complex and painful international conflicts that have been the subject of similar concern to the United Nations and to all States large and small.

The Palestine National Council, at its recent meeting in Algeria, on 15 November 1988, issued a Declaration of an independent State of Palestine.

Consistent with the principles that inspire its foreign policy, the Government of Ecuador supports the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, especially those relating to its self-determination and independence, which is tantamount to its right to establish a sovereign State. We decisively endorse the call for a comprehensive, just and lasting peaceful solution to the Middle East conflict within the framework of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and of an international conference to be convened under the auspices of the United Nations. I need not labour the point: the subject has been repeatedly considered in this Assembly.

I stress, however, that any peaceful solution requires sincere international co-operation on the part of the parties to the conflict, in keeping with the aforementioned Security Council resolutions. My Government considers that in international law and even more so, under the United Nations Charter, there is no room for any problem relating to the recognition of a State.

As the constitutional President of the Republic of Ecuador, Mr. Rodrigo Borja, has stated:

(Mr. Leoro, Ecuador)

"The State does not need international recognition because the State is free in itself. When we were born as a State in 1830, we required no international recognition, nor did we ask anyone's permission to exist as a State."

It should be remembered in this respect that article 12 of the Charter of the Organization of American States (OAS) establishes as a guiding rule for its members that "The political existence of the State is independent of recognition by other States."

My Government hopes that the Algiers Declaration will promote these objectives and thus make a new contribution to the search for peace and stability in the region, to which the General Assembly and the Security Council have devoted considerable effort in their respective jurisdiction under the United Nations Charter.

The prospects for international understanding have become more propitious, particularly in the last 24 hours, thanks to the statements made by the Government of the United States of America, which mark a positive stage in this process. Therefore, my Government hopes that a settlement will soon be found to this vexed international problem.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from Spanish): In accordance with General Assembly resolution 477 (V), of 1 November 1950, I now call on the Under-Secretary-General of the League of Arab States.

Mr. AL-PARA (League of Arab States) (interpretation from Arabic): At this late hour I shall confine myself to raising a few points concerning the Israeli position, which has led to deterioration of the situation in the region.

(Mr. Al-Fara, League of Arab States)

For one thing, Israel asks for security guarantees. The question is: who should provide guarantees to whom? Should the one expelled from his homeland give guarantees to the usurper? Should he who asks to return to his homeland give guarantees to the one who refuses him that right? Should unarmed people give security guarantees to Israel, which possesses nuclear weapons and intercontinental missiles? Should those who continue to be the victims of repeated wars and massacres give guarantees to the terrorists who sing the praises of the massacres of Deir Yassin, Qibya, Nahalin, Qalqiliya, Gaza, Khan Yunis, As-Samu, Kafr Qasim, Sabra, Shatila and other refugee camps?

What guarantees does Israel want? Now that the Palestinians have lost their homeland, their identity, must they guarantee that they will remain displaced wherever in the world they may be? Must they guarantee not to resort to resistance in order to rid their homeland of occupation, even though resistance was the only legitimate way of liberating the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America?

Was it not through such resistance that George Washington achieved the independence of the United States? Were George Washington, Simon Bolivar and General De Gaulle not called terrorists at one stage of their struggles? If Israel's real though tacit condition for peace is that the Palestinians content themselves with peace efforts, dialogue and discussions at the United Nations and in other international forums, as well as suppression of the resistance, the intifadah has replied with a resounding "No"! No resistance movement in history has ever laid down its weapons and abandoned its struggle before achieving independence.

There has been repeated talk about Israel's right to exist. Yet Israel does not recognize the existence of the Palestinian people. Golda Meir used to say: "Where are the Palestinians? Very simply, they do not exist."

(Mr. Al-Fara, League of Arab States)

What about the right of the two peoples to exist? What about the mutual recognition of two States in Palestine? How can a people whose very existence is denied by Israel acknowledge Israel's existence? What are we to understand by the statement of the representative of Israel, other than a call for the total surrender of the representative of the Palestinian people in exchange for negotiations?

And on the subject of clarity, can the representative of Israel make clear what Israel we are talking about? What Israel are we required to recognize? What are its boundaries? Is it the Israel of resolution 181 (II) - that is, the Partition resolution? Is it the Israel which expanded in 1948? Is it the Israel of 1976, which occupies all of the Palestinian homeland? Or is it the Israel of Ben Gurion, which stretches north and east to reach the Littani River in Lebanon, the Al Massaa, south of Damascus, and the Sham, the Syrian Desert, which cannot be attained before annexing all of Jordan?

The representative of Israel casually dismisses the Declaration of Independence of the State of Palestine as "unilateral". Show me a revolution or a liberation movement that declared the creation of its State with the permission of the occupier. Did George Washington get permission from Britain before proclaiming the United States? If Israel, with the knowledge of the United States, thinks that massacres, breaking the bones of young children, burying young men alive and an assured United States veto in the Security Council can break the back of the intifadah, well, it has another think coming.

The United States representative, Ambassador Walters, declared yesterday that his country is against the imposition of an external solution. However, he never made clear why the United Nations is insistent on protecting Israel's conquests

(Mr. Al-Fara, League of Arab States)

from outside, or why the United States has resumed supplying Israel with cluster bombs as a contribution to Israel's military might.

Is that not tantamount to protecting the Israeli conquest and occupation of Palestinian lands?

The United States should instead call on Israel to put an end to its colonialist settlements that are spreading like a cancer in the homeland of the Palestinian people. The United States should refrain from and put an end to repression and extermination. It knows perfectly well that Israel has used all sorts of new methods of torture and repression against the "children of the stones" and against women and the elderly. Indeed, the Israeli occupation forces pursue and harass Palestinians everywhere: at home, in the workplace, in the mosque, in church, in the schools, at the universities, in cities, villages and camps; they assault the Palestinian, his family, his land, and all that is sacred to him.

Shamir and Rabin license the killing of demonstrators, the breaking of their bones, their detention and imprisonment without trial. They license collective punishment; they license the use of new types of bullets and of poisonous gas, which has led to the death of children and to spontaneous abortions. They have shut down newspapers and other publications; they have demolished houses and destroyed crops; they have cut down trees; they have expropriated and stolen water resources and electricity.

(Mr. Al-Fara, League  
of Arab States)

The water confiscated by the Israeli occupation authorities in the West Bank is estimated to be 485 million cubic metres a year. We wish to note here that the total capacity of the West Bank is merely 600 million cubic metres a year.

General Zaivi, one of the extremist leaders in Israel, unmasked the intentions of Israel when he said:

"The Palestinians are the main losers in the Arab-Israeli struggle. We demolish their homes; we break their bones; and therefore to deport them eastwards a few kilometres - that is, into Jordan - will provide them with the suitable and appropriate solution."

Therefore, the United States must endeavour to put an end to this repression, those massacres and the colonialist settlements in order to create the climate necessary to move towards peace and take into consideration the tremendous efforts made by the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Arab States and the courageous and bold steps taken by the PLO in order to live peacefully, by supporting the draft resolutions before the General Assembly, the adoption of which will constitute positive steps towards a just peace. This is an historic opportunity for the United States, if indeed the United States wishes to appear noble in the annals of history.

Mr. President, you have helped to guide the discussion on this item in Geneva, which reflected the will of the peoples of the world who wished to hear Chairman Arafat and promote the peace process. The whole world is looking to this session with hope and optimism. Chairman Arafat, with a mandate from the Palestine National Council, has before this session of the General Assembly very clearly expressed the message of peace, and the debate here has reflected deep appreciation for the position of the PLO. What remains for us is to translate these positions into decisions and resolutions commensurate with the importance of this session and

(Mr. Al-Fara, League  
of Arab States)

the aspirations of the international community and all its people. We hope that the permanent members of the Security Council will assume their special responsibility in the maintenance of peace and security and play a constructive role in attaining these lofty objectives, thereby making this session historic and beautiful Geneva once again a place where peace is achieved and solutions to difficult problems are found.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We have heard the last speaker in the debate on the item.

I now call on Her Excellency Mrs. Absa Claude Diallo, Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, who will introduce the draft resolutions.

Mrs. DIALLO (Senegal), Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (interpretation from French): I thank you, Sir, for giving me once again the opportunity to speak before the General Assembly in my capacity as Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People.

The past few days have been an exciting time for the members of our Committee. We have heard statements of historic importance by the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) as well as by a large number of Foreign Ministers who have travelled to Geneva, together with other Heads of delegation, especially to participate in the debate on the question of Palestine. The high level of representation has been unprecedented; it attests to the desire of the international community as a whole to demonstrate its special interest in the matter. The exceptional interest generated in the world has been reflected in all the media. Seldom before has the issue of the attainment of the national rights of an oppressed people evoked this kind of response.

(Mrs. Diallo, Chairman, Committee  
on the Exercise of the  
Inalienable Rights of the  
Palestinian People)

The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People has welcomed in particular the important clarifications on the PLO's position on the matter given by Chairman Yasser Arafat in his statement to the Assembly and in the press conference yesterday, as it has the recent decision of the United States Government to establish official contacts with the Palestine Liberation Organization through the United States Ambassador in Tunis.

These historic new developments, demonstrate, on the one hand, the increasing concern of the international community and, on the other, the urgent need for progress towards a just and lasting solution on the question of Palestine, if peace and stability are to be restored in the region. It is obvious to all that failure to settle the Palestinian issue poses a growing threat to international peace and security. Therefore, the General Assembly and the Security Council must join their efforts to settle the question. It is with that in mind that the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People has, since its establishment, spared no effort to provide the relevant bodies of the United Nations with those elements likely to achieve that objective. One example is the settlement plan proposed by the Committee in its very first recommendations. That plan was endorsed by the General Assembly at previous regular and special sessions. The Assembly also endorsed overwhelmingly the proposal to convene the International Peace Conference on the Middle East as the best possible way to establish a dialogue among the parties involved.



(Mrs. Diallo, Chairman, Committee  
on the Exercise of the  
Inalienable Rights of the  
Palestinian People)

The courageous uprising of the Palestinian people, and the decisions of the Palestine National Council, in particular the establishment of a Palestinian State, and the important statements by Chairman Yasser Arafat, have now clearly opened the way for a negotiated settlement of the question of Palestine and thus put an end to the conflict and suffering in the region.

Accordingly, the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People has the honour to submit to the General Assembly draft resolutions A/43/L.50 to L.54.

(Mrs. Diallo, Chairman, Committee  
on the Exercise of the Inalienable  
Rights of the Palestinian People)

The first three draft resolutions - A/43/L.50, L.51 and L.52 - will, once adopted by the General Assembly, become one resolution in three parts, A, B and C. The other two draft resolutions, again after their adoption by the General Assembly, will be numbered separately, as the second and third resolutions on the question of Palestine. Draft resolutions A/43/L.50, L.51 and L.53 are essentially the same as those submitted in past years and have as their main purpose to enable the Committee, the Division for Palestinian Rights and the Department of Public Information to continue their programme of work in accordance with the budgetary appropriations approved by the Assembly at its forty-second session in 1987.

Draft resolution A/43/L.50 endorses the recommendations contained in the report (A/43/35) of the Committee and stresses the need for the Security Council to take positive action on these recommendations, which, in our view, are objective and pragmatic and can make a notable contribution to a settlement of the question of Palestine. Furthermore, the draft resolution requests the Committee to continue to exert all efforts to promote the implementation of its recommendations and to carry out its mandated programme of work, placing particular emphasis on co-operation with non-governmental organizations. The draft resolution also requests the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine to co-operate fully with the Committee.

Draft resolution A/43/L.51 deals in particular with the role of the Secretariat on the question of Palestine. Here, the Secretary-General is requested to provide the Division for Palestinian Rights of the Secretariat with the necessary resources to discharge the tasks defined in earlier resolutions, including the organization of seminars, non-governmental organization meetings and symposia, and the preparation and dissemination of studies and information material. The Division, as the General Assembly is aware, has succeeded, through

(Mrs. Diallo, Chairman, Committee  
on the Exercise of the Inalienable  
Rights of the Palestinian People)

its dedication, competence and objectivity since its establishment, in making the question of Palestine better understood and grasped by public opinion.

The draft resolution contains two new paragraphs with respect to last year's resolution, namely, the fourth preambular and third operative paragraphs, which refer, respectively, to international standards on the rights of children and to a request addressed to the Division for Palestinian Rights to pay particular attention to the plight of Palestinian children in the occupied Palestinian territories in its programme of work for 1989.

Draft resolution A/43/L.52 deals with the role of the Department of Public Information in bringing about a better understanding of the question of Palestine. Our Committee is extremely grateful to the Department of Public Information for its constant support of the Committee's objectives. The draft resolution requests that the Department, in full co-operation and co-ordination with the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, continue its special information programme on the question of Palestine, with particular emphasis on public opinion in Europe and North America. The Department of Public Information is entrusted, in particular, to disseminate information, publish brochures, expand audio-visual material and organize activities for journalists.

Draft resolution A/43/L.53 deals with the convening of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East. Of course, the text of this draft resolution takes fully into account the important recent developments and builds upon the ongoing efforts to promote the convening of this Conference.

(Mrs. Diallo, Chairman, Committee  
on the Exercise of the Inalienable  
Rights of the Palestinian People)

In particular, in operative paragraph 2, the General Assembly would call for the convening of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East, under the auspices of the United Nations, with the participation of all parties to the conflict, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, on an equal footing, and the five permanent members of the Security Council, based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, primarily the right to self-determination.

In operative paragraph 3, the draft resolution affirms a number of well-known and universally accepted principles for the achievement of comprehensive peace, namely,

"(a) The withdrawal of Israel from the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and from the other occupied Arab territories;

"(b) Guaranteeing arrangements for security of all States in the region, including those named in resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947, within secure and internationally recognized boundaries;

"(c) Resolving the problem of the Palestinian refugees in conformity with General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948, and subsequent relevant resolutions;

"(d) Dismantling of the Israeli settlements in the territories occupied since 1967;

"(e) Guaranteeing freedom of access to Holy Places, religious buildings and sites."

With regard to this operative paragraph - paragraph 3 - I should like to point out that in subparagraph (a) of the English version, the word "from" should be inserted between the words "and" and "the", and the phrase should read "and from the other occupied Arab territories", in order to make the text more precise.

(Mrs. Diallo, Chairman, Committee  
on the Exercise of the Inalienable  
Rights of the Palestinian People)

In subparagraph (b), the words "General Assembly" should be added between the words "in" and "resolution 181 (II)", and the phrase should read "in General Assembly resolution 181 (II)".

In operative paragraphs 4 to 6 of draft resolution A/43/L.53 the text notes the expressed desire and endeavours to place the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, under the supervision of the United Nations for a limited period; requests the Security Council to consider measures needed to convene the Conference, and to consider guarantees for security measures for all States in the region; and also requests the Secretary-General to continue his efforts to facilitate the convening of the Conference, and to submit progress reports on developments in this matter.

Draft resolution A/43/L.54 relates to the proclamation of the State of Palestine and is therefore a completely new text this year. In the preambular part, the General Assembly would recall, inter alia, that its resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947, in which it called for the establishment of an Arab State and a Jewish State in Palestine; expresses awareness of the proclamation of the State of Palestine by the Palestine National Council in line with that resolution and in exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people; and recalls General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX) of 22 November 1974, on the observer status of the Palestine Liberation Organization and subsequent relevant resolutions.

(Mrs. Diallo, Chairman, Committee on  
the Exercise of the Inalienable  
Rights of the Palestinian People)

In the operative part of draft resolution A/43/L.54, the General Assembly would acknowledge the proclamation of the State of Palestine by the Palestine National Council; affirm the need to enable the Palestinian people to exercise their sovereignty over their territory occupied since 1967; decide that, effective as of the date of the adoption of the draft resolution, the designation "Palestine" should be used in place of the designation "Palestine Liberation Organization" in the United Nations system, without prejudice to the observer status and functions of the Palestine Liberation Organization within the United Nations system in conformity with relevant United Nations resolutions and practice; and request the Secretary-General to take necessary action to implement the resolution.

I wish to announce the following new co-sponsors for the draft resolutions before the Assembly:

Draft resolutions A/43/L.50, L.51 and L.52: Cyprus, Madagascar, Vanuatu and Zambia;

Draft resolution A/43/L.53: Angola, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Djibouti, Egypt, Hungary, Morocco, Sri Lanka, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen and Zambia;

Draft resolution A/43/L.54: Angola, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Djibouti, Egypt, Malta, Mongolia, Morocco, Sri Lanka, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen and Zambia.

The five draft resolutions before the General Assembly, in letter and spirit, have a single objective: the restoration of peace to the Middle East through the exercise by the Palestinian people, through peaceful means, of its inalienable rights to self-determination, independence and the establishment of a State in Palestine. As the Assembly will have noted, moderation, restraint and objectivity characterize these draft resolutions. By adopting them, the Assembly will make a

(Mrs. Diallo, Chairman, Committee on  
the Exercise of the Inalienable  
Rights of the Palestinian People)

positive and constructive contribution to the restoration of peace, stability and security in the Middle East, and thereby will enable the Palestinian people to advance towards recovering its legitimate and inalienable rights.

The draft resolutions have been the subject of extensive consultations and are the result of the intense efforts of many delegations, both within and outside our Committee. We are convinced that our joint efforts are bringing us closer to a consensus on this most important issue of our time.

On behalf of all the sponsors, I call on all delegations, particularly in the light of the significant developments of these past few days on the question of Palestine, to vote overwhelmingly in favour of draft resolutions A/43/L.50 to A/43/L.54, thus demonstrating their willingness to seize the new opportunity that history has presented us here in Geneva.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting on all five draft resolutions or any one of them. As representatives are aware, they will also have an opportunity of explaining their vote after the voting.

I would remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in explanation of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. SAID (Islamic Republic of Iran) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish to make clear the position of the Islamic Republic of Iran on draft resolutions A/43/L.53 and A/43/L.54, which will be submitted to a vote at this meeting of the General Assembly.

We appreciate the possibility of addressing the Assembly. Based on the principled positions of the Islamic Republic of Iran, we submit the following clarification on those two draft resolutions.

(Mr. Said, Islamic Republic of Iran)

We greatly appreciate the efforts of the United Nations and its Member States to find a solution to the question of Palestine and put an end to the constant injustice endured by the heroic people of Palestine. We deeply believe in the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to all the land of Palestine. Only a solution that deals with the problems in a radical manner will be just and lasting, will bring about a logical outcome to the present problem and will not diminish any of the rights of the Muslim people of Palestine. No partial solution, no compromises can be considered as anything but a temporary remedy, a remedy that can last only a short time.

Our specific views on the draft resolutions are the following:

First, the preamble to draft resolution A/43/L.53 makes it appear that the objective of the heroic intifadah of the Palestinian people is limited to liberating the territories occupied since 1967. That is not a correct objective; indeed, it not only contradicts the nature and aim of the intifadah, but also falsifies the objective of the intifadah. As evidence of that, I remind the Assembly of the intifadah of all the Palestinians in all the occupied territories before the unjust resolution 181 (II) on partition was implemented.

Secondly, operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/43/L.53 refers to resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) as the basis for the settlement of the Middle East conflict. But in those resolutions the Palestinians are regarded as refugees and the presence of zionism on the land of Palestine is acknowledged. The Islamic Republic of Iran totally rejects that.

Thirdly, paragraph 3 (a) of draft resolution A/43/L.53 affirms as one of the principles for the achievement of a comprehensive peace the withdrawal of the Zionist entity from the territories occupied since 1967. But instead of that we must insist on Zionist withdrawal from all the occupied Palestinian territories.



(Mr. Said, Islamic Republic of Iran)

Fourthly, paragraph 3 (b) of this draft resolution provides for guaranteeing arrangements for the security of all States in the region, including those named in resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947, within secure and internationally recognized boundaries. But that subparagraph recognizes not only the unjust resolution on the partition of Palestine, but also the illegal Zionist entity. The Islamic Republic of Iran categorically rejects that.

I turn now to draft resolution A/43/L.54.

First, the preamble to the resolution refers to resolution 181 (II). That is totally unacceptable to us and we reject it. The resolution referred to contains provisions for the partition of Palestine. I repeat that we totally reject that.

Secondly, the Islamic Republic of Iran cannot accept limiting the sovereignty of the people of Palestine to the territory occupied since 1967. We would refer to what we have said previously in this regard. We affirm that the people of Palestine have sovereignty over the entire Palestinian homeland, and the State of Palestine should be established on all the land of Palestine.

In view of what I have said, the Islamic Republic of Iran cannot accept these two draft resolutions. Each State's territorial integrity and sovereignty are indivisible, in keeping with the United Nations Charter.

We therefore cannot participate in the voting on draft resolutions A/43/L.53 and A/43/L.54. They are completely unobjective.

Mr. PHOFOLO (Lesotho): In our statement last night on the question of Palestine, we set forth Lesotho's position on the just cause of the Palestinian people.

We repeat that we call on the State of Israel to understand the need to withdraw from all occupied Arab territories. We fully support and recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinians to their own homeland, within secure

(Mr. Phoofole, Lesotho)

borders, coexisting peacefully with Israel and all the other countries of the region. Lesotho supports the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East and Palestine problems.

Regrettably, owing to time constraints - exacerbated by this festive season of joy and the singing of "Hallelujah, there comes a King to redeem the world" - the Kingdom of Lesotho is not yet able to pronounce itself on the historic Algiers Declaration of the Palestine National Council, proclaiming an independent State of Palestine. That proclamation has been noted and welcomed by the Kingdom of Lesotho.\*

---

\* Mr. Van Lierop (Vanuatu), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Phoofole, Lesotho)

Against that background, Lesotho will support draft resolutions A/43/L.50 to A/43/L.53 and will abstain on draft resolution A/43/L.54. At an appropriate time, in the not-too-distant future, the Kingdom of Lesotho will officially pronounce itself on the Algiers Declaration of 15 November 1988 by the Palestine National Council.

Mr. OMAR (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has consistently and unambiguously stated its position on the question of Palestine. Indeed, yesterday the General Assembly heard a statement on this subject by the representative of my country.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya will continue to support the militant Palestinian people. It will continue to recognize the State of Palestine and its sovereignty over all the territory of Palestine.

Our support for draft resolutions A/43/L.53 and A/43/L.54 should not be understood in any way as implying a recognition of the occupier or the granting of any legitimacy to the occupation. My country places on record its reservation in regard to anything that would be tantamount to recognizing the occupier or the legitimacy of the occupation.

Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway): Norway will vote in favour of draft resolution A/43/L.53.

I should like to emphasize that the Norwegian Government very much welcomes the recent promising developments and the new possibilities for progress in the Middle East peace process and the achievement of an early and comprehensive peace settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. First and foremost, we wish to emphasize the helpful and encouraging political position taken by the Palestine National Council at its recent meeting and the statements by the Chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization, Mr. Yasser Arafat.

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

By recognizing Israel's right to exist within secure and recognized boundaries, by accepting Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) as a basis for peace negotiations under the auspices of the United Nations and by rejecting and condemning terrorism, the Palestine Liberation Organization has taken a major step in the direction of a just and lasting peace.

We now call on the Government and people of Israel to respond positively and constructively to this new and radical opening for peace.

This draft resolution which the Assembly is about to adopt contains essential elements for the achievement of peace. We should, however, like to repeat our concern that the modalities of the peace conference and the content and framework of the negotiations should be freely decided upon by the parties themselves.

The Norwegian Government will lend its full support to the Secretary-General in his efforts directed to ensure the early convening of the conference and in bridging the gaps that still exist between the parties.

Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation has clearly stated its position on the question of Palestine. We have said that the Syrian Arab Republic has always regarded the question of Palestine as a question of primary importance. In various international gatherings we have stressed the importance of the Palestinian national entity. We have made sacrifices for this cause. We have borne a very heavy burden in helping the Palestinian people. We have fought to ensure that they could exercise their inalienable rights, including their right to return, to self-determination and to the creation of their independent, sovereign State on their homeland.\*

---

\* The President returned to the Chair.

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

With regard to draft resolutions A/43/L.53 and A/43/L.54, my country's affirmative vote will not signify recognition of Israel, which does not recognize the national rights of the Palestinian people and continues to occupy the Syrian Arab Golan and other Arab territories, in contravention of United Nations resolutions and international law.

Mr. PETRONE (United States of America): Over the last 24 hours we have seen important developments in the search for Middle East peace and resolution of the Palestinian problem. The Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) has explicitly announced its acceptance of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), recognition of Israel's right to exist and renunciation of terrorism. We view this as another step forward toward the direct negotiations between the parties concerned that are essential to achieving a comprehensive settlement. We are encouraged by this positive movement. On this basis, Secretary Shultz announced yesterday that the United States is prepared to engage in a substantive dialogue with the PLO.

The draft resolutions before the Assembly today are unhelpful and inconsistent with the search for peace. In his remarks before this body yesterday, Ambassador Walters gave a clear exposition of United States policy on the fundamental issues involved and our vision of a realistic framework for reaching a negotiated settlement. We have also listened carefully to the views expressed by other participants. Much has been said here about fresh new opportunities for advancing peace in the Middle East. It is unfortunate that the draft resolutions being considered today fail to address the issues in a constructive manner and thus

(Mr. Petrone, United States)

do nothing to advance the prospects for achieving a settlement. Rather, these texts, like so many others adopted by the Assembly over the years, will only make it more difficult to bring the concerned parties together at the negotiating table. We cannot support such measures.

(Mr. Petrone, United States)

In an improvement over earlier years, the draft resolution on convening an international peace conference on the Middle East does not cite General Assembly resolution 38/58 C, which prescribed an extremely one-sided formula for a predetermined settlement. Yet this draft still fails to address the centrality of direct negotiations between the parties. Instead, it purports to resolve in advance issues which must be resolved in negotiations, such as withdrawal from the occupied territories, dismantlement of settlements and creation of an independent Palestinian State. This approach is inconsistent with the PLO's own statement acknowledging the need for negotiations with Israel.

The United States does not rule out any means of reaching the direct negotiations that we believe are essential to concluding a just and lasting peace. In this regard, we have said we could support a properly structured international conference - one designed to facilitate negotiations between the parties concerned, not a conference with the authority to impose a prescribed solution or overturn agreements reached between the parties. The latter would only be a formula for more conflict.

In addition, this draft resolution endorses the concept of placing the occupied territories under the temporary supervision of the United Nations. We cannot support such a concept. In our view any proposal to extend United Nations authority over the occupied territories is impractical and unrealistic.

My Government objects strongly to a second draft resolution which acknowledges the proclamation of the State of Palestine and seeks to change the PLO's present United Nations observer designation to that of "Palestine". The latter formulation is vague. Yet, however one interprets it, we believe it is unhelpful. We cannot support attempts to lend even a degree of purported legitimacy to the

(Mr. Petrone, United States)

self-proclaimed Palestinian State. The United States, like the large majority of members of the General Assembly, does not recognize this State. As Secretary Shultz reaffirmed yesterday, our decision to engage in a substantive dialogue with the PLO should not be taken to imply acceptance or recognition by the United States of an independent Palestinian State.

As a policy matter, we firmly believe that the Arab-Israeli problem must be resolved through negotiations, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), and not by unilateral actions of any party.

Moreover, we see no legal basis to justify recognition of a Palestinian State. This self-declared entity does not satisfy the generally accepted criteria under international law for statehood.

The remaining three draft resolutions are not new. As in years past, these texts endorse the activities of various United Nations organs that, regrettably, are dedicated to expounding only a very one-sided perspective of the Palestinian issue. We have said that legitimate Palestinian rights must be addressed in the context of negotiations. In perpetuating such a distorted, unbalanced picture of the problem, however, the United Nations bodies referred to in the draft resolutions do little to further the real interests of the Palestinian people.

We call again on all concerned parties to dispense with unproductive polemics and instead focus on positive, practical steps to move the peace process forward.

Mr. SAINT-PHARD (Haiti) (interpretation from French): We read the following in Chapter 13 of Genesis:

And Abraham went up out of Egypt, he, and his wife, and all that he had, and Lot with him, into the south.

And Abraham was very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold.

And he went on his journeys from the south even to Bethel, unto the place where his tent had been at the beginning, between Bethel and Hal,



(Mr. Saint-Phard, Haiti)

Unto the place of the altar, which he had made there at the first; and there Abraham called on the name of the Lord.

And Lot also, which went with Abraham, had flocks, and herds, and tents.

And the land was not able to bear them, that they might dwell together, for their substance was great, so that they could not dwell together.

And there was a strife between the herdmen of Abraham's cattle and the herdmen of Lot's cattle; and the Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelled then in the land.

And Abraham said unto Lot, Let there be no strife, I pray thee, between me and thee, and between my herdmen and thy herdmen, for we be bretheren.

Is not the whole land before thee? Separate thyself, I pray thee, from me. If thou wilt take the left hand, then I will go to the right; or if thou depart to the right hand, then I will go to the left." (The Holy Bible, Genesis 13:1-9)

The Rabbi of Nazareth, from the mountain where he was teaching the crowds, said to them, among other things:

"Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called the children of God."

(The Holy Bible, St. Matthew 5:9)

After the epic achievement of its independence in 1804, Haiti, a noble daughter of the whole of Africa - in addition to the symbolic value of the example it had set by participating previously in the efforts to liberate the thirteen American colonies - provided all possible assistance to the Liberator Simon Bolivar, but on one condition: that he free all those weighed down by the chains of slavery.

What is more, Haiti, as a lover of peace, passionately devoted to harmony, the right of peoples to self-determination and dignity, and all the rights of man - including homojudaicus and homoarabicus - is pleased to join the movement of all the healthy forces within the international community towards reaffirming, yet again, Israel's right to exist in all peace and security within safe and internationally recognized boundaries, and its parallel obligation - and here I

(Mr. Saint-Phard, Haiti)

base myself on the principles of President Woodrow Wilson - to withdraw from the occupied territories.

Haiti also takes this opportunity of expressing again its unreserved support for the inalienable rights of the Palestinians to self-determination, independence and their own country, free from all intimidation and all threats of force.

(Mr. Saint-Phard, Haiti)

My delegation welcomes with great pleasure yesterday evening's announcement from Washington by Secretary of State George Shultz, who has done so much during the Reagan era for world peace. My delegation welcomes this historic gesture, which will at the very least lend impetus to progress along the winding path to international peace and security.

Through the example of Abraham and his willingness to make major concessions in exchange for peace, the tale of Abraham and Lot, which I recited at the beginning of my statement, contains the essential elements of the conceptual, moral and psychological framework, or recipe, for the just and lasting peace the children of Isaac and Ishmael, the Jews and the Arabs, and their cousins all over the world, long for with all their hearts.

It is in that spirit that my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolutions before us, which are designed for healthy progress towards the solution of the many conflicts that have for too long perpetuated the fratricidal hostilities between our Israeli and Palestinian brothers.

My delegation congratulates the Palestinian people on its courage and discipline under stress, and must note the skill and diplomatic maturity of the PLO, that people's sole and legitimate representative, under the guidance of its leader, Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the PLO.

I can think of no more appropriate thought for our brothers in Israel than a rather sober reflection by the founder of the State of Israel, Ben-Gurion, who in July 1967, following the six-day war, expressed his concern about the territories recently occupied and said it was essential to return them as soon as possible, for Israel would contribute to its own destruction by holding them.

That is a moving plea for withdrawal from the occupied territories in exchange for peace, the ultimate stake in the Middle East and perhaps throughout the world.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to inform members that Jordan has become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/43/L.50 to L.54, and Sudan has become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/43/L.53 and L.54.

I wish to note that for technical reasons printed voting sheets will not immediately be available to delegations. The votes will of course be reflected in the verbatim record. I would ask representatives to make note of the results for their own information; blank copies of the voting sheet are available.

We shall now take a decision on the draft resolutions before the Assembly. In that connection, I have been informed by the Secretary-General that should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/43/L.50 and Corr.1, paragraph 4 would, inter alia, authorize the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People to make such adjustments in its approved programme of seminars and symposia and meetings for non-governmental organizations as it may consider necessary. It is not anticipated that such adjustments would involve any programme budget implications.

We shall first take action on draft resolution A/43/L.50 and Corr.1. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A roll-call vote was taken.

Austria, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/43/L.50 and Corr.1 was adopted by 123 votes to 2, with 20 abstentions (resolution 43/175 A).\*

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now take a vote on draft resolution A/43/L.51 and Corr.1. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A roll-call vote was taken.

El Salvador, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

\* Subsequently the delegation of Panama advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, United States of America

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

Draft resolution A/43/L.51 and Corr.1 was adopted by 123 votes to 2, with 20 abstentions (resolution 43/175 B).\*

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We turn now to draft resolution A/43/L.52 and Corr.1. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A roll-call vote was taken.

Philippines, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

\* Subsequently the delegation of Panama advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, United States of America

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

Draft resolution A/43/L.52 and Corr.1 was adopted by 127 votes to 2, with 17 abstentions (resolution 43/175 C).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We turn now to draft resolution A/43/L.53. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A roll-call vote was taken.

Luxembourg, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

**In favour:** Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

**Abstaining:** Canada, Costa Rica

**Draft resolution A/43/L.53 was adopted by 138 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions (resolution 43/176).**

**The PRESIDENT** (interpretation from Spanish): We turn now to the final draft resolution on which we must take action today, draft resolution A/43/L.54. A roll-call vote has been requested.

**A roll-call vote was taken.**

**Costa Rica, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.**



In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Canada, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire

Draft resolution A/43/L.54 was adopted by 104 votes to 2, with 36 abstentions (resolution 43/177).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position on the resolutions just adopted.

Mr. COSTELLO (Australia): The central purpose of draft resolution A/43/L.53 is the convening of an international conference for the purpose of achieving a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute. We strongly support that goal, and therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution.

Australia has taken the view that such an international conference can realistically occur only on the basis of mutual recognition of each other by Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO).

(Mr. Costello, Australia)

Mr. Yasser Arafat's comments to the press in Geneva on 14 December are a clear and unambiguous statement of the PLO position and undoubtedly now provide a basis for discussions which can lead to a settlement of the Middle East dispute.

Australia believes it is now vital for Israel to respond in a similar manner to these developments and open a dialogue with the PLO.

With appropriate responses from all parties and the step-by-step confidence-building measures Australia believes are necessary, the parties can in our view resolve any remaining differences over the negotiating process.

While Australia supports the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including if they so choose to independence and the possibility of establishing their own independent State, the question of Australian recognition of a Palestinian State will only arise in the context of an acceptable negotiated peace settlement rather than in response to a unilateral declaration.

We abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/43/L.54 because its central purpose and objective is to achieve recognition of such a State ahead of a negotiated settlement.

Mr. HATANO (Japan): Japan has supported the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East in the believe that an international framework of some sort is needed for the settlement of the Middle East peace issue and that it is necessary to maintain the peace process for the stability of the Middle East. My delegation therefore voted in favour of draft resolution A/43/L.53.

With regard to the words "to place the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, under the supervision of the United Nations for a limited period" in paragraph 4 of that draft resolution, my Government would like to study carefully the concrete modalities for such supervision.

(Mr. Hatano, Japan)

With respect to draft resolution A/43/L.54, Japan considers that the adoption of the proclamation of the State of Palestine is of significance as an expression of the Palestinians' long-cherished national desire. Japan takes the position that the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people, including the right to establish an independent State, should be recognized and respected.

However, in the current situation the conditions for the recognition of a State under international law have not been fulfilled.

Therefore, Japan wishes to put on record its reservations on the fact that this draft resolution presupposes the establishment of the State of Palestine.

On the other hand, Middle East peace should be achieved through negotiations with the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Mr. JACOBVITS DE SZEGED (Netherlands): The Netherlands voted in favour of draft resolution A/43/L.53 because we strongly support the early convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East under the auspices of the United Nations as a suitable framework for the necessary negotiations between the parties directly concerned.

At the same time, we have certain reservations, notably where the resolution pronounces itself on issues which, as set out in the Venice declaration of the European Community, should be addressed and can only be solved in negotiations. This concerns, among other things, the issue of secure and precise borders and the question of how to solve the refugee problem. The question of the settlements, which we have always considered to be illegal, will also have to be addressed in negotiations. The nature of possible transitional arrangements is another matter which will require prior agreement among the parties directly concerned.

(Mr. Jacobovits de Szeged,  
Netherlands)

All these issues, including the vital question of the implementation of the right of self-determination of the Palestinian people, require a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement, which can only be achieved through negotiations.

Whatever steps this Assembly recommends, our paramount task remains to do all we can to promote a negotiated and peaceful settlement of a burning issue that has remained unresolved all too long.

Sir Crispin TICKELL (United Kingdom): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/43/L.53. We abstained in the vote on the draft resolution whose text is set out in document A/43/L.54. I wish to explain that our vote in favour of the text in document A/43/L.53 does not alter my Government's views on an international conference in the Arab-Israel dispute; nor can it in any way prejudice the eventual outcome of negotiations between those directly concerned. In addition, my Government understands the term "the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and the other occupied Arab territories", which appears in paragraph 3 (a) of document A/43/L.53, to mean those territories referred to in Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

On the draft resolution whose text appears in document A/43/L.54, my delegation's abstention does not mean that the United Kingdom has recognized the State of Palestine as proclaimed unilaterally by the Palestine National Council on 15 November 1988 in Algiers. My delegation's abstention should not be taken to imply any change in my Government's position.

Mr. FORTIER (Canada): My delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution concerning the mandate of the Department of Public Information (A/43/L.52). In changing from votes against similar draft resolutions in past years, my delegation wishes to emphasize Canadian concern for the conditions of the Palestinian people and support for the promotion of their individual and collective rights in accordance with international law and Security Council resolutions.

Having stated those important principles, my delegation wishes to reiterate the fundamental importance attached by Canada to the maintenance of a fair-minded approach in the consideration of all aspects of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Partisanship in the carrying out of United Nations responsibilities towards the Palestinian people does a disservice to the cause of peace. As well, Canada considers that there is an element of duplication between the mandates of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the Division for Palestinian Rights and the activities of the Department of Public Information. For those reasons, my delegation could not support the draft resolutions pertaining to those three bodies.

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/43/L.54, concerning a Palestinian State. Canada has not recognized the State which was proclaimed in Algiers by the Palestine National Council. My Government believes that the question of the representation of such a State at the United Nations is premature.

Finally, my delegation has again abstained in the vote on the draft resolution calling for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East. The Government of Canada has repeatedly expressed its conviction - and did so again yesterday in the General Assembly - that a properly structured international conference is the appropriate framework for negotiations between the parties directly involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict. However, we retain serious reservations about certain of the provisions of this draft resolution which prejudice the outcome of negotiations.

My delegation is mindful of the Secretary-General's invitation to the Security Council to assist in making progress towards a just and lasting settlement. It believes that any measures the Security Council might consider require the acceptance of the parties themselves.

It is essential that there be United Nations support for direct talks between the parties to the Arab-Israeli dispute. It remains our view that an international conference should be the expression of such support in a framework which is accepted by all concerned and which facilitates rather than hinders direct negotiations.

Mr. GUNNLAUGSSON (Iceland): Iceland voted in favour of draft resolution A/43/L.53. In that context we would like to state that in our view a comprehensive settlement concerning the question of Palestine should embrace the following elements: unqualified recognition of Israel's right to exist within secure,

(Mr. Gunnlaugsson, Iceland)

recognized borders and recognition of the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people. The foregoing conditions having been accepted, negotiations should be initiated on new and secure boundaries between Israelis and Palestinians. Negotiations between the parties to the dispute are indispensable.

Mr. LEORO (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Ecuador voted in favour of draft resolution A/43/L.54, dated 14 December 1988. Our vote should be understood in light of the statement made previously by our delegation in the General Assembly.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): We are witnessing a major evolution of the Palestinian problem, an evolution which France warmly welcomes. The sponsors of draft resolution A/43/L.54 have proposed that we immediately incorporate into the practice of the United Nations the consequences of that evolution. France has no objection in principle to such a change, and it will accept it willingly once the conditions are met.

But we have not been able today to vote in favour of that draft resolution, for we must take into account the legal considerations of which everyone is aware.

Mr. HOHENFELLNER (Austria): Austria has explained its position on the question of Palestine during the debate on the item. Our position, which is well known and has been consistent over the years, led us to abstain, as we did in previous years, in the votes on draft resolutions A/43/L.50 and A/43/L.51.

In view of the valuable activities undertaken by the Department of Public Information with regard to the question of Palestine, Austria voted in favour of draft resolution A/43/L.52.

(Mr. Hohenfellner, Austria)

Owing to its long-standing commitment to the early convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, Austria, as it did in the past, voted in favour of draft resolution A/43/L.53.

Austria welcomed the decision of the Palestine National Council of 15 November 1988 to proclaim the creation of a Palestinian State and agrees with the general thrust of draft resolution A/43/L.54. However, in view of the wording of one of its operative paragraphs, which raises a legal problem for which there is no precedent in our Organization, we had to abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

Mr. ZEFOS (Greece): I speak in my national capacity. My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/43/L.54. Needless to say, Greece would have voted for this draft resolution; may I recall that, among other things, a month ago the Greek Government in a clear statement welcomed the decision of the Palestine National Council proclaiming the State of Palestine. If instead of casting a positive vote we abstained it is because we are convinced of the value of concerted efforts, as displayed by the 12 member States of the European Community, for a just and viable solution to the Palestinian question by peaceful means in accordance with Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

That common approach, and the value we attach to the collective efforts of the 12 member States of the European Community, has been manifested by their common stance of abstention on draft resolution A/43/L.54, and we believe that it expresses a commitment to an effective contribution to the solution of the problem.



COUNT YORK von WARTENBURG (Federal Republic of Germany): The developments we have witnessed in recent days are of great political importance for all endeavours to achieve peace in the Middle East.

Like our partners in the European Community, we hope that a political solution will be promoted by those developments. Therefore, we voted for draft resolution A/43/L.53, which we see in the light of the Community's Venice Declaration.

A political solution will require negotiations within the framework of an international peace conference to be carried out by all the parties concerned with a sense of compromise.

(Count York von Wartenburg,  
Federal Republic of Germany)

In our view, operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/43/L.53 sets out programmatic parameters for such negotiations aimed at the achievement of comprehensive peace.

It is our opinion that operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/43/L.54, in the vote on which we abstained, does not change the observer status and the functions of the Palestine Liberation Organization established within the United Nations system in conformity with resolution 3237 (XXIX) and subsequent practice.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Pursuant to resolution 3237 (XXIX) of 22 November 1974 and past practice, and in keeping with operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/43/L.54, which the General Assembly has just adopted, I now call on the Observer of Palestine.

Mr. TERZI (Palestine): Mr. President, in the name of Palestine, the Palestinian people and the Palestine Liberation Organization, the representative of the Palestinian people, I wish to thank you, Sir, and all those members who voted in support of the cause of peace and of the cause of a settlement through the United Nations.

In the name of the Palestinians, those who are suffering under the barbarous and repressive occupation by Israel, those scattered in refugee camps and those in the dispersion, I wish to thank every single member here, including those who have voted against us. May I at the outset thank you, Sir, also for the statement you made this morning concerning the rapid developments in the last 36 hours that:

(spoke in Spanish)

"Once more, our Organization - the United Nations - has proved to be the catalyst for decisive steps forward in the search for a settlement of a major regional conflict." (A/43/PV.81, p. 82)

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

(continued in English)

We fully agree with you that the regional conflict in the Middle East has been a cause of concern and apprehension and at times a cause for alarm at the United Nations during the past 41 years. We believe that the United Nations remains the only forum where such conflicts and regional conflicts can be addressed and settled.

When the Palestinian people exercised its right and declared its State, it was not a unilateral action in the sense that was presented to the General Assembly. The Palestinian people took that action in exercise of its right as envisaged in resolution 181 (II) of 1947. Those who think that we did so unilaterally seem to forget that they voted for a resolution that asked the Palestinian people to take the necessary action to proclaim an independent Arab State. On 15 November 1988 in Algiers our National Council exercised that right and carried out that task. We are surprised that some of those who think it was unilateral have forgotten that they were the very ones who voted for the partition of the country and the fragmentation of the people.

The Secretary-General and the members of the Security Council now have a new task, a task which was almost unanimously approved notwithstanding the two "red lights" that always stand in the way of peace and the process of peace.

Of course, we have detected and we fully appreciate the change in policy of the Administration in Washington, D.C. It is only a dialogue that it wishes to start; but we are fully confident that eventually, and the sooner the better, it will admit that there is a Palestinian people and that that people has the right to self-determination and to exercise that right in its own country, in Palestine.

We are gratified to note that the European Community has voted in favour of the call to convene the International Peace Conference on the Middle East, under

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine)

the auspices of the United Nations, with the participation of all the parties to the conflict, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, on an equal footing, and the permanent members of the Security Council, as outlined in the resolution.

We believe the time has come when the blood of our victims of the intifadah will not have been shed in vain, when those heroes of the uprising, those stone-throwers in their year-long struggle to achieve their freedom and liberty in their own country will be rewarded.

The writing is on the wall and the resolution is that writing. We deeply appreciate the co-operation of the Secretary-General and the Secretariat in taking immediate action to change the name-plate before us, and we assure the Assembly that our co-operation with the Secretary-General to achieve peace in the Middle East will remain as strong and consistent as ever.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): As our meetings in Geneva are coming to a close, I should like to express my thanks to all delegations here for their warm co-operation and deep understanding, which have enabled us to overcome certain technical difficulties of these special meetings. The efforts you made helped bring about the success of our deliberations. On behalf of all delegations and on my own behalf, I wish especially to thank the Secretary-General, the Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs and Secretariat Services, Mr. Joseph Verner Reed, and the Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva, Mr. Jan Martenson, whose staff deserve our gratitude for their tremendous efforts in so speedily and effectively arranging for the General Assembly to meet here.

(The President)

I should also like to give special thanks to the interpreters, the translators, the security officers, the conference staff, the press staff, engineers, messengers and all other staff members who have worked with us over the past three days for having stood by us even until the late hours.

Finally, I believe that we all owe very special thanks to the authorities of the Swiss Confederation for the way in which they have welcomed the Assembly, thus facilitating our deliberations. To all of them go my very special thanks.

The representative of the Soviet Union has asked to make a statement, and I now call on him.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has asked to speak in order to express its most sincere gratitude to all the delegations that have expressed condolences and sympathy in connection with the earthquake in Armenia. Our people are grateful to the international community for the moral support and material assistance it has extended to us in connection with this tragedy. In that, we see yet another manifestation of the unity of the world community, a unity that was so impressively demonstrated in the discussion of the question of Palestine, which is at the very core of a Middle East settlement.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 37.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.