

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records



95th
PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 11 December 1984,
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

*President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA
(Zambia).*

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Helgason
(Iceland), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

AGENDA ITEM 33

Question of Palestine (concluded):

(a) Report of the Committee on the Exercise of the
Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People;

(b) Report of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania): My delegation considers the issue before the Assembly to be one of the most crucial issues confronting the international community, for, by virtue of the strategic importance of the Middle East and the fact that peace, security and stability cannot be established in the area without resolving the root cause of the conflict, the question of Palestine is central to international peace and security; but, above all else, it is a question of human freedom and dignity and the quest of a people, the people of Palestine, for recognition of their inalienable right to self-determination.

2. Thirty-six years after the partition of their land, the Palestinian people continue to be denied their most fundamental human, political and national rights, in flagrant violation of the basic norms of international law, the Charter of the United Nations and its resolutions and decisions. Israel has, to date, in a diabolical combination of force and arbitrary legislative and administrative measures, only paralleled by those of *apartheid* in South Africa, embarked on a campaign to entrench its domination in Palestine. Measures under way to change the demographic composition, geographical character and administrative status of the occupied Palestinian territories and to separate the Palestinian people from their historical and cultural homes, undermine their identity and question their national existence—and even physical annihilation—have formed part of this scheme. As a consequence, the Palestinian people not only have become second-class citizens in their own country, but also continue to be subjected to incessant humiliation, harassment and all forms of violence, including murder. Assassination of Palestinian leaders has also become an integral part of the Israeli lawlessness visited upon the Palestine people by the Israeli occupiers.

3. The international community cannot afford to be indifferent when an entire people is systematically being annihilated in the Middle East. It should stand against Israeli aggression and for the Palestinian rights. Together with the recognition of those rights, the international community should embark on a process to put into effect concrete measures for their exercise without external interference. Those rights, as originally envisaged in General Assembly resolution 181 (II), adopted on 29 November 1947, and the right to return, the right to compensation, and so on, must be reiterated.

4. It is the United Nations which has a historical responsibility for the problem. It is the Organization which must continue to play the central role in its resolution, on the basis of the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

5. The adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 3236 (XXIX), embodying the fundamental rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination without external interference, the right to national independence and sovereignty, the right to return, the right to regain all their rights by all means possible and the right to recognition as a principal party in the search for a lasting peace in the Middle East, underscored the continued commitment of the United Nations to the restoration of Palestinian rights. It is in this context that despite numerous set-backs, all precipitated by the recalcitrancy and obstinacy of Israel, the international community has not been deterred from its principal objective of restoring peace in the Middle East.

6. It is in recognition of this fundamental consideration that the efforts of the international community have converged on the need for collective action under the auspices of the United Nations. The adoption by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, of the Geneva Declaration on Palestine¹ and the elaboration of the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights,¹ to work towards the realization by the Palestinian people of their right to self-determination, independence, freedom and free national and social development, underscores this position.

7. Furthermore, the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 38/58 C was essentially a recognition of the need to harmonize international efforts to find a just and lasting solution to the Palestinian question. In that resolution, the Assembly endorsed the call for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East. That resolution embodies an international consensus on a framework for peace comprising the key elements of any process leading to such eventuality.

8. Consistent with this position, therefore, my delegation wishes to reiterate its strong support for

the conference proposal, on the basis of six basic principles: first, the strong opposition to and categorical rejection of Israeli policies and practices in the occupied territories, particularly the establishment of settlements; secondly, ending the Israeli occupation of Arab territories, in accordance with the principle of the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by force; thirdly, the nullification and voidance of all legislative and administrative measures adopted by the occupying Power which have modified or attempted to modify the character and status of the City of Jerusalem; fourthly, the recognition of the right of the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO], the sole and authentic representative of the Palestinian people, to participate on an equal footing with other parties in all efforts to bring about peace in the region; fifthly, the realization by the Palestinian people of the inalienable right to self-determination, including the right to an independent homeland; and, lastly, the recognition of the right of all States in the region to an independent existence within secure and internationally recognized borders. These key elements, as embodied in the Geneva Declaration on Palestine, remain the firm basis for any possible settlement of this question.

9. Since the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, the international community has continued its consideration of the question of Palestine. Both the Meeting of Ministers and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984, and the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, at its session held at Addis Ababa from 12 to 15 November 1984, have reaffirmed their support for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and reiterated their conviction that the question of Palestine is at the core of the Middle East problem and the root cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict, a conflict whose solution must be comprehensive, just and lasting, based on the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations and taking into account the interrelated character of the elements that constitute the problem.

10. In particular, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, as well as condemning

“all manoeuvres and formulae aimed at preventing the people of Palestine from exercising their rights to self-determination, to achieve their national aspirations to return to their homeland and exercise their freedom and complete sovereignty”²

reiterated its firm support for the Arab peace plan, adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference,³ as

“an important contribution to the search for a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict; and [called] for the implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/58 C on the holding of an international peace conference on the Middle East”²

11. If the period of the past 36 years of dealing with the question has brought to light any reality it is that the challenge before the international community is an enormous one. It has also demonstrated that the solution to the Palestine problem will come about only if all aspects of the problem are taken into account, if the unity of those directly involved is restored and consolidated and if the close co-opera-

tion of those sincerely supporting the just cause of the Palestinian people is further strengthened. It is this challenge that we call upon the international community to face.

12. Mr. AL-OSTA (Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Now that we are speaking once again in the General Assembly on the question of Palestine we know that all are aware that this question has already been discussed in all its aspects. All that one might say on the subject today has already been stated and restated tens if not hundreds of times over the past 37 years.

13. All delegations present are familiar with the actual situation in Palestine. Those delegations have been disappointed over the years and no longer believe in the ability of the United Nations to resolve international political problems, beginning with the question of Palestine.

14. My delegation deplores the unfortunate and serious situation in which the United Nations finds itself. We believe that responsibility lies squarely and primarily on the shoulders of the permanent members of the Security Council, who, up to the present, have been acting in a way that limits the Organization's ability to solve international problems. They defy the opinion of the majority of States Members of the United Nations and abuse the right of veto in the Security Council.

15. However, the delegation of Yemen would like to reaffirm its support for the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, as we also support the recommendations of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, and the Arab peace plan adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference.³

16. My delegation would like to reaffirm its clear and unwavering position regarding the question of Palestine. We believe that any just and equitable solution requires the total and unconditional withdrawal of all Israeli forces from occupied Arab territory, including Jerusalem, and the recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to return, the right to self-determination and the right to the establishment of an independent State on its national soil, under the leadership of the PLO, its sole legitimate representative. Any solution which fails to take those elements into consideration is doomed to failure.

17. We repeat our support for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all parties involved on an equal footing, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, in order to achieve a just, lasting and comprehensive solution to the problem.

18. It is high time for the international community to commit itself to putting an end to the arrogance and aggression of Israel. The time is ripe also for restoring to the Palestinian people its legitimate rights. It is the duty of those countries which support Israel, in particular the United States, which is supplying it with arms, funds and political, diplomatic and military support, to reconsider their position regarding Israel and its policy of aggression in the Middle East. We hope that the recent agreement concluded between the United States and the Soviet Union regarding the opening of negotiations without

pre-condition will make it possible to achieve solutions to all kinds of problems, not only those relating to disarmament; we are thinking first and foremost of the question of Palestine, the solution of which should be founded on a peaceful and just basis, in accordance with international law.

19. For Israel has never ceased to falsify historical facts and to justify its aggression and expansionism on the pretext of legitimate self-defence. The world today knows that the claims of Israel have no basis. We know that Israel, arrogantly and obstinately, defies the entire world.

20. We hope most sincerely to see the day when right will prevail and the Palestinian people will regain all of its legitimate rights, and we intend to work to that end. We hope to see the State of Palestine take its place among us as a full-fledged member of the United Nations.

21. Mr. SALAH (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The position of Jordan with regard to the Palestinian problem is based on two fundamental elements: first, the continuance of the Israeli occupation of the West Bank, including Jerusalem, and the Gaza Strip, which is preventing the Arab Palestinian people from exercising its right to self-determination, and Israel's occupation and subsequent annexation of the Golan, which is a cause of continued tension and conflicts in the Middle East; and secondly, the reduction of tension and, in consequence, the attainment of peace in the Middle East, that most sensitive and vital region, which is today more than ever an international responsibility.

22. The history of the Israeli occupation of the Arab territories is well known to all. During the past 17 years, the true aggressive and expansionist intentions of Israel with regard to the Palestinian people and the West Bank and Gaza have become clear, in particular to the United Nations. In fact, no Israeli propaganda, whether about Israel's "desire" for peace or the "rejection" of peace by the Arabs, can any longer conceal the existence of a well-established Israeli plan and a co-ordinated policy for the Judaization of the West Bank and Gaza, just as occurred formerly in the case of Jerusalem and the Golan. Proof of this is that Israel is trying feverishly to create *faits accomplis* in the occupied territories, hoping thus to ensure the eventual transformation of the existence of Israel, at present based on force and aggression in these territories, into a "legitimate" existence in the future. That is why Israel is always using delaying tactics in order to gain time and resist all efforts to bring about peace. This is a reality that everybody must remember when the Palestinian question is being considered. The most dangerous thing of all is that Israel is a perpetual cause of tension and violence, so that it is impossible—and I mean quite impossible—to accept in any way this policy of *fait accompli* which Israel is trying to impose in the region. Peace at any price is an invitation to war—that has proved to be the lesson of the two world wars, from which humanity suffered so severely. I need not recall that Israel, basically, is now practising the philosophy of "peace at any price". Representatives will understand the seriousness of this attitude for world stability and security. Regardless of Israeli attempts to change the demographic and geographical character of these territories, the West Bank, including Jerusalem, with Gaza and the Golan, must be returned to Arab sovereignty. The more Israel steps up its establishment of settlements in these territories and its

repressive practices against the Palestinian people, the more it increases the tension, violence and extremism in the region and, hence, the possibility of a world confrontation, which at present we could avert.

23. Israel's action in the occupied Arab territories and in the region reflects continued defiance of the principles of international law and is a source of violence and extremism. Its attitude in the United Nations and with regard to the efforts made within its framework, particularly by the Secretary-General, for the convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East is just as dangerous.

24. This is a brief summary of developments concerning the Palestinian problem since it was considered last year by the General Assembly. They culminated, on the one hand, in a renewal of Israeli efforts to entrench its occupation and try to transform it into a "legitimate" fact, and on the other, its disregard and rejection of peace efforts and its defiance of legitimacy and of the international consensus. There is no need to reaffirm the gravity of this situation for international peace and security.

25. In the light of all this, the position of Jordan has always been based on the fact that it is necessary to respect scrupulously the fundamental principles which govern the Arab-Israeli dispute and which international legitimacy has given concrete form in many serious situations and circumstances, and, in particular, in Security Council resolution 242 (1967). If we have accepted that resolution and called for its implementation, it is not because the resolution was based on a Jordanian demand but because it represents the basis for international unanimity and gives effect to principles accepted by the international community and by the Security Council, the international authority entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security, and because it represents the basis for a lasting and just political solution in the Middle East, that is, "land in exchange for peace". The events that have taken place since the adoption of that resolution, particularly in 1973, have proved that the resolution continues to be the basis of the international consensus in favour of a political settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The effect of this resolution can be seen in all the peace initiatives, whether from the Arab or any other side. These peace initiatives, all of which propose negotiations between the parties and have been rejected by Israel, have another political meaning. In addition to expressing the international will to find a political solution which could lead to a comprehensive, just and, consequently, lasting peace in the Middle East, these initiatives demonstrate the good will and desire for peace of the Arab side, which have accepted them in one form or another. They also show that the Arab side, including the Palestinian people and its representatives, take as their point of departure the principle of international legitimacy and what the international community has accepted as the basis for a settlement in the Middle East.

26. This means that the United Nations has the direct responsibility to take action, to go beyond the stage of the mere presentation of ideas and principles and to embark on the stage of the implementation of these principles. It is, moreover, the duty of us all to facilitate the task of the United Nations in this matter. For that reason, we in Jordan, together with the Palestinian people in the occupied territories, have sought to keep open all possibilities for achiev-

ing peace. In this regard, we stress the positive role played by our people living under occupation in maintaining an objective and balanced context for the Arab political initiative, of which Jordanian co-ordination with the PLO constitutes the essence and vanguard. Although they have been subjected to the most brutal forms of repression and terrorism designed to force them to abandon their land, our people have risen above their suffering and have placed themselves in an objective, well-balanced context that is given concrete form in the safeguarding of the national territory and of the Arab identity. In that framework, the Palestinian people has resisted the occupation and rejected all exhortations to extremism and all attempts to divide it, no matter what methods have been used for this purpose. We in Jordan have committed ourselves to respecting the conscience of our people and of our Arab Palestinian people living under occupation. We feel that this is the criterion for action on our part. We think that that is self-evident. There are some, however, who have acted as though the Palestinian people represented only a small group or a small number of individuals that could be used as a bargaining chip in the game of nations, within the context of an extremist and illogical approach, for which Israel is responsible and which has become the most effective means for implementing its expansionist and aggressive plans directed against the Arab nation. The will of our people under occupation has been the point of departure for and the fundamental criterion of our political action. In addition, the international community has agreed on a basis for a political solution, in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions, which are binding in nature. Hence, we have done everything in our power and everything necessary to maintain the attachment of our Arab Palestinian people to its land. We have sought also to put that people's will and aspirations into concrete form. That is the reason for our co-ordination with the PLO in seeking an objective and shared notion in regard to the safeguarding of our territory. In fact, the Palestinian people has repeatedly reaffirmed both its Arab identity and its national identity. It has given concrete form to its Arab identity by firmly maintaining Jordanian-Palestinian unity, based on a single glorious history and on suffering shared today, and on their belief in a future of unity which, no matter how long it takes to achieve, will constitute an outstanding page in its history. Its national identity is reflected in an indestructible will and in independent decision-making. We in Jordan are very much aware of this; we experience it every day. The children of the Palestinian people demonstrated their dedication to unity in 1950, despite the manoeuvres engaged in by several enemies of Arab unity to undermine it. That is why the Arab Palestinian people under occupation has proposed an approach for international political action that can put an end to its tragic situation. It has proved to the international community that it is faithful to its heritage and its identity, and it has sought objective action based on the international consensus for the attainment of peace between the Arabs and Israel. It has also reaffirmed that sincere action on the Palestinian question requires an appeal for Arab unanimity and unity, not division. That was the framework for the Jordanian dialogue with the PLO, which gave concrete form to the agreement by both sides on the need to put an end to occupation and to regain the Arab territories,

beginning with Jerusalem, as well as to co-ordinate the efforts of the Palestinian people to preserve its national future.

27. What I have just said constitutes only a part of the basic elements of our political existence, of the experience of unity of the Jordanian people that lives under occupation, just as does its ally, the Palestinian people, in a spirit of a sacred united destiny. The Palestinian people has shown its dedication to unity as a national value and objective and as an essential and effective guarantee of the restoration of its national rights in Palestine. We in Jordan cannot but share the suffering of the Palestinian people under the yoke of occupation. I say this only to point out that in undertaking our political initiative we had in mind, above all, the suffering of the Arab Palestinian people and our responsibility towards them. The Jordanians are a proud people. They are defending and will defend their nation, no matter what sacrifices must be made. We want our people to be liberated; we want to safeguard them, not to increase their suffering. We do not want this suffering to be handed down to future generations. We want our children to inherit, at least, the results of our objective action, healthy and rational concepts, if we are not able to hand down to them peace, hope and development.

28. That is the context of Jordan's political action, as reflected in the peace efforts and initiatives, as well as in the call for an international conference in which all the parties involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict would participate and which would make it possible for the Palestinian people to choose its representatives in all freedom. That was the commitment we in Jordan undertook when we declared our acceptance of the resolution adopted by the seventh Conference of Arab Heads of State or Government, held at Rabat in 1974, and when we began a dialogue with the PLO. We did this because it was the wish of our people in the West Bank and Gaza, a wish reiterated very clearly this year and quite recently again during the meeting of the Palestine National Council, at Amman. The unity of the Jordanian and Palestinian peoples is a sacred historical fact, and Jordan's co-operation with the PLO must serve to crystallize a common political concept whose point of departure is an irrefutable and non-negotiable principle: Israel's withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories, in exchange for recognition and the security of all the States of the region and their peoples. That is why we regard this co-operation as the means for crystallizing the freely expressed will of the Palestinian people, as well as the basis for political action. Hence, we have given full latitude to the PLO to decide the position it wishes to take, a position dictated by its national obligations and by the suffering that has been endured by the Palestinian people. King Hussein announced in his opening statement to the seventeenth session of the Palestine National Council, at Amman, that Jordan would accept the decision taken by the PLO in this regard. The Palestinian people, having reaffirmed its freely expressed will and its desire for national unity, expects reciprocity from us. It expects that we will be sincere and will shoulder our responsibilities.

29. We in Jordan have always believed in these ideals. We have always implemented them, and we have no doubt that they will be a major factor in any political action by the PLO, the representative of that people. Similarly, under the yoke of occupation the

Palestinian people has expressed Jordanian-Palestinian unity—past, present and future. In presenting its liberation as a national imperative, it appealed to the Arab nation to close ranks so as to achieve its salvation. Our Arab Palestinian people launched the same appeal to the international community in order to awaken the world's conscience to seek action based on justice, objectivity and even-handedness. The Palestinians have sought peace; they are resisting occupation by all the modest means at their disposal. The moderation they have shown, together with their legitimate resistance and the pursuit of their struggle, can form the basis for an honourable way out of the current deadlock. While the Palestinian people's moderation and its acceptance of the international community's verdict enhance United Nations efforts for the establishment of a comprehensive, lasting and just peace in the Middle East, the just struggle of the people and its insistence on justice will not allow the world to forget its suffering and, later, to fall into the trap of a guilt complex. Quite frankly, today we can see that the Arab Palestinian people is providing the international community, through its struggle and its moderation, with an opportunity to avoid what could bring us all to fall into that trap in future.

30. Furthermore, I wish to stress that Jordanian-Palestinian political action is encountering many difficulties and obstacles, in particular from Israel, which did not even allow representatives of the West Bank members of the Palestine National Council to participate in that Council's meeting in order to take their own decision with regard to establishing and maintaining peace. Israel's attitude has also been negative with regard to the proposed peace conference endorsed by the General Assembly and to the Secretary-General's efforts towards its realization. That conference, which has been called a "peace conference", provides an opportunity to uphold the legitimate requirements of the two parties to the conflict: Israel's withdrawal from the occupied territories and the implementation of the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people, on the one hand, and security for and recognition of Israel, on the other.

31. I shall not speak of the inhuman and illegal Israeli practices against the Arab Palestinian people in the occupied Arab territories. The file on such acts perpetrated by Israel led to the General Assembly declaring, in 1982, that Israel is not a peace-loving State. If Israel truly wished peace, it could today take the initiative so as to demonstrate its good will. It could stop the process of Judaization of the occupied Arab territories, recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, put an end to its expansionist acts of sabotage in the region and stop its policy of hegemony and resort to force, including the total militarization of Israeli society and the creation of a dangerous situation of international polarization. Should Israel refuse to take the initiative and create a climate of détente, the United Nations and, in particular, the members of the Security Council have a special responsibility *vis-à-vis* the Palestinian people and the establishment of peace and the maintenance of security and stability. If Israel continues to resist the establishment of peace, the United Nations should then seek to impose it, otherwise the Organization—the hope of mankind—could fall victim to intransigence, extremism and aggression.

32. The United Nations has not been able up to now to play its role as it should. Since those who have

tried on their own to contribute to the achievement of a comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East have not succeeded, it might prove more productive for them to make their contribution through the United Nations in order to ensure the timely achievement of this noble, and necessary, goal. As a super-Power, the United States has a special responsibility with regard to peace, and it must hasten to shoulder that responsibility. That its bilateral efforts have not been fruitful is perhaps because it has chosen to stand at the side of one of the parties to the conflict instead of playing the role of neutral mediator. Israel has exploited its special and privileged relationship with the United States for its own ends. Hence, it has become clear—and this is not a source of satisfaction to any of us—that the United States has lost on both sides, while Israel has benefited to the extent of the United States loss. The United States, which has invested considerably in Israel under the pretext that such action could make Israel more forthcoming and less intransigent and extremist, has lost not only its investments but also its political influence in its relations with the Israeli leadership. This unlimited material and political support given to Israel by the United States has undermined the reputation and credibility of the United States throughout the Arab world and internationally, whereas it could have been placed at the service of a constructive and even-handed American role in the region. I do not intend to go into details and give data on the unbalanced relationship between the United States and Israel. However, it is clear that it not only runs counter to United States interests but also undermines regional peace and stability. If it is true that the United States believes its support for Israel—which remains intransigent, irreducible and expansionist—has priority over its international responsibilities, we are indeed faced with an extremely difficult situation. If the United States believes that Israel's security must be at the basis of its policy in the Middle East and takes the necessary steps to implement such a policy, the Arabs are then constrained to look to the defence of their very existence and to safeguard their legitimate rights.

33. It is not at all satisfactory for the United Nations to be brought to the point of having to beg a super-Power to respond to the efforts for the convening of an international conference and to support the request made to Israel in this connection. The United States is a super-Power and quite capable of defending its own legitimate interests both within and outside the United Nations. Hence, I do not believe that its participation, together with the international community, in the establishment of a comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East could be less important and less effective in the long term than its unilateral achievement of that goal.

34. We are aware of the difficulties inherent in the mission the General Assembly has conferred upon the Secretary-General to pursue his efforts for the convening of an international peace conference which could serve as the framework for negotiations to arrive at agreements ensuring the peace and security of all States and peoples in the region and recognizing their existence. Israel has demonstrated its intransigence and inflexibility; furthermore, there is a lack of enthusiasm on the part of a great Power and inability to act on the part of the Security Council and other international bodies. Proceeding

to take action can come about only from our own will and our faith in the future, and I believe that we must have recourse to these two primary factors in these difficult times, when we must mobilize our efforts and demonstrate our firm resolve to achieve peace between the Arabs and Israel based on justice and international legitimacy.

35. Today, the Assembly heard a statement by the representative of Israel [94th meeting]; the least that can be said about it is that it failed on two counts: first, because it was not in keeping with the objectives of peace and security that the United Nations is seeking to achieve in the Middle East; and, secondly, because it was essentially based on a set of falsifications and inexactitudes well known to all. It seems that the new Israeli representative wanted to outdo his predecessor in falsifying facts and in advancing new theories. But it is obvious that he cannot do better than his predecessor in the field of international law. Hence, he chose another field, a more general field—that of international relations—and attempted to advance new theories on war and peace, on the history of the United Nations, on peoples and national ethnic groups.

36. I really do not feel obliged to respond to all the inexactitudes in the statement of the Israeli representative; his affirmations speak for themselves. I shall confine myself to making a few general observations. Israel's responsibility with regard to the 1967 war is now clearly established and well documented. The Arab States did not take the initiative of attacking Israel. Indeed, it was Israel which, before the war had begun, declared that it would attack Syria and occupy Damascus in order to overthrow the Government. Many historians, politicians and jurists have stated that it was Israel which put forward war plans so as to create an explosive situation in the region, as *The Observer* reported on 5 June 1967.

37. I shall not elaborate on the theory of Israel's security, based on sudden and preventive strikes and invasion under the pretext of legitimate defence. The principle of legitimate defence has been distorted, just as the principles of international law have been trampled upon, principles which Israel made nothing more than a "clearing-house" to justify its aggression against the Palestinian people and the Arab nation. In his statement, the Israeli representative spoke of the 1967 war and other wars unleashed by Israel against its Arab neighbours, as well as claims calling for the West Bank from now on to be called Judea and Samaria. If Israel considers that the West Bank represents only Judea and Samaria, it should not be surprised if Arabs resort to war to liberate their territory. I believe that the explanation of the 1967 war and the Israeli threats that preceded it show Israel's determination to hold on to the West Bank, Jerusalem, Gaza and the Golan Heights. Of course, the justifications of the Talmud and the weak pretext of security still continue.

38. The Israeli representative would have the victorious take everything, with the vanquished having no other choice but surrender. If that is Israel's approach with regard to the question of Palestine, and in dealing with the United Nations in particular, I do not believe that it would be useful to hear the Israeli representative speak in this body where justice is done to the oppressed and where peace and justice throughout the world are sought.

39. The Israeli representative denied the existence of the problem of the occupied Arab territories and the existence of the refugee problem, placing responsibility for the problem on Arab leaders. If Israel is not responsible for the refugee problem, even though it was Israel which perpetrated the Deir Yassin and Qibya massacres, followed in 1948 by a propaganda campaign against the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza, threatening them with the same fate as that of the massacred inhabitants of those two villages; if Israel is not responsible for the exodus of two million Palestinian refugees since 1948 and if that exodus was not an Israeli aim, then let Israel simply allow them to return. Since their return would pose no problem to Israel, would it not be logical for Israel to authorize this return?

40. Why does Israel ask the Arabs to take care of the refugees while Israel itself bears the political and moral consequences of the destruction of the Palestinian people's national identity, instead of accepting them and accepting their return to their homeland, from which they were expelled?

41. As I have already said, in the statement made this morning by the Israeli representative, there were numerous inexactitudes and half-truths. Proof of that can be seen in his attempt to distort not only history but also geography and the existence and national identity of the Arab nation. For him, the Palestinian people does not exist; Jordan is Palestine and Palestine is Jordan; the Jordanian people does not exist in the Israeli representative's vocabulary. It is inadmissible that the Israeli representative should seek to impose on the Arab nation his own definition of its national identity and of the relationships among the Arab peoples themselves, forgetting that Israel is made up of colonizers that have come from the four corners of the world—the followers of the racist philosophy or ideology of Zionism—to chase away the entire Arab people and attempt to establish hegemony over the entire region.

42. Finally, the Israeli representative this morning tried very hard but wasted the valuable time of members by citing various statements made by Arab leaders requesting what he called the "destruction of Israel". Indeed, that is a game Israeli spokesmen love to play, because it serves Israel's goals in struggling against peace. However, the Israeli representative made sure not to refer to Arab appeals for peace, in particular those made by Jordan and by King Hussein. That illustrates just how much credibility can be ascribed to the Israeli representative's statement, and this credibility vanishes when we consider that he was not even accurate in his references. In mentioning the radio message addressed by King Hussein to the Arab army defending the City of Jerusalem during the June war, he distorted that message in such a way as to serve his interests, to give rise to anti-religious, fanatic and extremist feelings. The Israeli representative quoted the message as follows: "Kill the Jews wherever you find them. Kill them with your arms, with your hands, with your nails and with your teeth."*

43. In fact, what King Hussein said was "Fight them", that is to say, "Fight the enemy", and not "Kill them", as distorted by the Israeli representative. King Hussein quoted the text of a verse of the Koran prohibiting war on civilians—women, chil-

*Quoted in English by the speaker.

dren and the elderly—those whom Israel did not spare in its siege of Beirut.

44. As for the old song "Jordan is Palestine and Palestine is part of Jordan", I do not know how the Israeli representative dares to mention it while endeavouring to prove Israel's innocence and its lack of responsibility with regard to the Palestinian problem. The Israeli representative is perfectly aware that there are geographical and historical hard facts outside the expansionist and false notions of the Israelis.

45. Jordan belongs to the Jordanians and Palestine to the Palestinians, and no one has the right to decide the identity and the homeland of a people whose roots go back thousands of years in the land of its ancestors, as is the case for the two brother peoples, Palestinians and Jordanians. The Palestinian people does not seek to establish its homeland where it happens to be living. That is characteristic of colonialists, which is in fact in keeping with the universal Zionist philosophy on which Israel is based and which seeks unscrupulously for space, even if that space belongs to others.

46. Mr. FARAH DIRIR (Djibouti): The Palestinian question is one of the biggest challenges the international community is facing today. It has already triggered five devastating conflicts and still continues to be a threat to international peace and security. The Palestinian tragedy began when the General Assembly decided to give the best part of Palestine, against the will of the people who had inhabited the land since time immemorial, to Jewish immigrants coming from every culture and clime. The world community was still under the shock of Nazi horrors when it decided to establish in Palestine a homeland for the victims of the holocaust, without prejudice, as it was believed, to the interests of Palestinian Arabs.

47. Unfortunately, however, the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine to be a haven for Jews in the Diaspora entailed the dispossession and dispersion of the Palestinian people. As the Zionists were campaigning before the creation of Israel, they wanted to give credibility to the preposterous assumption that Palestine was not inhabited. The terrorism and the massacre that heralded the establishment of Israel drove the Palestinians into exile, a process which, sadly, has continued until today. The United Nations was not indifferent to the Palestinian plight. The General Assembly, in adopting resolution 194 (III), affirmed the right of the dispersed Palestinians to return to their homeland and recover their usurped properties. Israel refused then, and continues to defy any attempt by the international community, to redress the injustice it perpetrates against the Palestinian people.

48. Today, the overwhelming majority of the international community has recognized the centrality of the Palestinian question to the conflicts and persistent tension in the Middle East. No one in his or her right mind will deny the legitimacy of the struggle undertaken by the Palestinian people, under the leadership of the PLO, to assert its right to return to its homeland, its right to self-determination, to independence and to establish its sovereign State on its national soil. These are the inalienable rights to which every people in the world is entitled. The Palestinians are not asking for more or for less: they are asking for their rightful place in the sun.

49. But, throughout its existence, Israel has negated not only the national rights of the Palestinian people but its very existence. As is well known, Israel's main preoccupation all along has been the evacuation of Palestinian inhabitants from the occupied territories for eventual annexation. The most effective tactic that the occupation authorities are resorting to in their endeavour to expel the inhabitants from their ancestral homeland is the programme of settlement and colonization. The malignant proliferation of settlements in the occupied territories is deeply affecting the economic and social life of the population. Every colonial settlement that is established near a Palestinian village or township is always intended to strangle the latter by diverting water resources and energy. The process of settlement continues at an accelerated pace to meet the quota of 100,000 Jewish settlers by 1985, thus modifying the demographic composition of the occupied territories. While these settlements put heavy strains on the living conditions of the Arab population, the settlers, armed by the occupation authorities, commit outright acts of aggression against them. As we all know, educational institutions are subjected to armed attacks by State-sponsored terrorism; public transport is bombed; houses are demolished; and even the sanctity of places of worship is violated, as in the case of the attempt to blow up the Al-Aqsa and Omar Mosques, setting fire to the Saadhin Mosque in Nablus and the assault on the Ibrahim Mosque in Hebron.

50. While the Palestinian Arabs are subjected to daily harassments, any protest on their part will be met by harsh measures. Collective punishment, curfews, arbitrary detention and expulsion, torture and even murder are the order of the day in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories. All these tactics are meant to make life so insecure and unbearable for the Palestinian and Arab inhabitants that they prefer to emigrate rather than live in Palestine.

51. Every Israeli attempt to obliterate the Palestinian national identity has ended in failure. The Palestinian nation is one of the oldest in the world, and history testifies to the continuity of Palestinians in Palestine since time immemorial, during which they have produced a particular national, artistic and legislative system that determines the existence of a specific national community which in turn is part of a larger Arab national community. It was a vindication of this historical continuity of the Palestinians when the League of Nations, in 1921, years before Israel was established, recognized the Palestinian national community.

52. Israel can massacre the Palestinians, expel them, confiscate their properties, usurp the cultural patrimony, desecrate their places of worship and cultural landmarks, and deny them their fundamental human rights, but it will never be able to destroy their spirit of resistance, their aspirations and their national will, which are the continuity of their history. Israel knows this better than any other. Ever since the Palestinians chose the PLO as their sole representative, the Zionist authorities have been haunted by the spectre of ever-growing Palestinian nationalism.

53. The unwarranted invasion of Lebanon in 1982 and the carnage and destruction it brought about were perpetrated with the sole purpose of physically liquidating the PLO and burying with it the hopes and national aspirations of the Palestinian people

under the rubble of Beirut. The PLO survived the test more determined than ever to continue the struggle for national independence.

54. The Palestinian leadership has once more demonstrated its political and diplomatic acumen at the beginning of this year when it was faced with a critical situation. The meeting of the Palestine National Council at Amman removed any doubts that might have been entertained in some quarters. The Amman meeting demonstrated to the world that the PLO represents not only the Palestinians in exile but also the Palestinians living in Palestine.

55. The primary responsibility of the United Nations is to find peaceful solutions for conflicts that might threaten international peace and security. The Palestinian question could trigger another conflagration at any moment. Today, the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations believe that the convening of an international conference on the Middle East would provide the most appropriate avenue leading towards the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the region.

56. Next year, the United Nations is to mark its fortieth anniversary. It will be an occasion for celebration, but it will also be a moment of retrospection and assessment of the achievements and failures of the Organization. The United Nations could have no better present for the world on that occasion than a just and lasting solution to the question of Palestine.

57. Finally, I would like to pay tribute and express my appreciation to the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which, under the competent and able leadership of Mr. Massamba Sarré, of Senegal, has spared no effort in enhancing international awareness of and support for the struggle of the Palestinian people to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and to establish an independent and sovereign Palestinian State. I commend the Committee's excellent report [A/39/35], which it has diligently prepared to highlight the legitimacy of the struggle of the Palestinian people, with which my delegation fully concurs. In this regard, my delegation hopes that the Committee's findings and recommendations enjoy the full support of the international community.

58. Mr. OCHIENGHS-WELBORN (Uganda): My delegation has read attentively the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People [*ibid.*] and the report of the Secretary-General [A/39/130 and Add.1]. I wish to pay a well-deserved tribute to Mr. Sarré, of Senegal, and the members of the Committee for their untiring efforts to fulfil the mandate entrusted to them by the General Assembly. Our appreciation goes equally to the Secretary-General, who over the past year has exerted considerable efforts to find a peaceful solution to the conflict in the Middle East.

59. The problem of Palestine has been one of the most urgent recurrent concerns of the United Nations ever since its inception. The item has remained prominent on the agenda of successive sessions of the General Assembly and other international forums. This is only right, because the failure to resolve it is the main cause of the conflict in the Middle East, which constitutes a grave threat to international peace and security.

60. When the General Assembly grappled with this issue in 1947, it recognized the necessity of establish-

ing a Palestinian Arab State. General Assembly resolution 181 (II), of 29 November 1947, from which Israel derives its existence, required the establishment of a Palestinian State. By that resolution, the international community undertook the obligation to ensure the establishment of a Palestinian State. Accordingly, contingent upon the admission of Israel to the United Nations was the requirement that it would abide by the United Nations partition plan. It was not the intention of the United Nations that the establishment of an Israeli State should result in injustice for the Palestinian people. They are now unfortunately being denied their inalienable rights. They are being forced to live in perpetual exile or suffer oppression under foreign occupation.

61. The main obstacle to the realization of a Palestinian State and a peaceful resolution of the Middle East conflict has been and remains Israeli intransigence. The Israeli objectives have been obvious for many years, though they have been masked under various guises. These objectives are: to integrate the occupied Arab territories within Israel, while finding a way of reducing the Arab population; to disperse the scattered Palestinian refugees and crush any manifestation of Palestinian nationalism or culture; and to gain control over southern Lebanon.

62. They have consistently rejected any political settlement that accommodates the inalienable rights of the indigenous population. Israel has sought to achieve its objectives through repression and State terrorism and to hoodwink the international community by a massive propaganda campaign which has long distorted the true nature of the question of Palestine.

63. Right from its establishment, Israel embarked on policies and actions aimed at preventing the full implementation of General Assembly resolution 181 (II); it immediately set out to expand beyond the boundaries allocated to it under the United Nations partition plan. Through aggressive actions and wars, Israel has been swallowing up more Palestinian and other Arab lands with the clear aim of preventing the Palestinian people from regaining their inalienable rights. Since 1967, the Israeli goal has been to consolidate its hold on the occupied lands. The implanting of numerous massive settlements is the main technique of converting conquest to annexation.

64. Annexation, expansion and the creation of settlements are contrary to international law. Article 47 of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, expressly proscribes the annexation of occupied territory. Article 49 prohibits the forcible deportation or transfer of the inhabitants of the occupied area. It also forbids the transfer by an occupying Power of any of its population into the occupied areas. Yet, in spite of the condemnation of the United Nations and its injunctions, Israel has continued to violate these provisions and has refused to rescind its actions.

65. Despite attempts to misrepresent the facts, many Israeli leaders have never hidden their real objectives. In a lecture at Hebrew University in May 1980, a former Israeli intelligence officer, General Gazit, warned against evacuating any part of historic Eretz Yisrael, which must remain entirely under Jewish control and basically a Jewish State. Referring

to the Arab indigenous inhabitants of those territories, he said: "The solution for them must be found outside historic Israel."

66. The report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories [A/39/591] gives the most recent examples of how Israel is altering the legal status, geographic nature and demographic character of the Arab territories occupied since 1967. It has adamantly refused to recognize the applicability of the 1949 Geneva Convention to the occupied territories. Viewed against the background of the annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights, the annexation of Jerusalem, the barbaric invasion and subsequent occupation of southern Lebanon, the avowed aim of which was to destroy the PLO, it becomes clear that Israel intends to annex the West Bank and Gaza in its quest for a greater Israel. It appears that the only kind of peace Israel desires, and is intent on imposing on the region, is one that denies the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and rules out the possibility of any comprehensive and just solution to the Middle East conflict.

67. Israel has always sought to put an end to the Palestinian national identity; but the history of the past four decades shows that the Palestinians are capable of making splendid sacrifices in order to maintain their national Palestinian identity and achieve the restoration of their inalienable rights. This was aptly demonstrated by the failure of the Israeli onslaught on Palestinians in the recent invasion of Lebanon to extinguish the spirit of freedom that inspires their liberation struggle. In spite of vicious attacks against them and their dispersal from Beirut, their struggle continues unabated and is supported by the overwhelming majority of the international community.

68. The PLO has proved beyond any shadow of doubt that it is the sole authentic representative of the Palestinian people. It emerged from the Israeli onslaught with its stature and political influence enhanced. It remains the true representative of the Palestinian people.

69. The West Bank population rejected the village leagues which the Israeli authorities were attempting to foist on them. It is clear that those who seek a peaceful resolution to the Middle East conflict must be prepared to talk to and negotiate with the PLO. It is unfortunate that Israel and one reputable Member of the United Nations still refuse to accept this reality. We believe that an acceptance of this truth by all would contribute positively to the peace process. It would discourage Israeli intransigence.

70. In our view, Israeli opposition to the PLO and Israel's adamant refusal to allow it a place at the peace negotiating table are not because of any provision in the PLO covenant. Israel opposes the PLO because it is the living expression of Palestinian nationalism and champions their inalienable rights, which Israel seeks to destroy.

71. David Krivine, in a letter to *The Economist* of 10 July 1982, gave the real reason why Israel objects to any discussion with the PLO. He said:

"The one group we won't talk with, it is true, is the PLO—but not because they are nasty people. The obstacle is the subject on the agenda. It can only be the creation of a Palestinian State on the West Bank, and that we can't agree to."

72. We ask those who refuse to talk to the PLO on the basis of this erroneous reason to challenge Israel as to whether it would be prepared to accept a Palestinian State, as called for in United Nations resolutions, if that condition were met.

73. The Israeli response to all peace proposals from any quarter which are aimed at achieving a just solution that takes into account the inalienable rights of the Palestinians has been negative and provocative. This is in contrast with the positive response of the PLO and Arab countries. In spite of Israeli provocations, they have been flexible. They have stood by the plan adopted at Fez on 9 September 1982 by the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference,³ under which all States in the region could coexist within secure and internationally recognized borders. Unfortunately, under the mask of the right to live within secure borders, Israel has obdurately refused to recognize the Palestinian right to self-determination and to enter into a dialogue involving the PLO.

74. The International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1982, called for an international peace conference on the Middle East. The General Assembly, in resolution 38/58 C, endorsed that recommendation and mandated the Secretary-General to make arrangements for the convening of the conference. We believe that that resolution provided good machinery for building a just and lasting settlement. Regrettably, Israel continues to put road-blocks in the way of the convening of the conference. We appeal to all concerned to co-operate with the Secretary-General and to facilitate the convening of the conference. As the previous peace conference, in December 1973, of which the United States and the Soviet Union were co-chairmen, demonstrated, such a forum would enhance the chance of success of the peace process in the region.

Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) took the Chair.

75. The main elements of a just solution to the Palestinian question, which is the core of the Middle East conflict, are present in a number of United Nations resolutions. A framework for peace must be just and comprehensive. It can be comprehensive and just only if it restores the rights of the Palestinian people and involves the participation of all the parties concerned. It must include the following elements: first, the withdrawal of Israel from the occupied Arab territories; secondly, recognition of the right of refugees to return to their homeland; and, thirdly, the exercise by the Palestinians of the right to self-determination.

76. The PLO, which is the sole and authentic representative of the Palestinians, must participate in the negotiations.

77. In a message addressed to the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People on 29 November 1984, on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, the President of Uganda, Mr. A. Milton Obote, stated:

"On this solemn occasion when we observe the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, I wish to convey to you the commitment of the Government of the Republic of Uganda and the people of Uganda to work towards the rehabilitation and enjoyment of the full rights of the Palestinian people.

"The Palestinians have the right to return to their homeland, the right to self-determination and the right to set up an independent State of their own. There can never be just and durable peace in the Middle East without addressing the injustice done to the Palestinians."

78. I wish on behalf of the Government and people of Uganda to reaffirm the commitment made by President Obote.

79. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I will begin with some very relevant verses from the Holy Koran. I take refuge in God, away from the accursed Satan.

"Verily God will defend (from ill) those who believe: verily, God loveth not any that is a traitor to faith, or shows ingratitude.

"To those against whom war is made, permission is given (to fight), because they are wronged;—and verily, God is most powerful for their aid;—

"(They are) those who have been expelled from their homes in defiance of right,"—that applies to the Palestinians, does it not?—"(for no cause) except that they say, 'Our Lord is God'. Did not God check one set of people by means of another, there would surely have been pulled down monasteries, churches, synagogues, and mosques, in which the name of God is commemorated in abundant measure. God will certainly aid those who aid His (cause);—for verily God is full of strength, exalted in might (able to enforce His will).

"(They are) those who, if we establish them in the land, establish regular prayer and give regular charity, enjoin the right and forbid wrong; with God rests the end (and decision) of (all) affairs." [Surah XXII:38-41.]

80. About four decades have passed since the occupation of Palestine, and the Palestinian people are still as displaced and homeless as ever. The Zionist usurpers of Palestine, with the unreserved support of the United States, are still taking hostage the entire nation of Palestine and are threatening the rest of the area. As members know, southern Lebanon has been added to the occupied territories. In spite of all the support and sympathy that the voting records have always demonstrated for Palestine, the United Nations has not so far been able to liberate one inch of the occupied land. It has been only a helpless spectator of the continuation of occupation, further illegal settlements, expansion of aggression, occupation of further territories and devastation of more residential areas.

81. Zionist dreams of occupation from the Nile to the Euphrates are coming closer to realization with the recent developments in the area; the Camp David conspiracy is gaining more recognition. After Jordan's green light, Iraq is now giving the green light. *The Washington Post* of 28 November 1984 has quoted Tariq Aziz as saying that "his nation will not oppose possible efforts by Jordan and the Palestinians to forge a peace agreement with Israel". "Israel," he continues, "is guilty of aggression against Lebanon, the Palestinians and Jordan, but Iraq has no right to veto a peace movement." Strange, isn't it? To give full assurance to those concerned, he says: "I say officially, we will not oppose it even if we don't like it. We have to consider it from the realistic point of view." That is how the Zionist dream of "from the Nile to the Euphrates" is gradually coming true and

that is how the cause of Palestine is being raped by its once adamant supporters, namely, Egypt and Iraq. Quite regrettable, isn't it? It is good to remember that Iraq severed its relations with the United States Government simply because of the latter's support for Israel. The same champion is now considering a Palestinian-Jordan peace treaty with the Zionist aggressor "from a realistic point of view".

82. Thus the Camp David conspiracy is enjoying more and more accommodation, so to speak, and receptivity, simply because the United Nations has not been able to seek even to implement justice in the cause of Palestine. Even General Assembly resolution 38/58 C, endorsing the call for an international peace conference on the Middle East, which was expected to serve the Palestine cause, was so easily exploited by the enemies of Palestine simply because, under the guise of seeking provision for agreement with the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights—adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983—the matter was referred to the Security Council. Of course, the outcome in the Security Council was already known beforehand: the negative vote of the United States on resolution 38/58 C clearly presaged the veto in the Security Council. In his letter of 13 January 1984, addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of the United States said:

"The United States believes firmly that the only path to peace in the Middle East lies in a process of negotiations among the parties based on Security Council resolutions 242 and 338, a process that the United States has sought vigorously and consistently to encourage, particularly in the Camp David accords and in President Reagan's initiative of 1 September 1982. Holding an international conference as recommended by the General Assembly would only hinder this process. It would predictably become a forum for propagandistic and extreme positions, and in the context proposed by the General Assembly and further articulated by the Secretary-General it would very likely yield a one-sided outcome not acceptable to one or more of the parties and therefore inoperable. The net result would be to diminish the prestige of the United Nations as the sponsor of the conference"—some people care so much about the prestige of the United Nations—"and delay the day when peace will come to the troubled Middle East." [A/39/130, annex III, appendix.]

You see, according to this text, peace can be achieved only when the base of imperialism and zionism is fully installed and imposed upon the people. They have to accept it, to swallow it, because the United States wishes it to be so. Otherwise, there can be no peace—from its point of view.

83. The meaning of an international conference in which the Governments that are directly involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict—namely, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria—are invited to a negotiating table is fairly clear. By "fairly clear", I mean that such a conference could again be exploited by some as a forum for direct negotiations. My delegation is quite sure that even if the idea had not been vetoed by the United States, the very fact that the Zionist base of terror would attend the conference on an equal footing with other countries would have been a concession to the Zionist enemy, and as such a setback for the cause of Palestine. Notwithstanding this

fact, the efforts of the United Nations for even a concessionary peace conference were vetoed by the United States.

84. If the same request for a peace conference is made and our Palestinian brothers vote for it, we shall follow them because we shall always co-operate with the cause of Palestine. But, in this instance, this spirit of co-operation is not fully in accordance with our spirit.

85. In such circumstances, serious consideration must be given to whether to count on the diplomatic front and whether the international forum is really advisable at all.

86. The basic problem in the Palestinian tragedy is the misunderstanding, and consequently the misrepresentation, of the problem. The problem is that the United Nations has given recognition and legitimacy to the occupation of Palestine, and so long as this mistake is not rectified, one will always confront a political situation in which the culprit and those behind it participate in making decisions for the victim. It is not very difficult to predict the decisions of a United Nations with such an absurd composition. When the burglar becomes the arbiter, obviously the victim becomes the culprit.

87. A more fundamental aspect of the problem, which I wish to address to my brothers in the delegations of the Muslim countries, stems from the fact that the occupation of Palestine by the Zionist enemy is an Islamic issue. Islamic territory has been attacked and occupied. The Muslim nation of Palestine has been subjected to aggression, homelessness, displacement, murder and massive genocide—not once, not twice, not three times, but continuously over the past four decades. Instead of undertaking our religious duty of collectively defending Palestine, we have simply secularized the matter and relegated it to a secular body, where the enemy has the power of manipulation and control. We cannot discharge our responsibilities by simply secularizing the matter of Palestine and hurling the issues at a secular playing-field. It is not by appealing to obscenity that anyone—and definitely not the Muslims in the General Assembly—can unburden himself of the Muslims' collective religious duties. Otherwise, we shall be, as we are now, left with the choice of abdicating to the incompetent our most serious concerns, such as Palestine. On what grounds can we Muslim nations expect a secular body to renounce its own artificial baby? On what grounds can we Muslim countries expect the United Nations to come and liberate our sanctuaries? On what moral, religious or even secular grounds can we expect the General Assembly to return the holy Al-Quds or the Al-Aqsa Mosque to us? Such an expectation is really absurd and inadmissible. The General Assembly is not going to do it, and we all know that it is not going to do it.

88. Either one is honest with the cause of Islam, with the cause of Palestine, or one wishes to nationalize Islam and secularize the masses of the Islamic Ummah and leave their destiny to the hands of one's Zionist enemies. If one really wants to be honest with the cause of Palestine, then one should take it as it really is. Palestine is an Islamic territory and Palestinians are a part of the Islamic Ummah. It is therefore the duty of all Muslims to mobilize all their capabilities, under the banner of Islam, for the liberation of occupied Palestine and the implementation of justice. And it is wrong to assume that

Palestinians must defend and suffer but others can only support, by pushing the green button in favour of a silly draft resolution. It is equally incumbent upon all Muslims to defend Palestine.

89. If Muslims decide to nationalize Palestine and secularize their Islamic duties, then all Muslims deserve the humiliation of defeat, not only in the area, but particularly in this forum, which is, after all, a secular international club that belongs to the others and not to Muslims.

90. There is no solution to the problem of Palestine in this international body. Its so-called solution would only add to our agony, because the best they can offer is the partition plan, which installed the enemy centre in our region and annihilated our Palestine. The solution of the Islamic problem cannot be a secular one from a secular source. Our position has always been that only a united Islamic front can liberate Palestine. Zionist hegemony cannot be halted or undone by those instruments in which Zionists themselves have a role. As a matter of fact, it is the desire of the Zionists to see you, here, adopt their language, define your problems according to their categories and seek their solution to your problems. For in every step by which you accommodate something of the enemy's you have already suffered a set-back. You are therefore the loser even when you are the winner.

91. You have been the victim of aggression, you have been wronged. You have the divine mandate to defend yourself. Why do you not do it? You have divine support in defending yourself.

92. Surely, God will defend those who believe. Surely, God does not love the ungrateful traitor. Leave is given to those who fight because they were wronged, and surely God is able to help them. Therefore, we have to defend ourselves. We have to make sure that we do not betray the law of God. Do not be a traitor to Islam. Defend yourself on the basis of the divine mandate. God is able to help those who were unrightfully expelled from their homes. This applies to the Palestinians, does it not?

93. Then the verse says this. Had God not driven back the people, some by the means of others? There have been cloisters and churches, oratories and mosques, destroyed. Do members not think that all this is taking place inside the occupied lands? Are not mosques and sanctuaries being devastated, changed, destroyed? There are even resolutions to that effect. God will indeed help, but we have to move, too. It is our duty to drive back those who have come to destroy cloisters, sanctuaries and mosques wherein divine names are to be recited. Remember that God will help him who helps God.

94. The enemy is very weak indeed. Do not fear him. He has no power when one stands. Do not be astounded by his technology. Those who stand firm and united will be victorious. In the words of the Koran: "And if the fly should snatch away anything from them, they would have no power to release it from the fly" [Surah XXII:73]. They are very small, very miserable. Do not give a lot of weight to their technology. It is ultimately the human mind which acts and makes the decision, not the technology. All that we have to do is to obey the divine prescriptions, which say: "And hold fast, all together, by the rope which God (stretches out for you), and be not divided among yourselves" [Surah III:103]; and: "Against them make ready your strength to the utmost of your

power, including steeds of war, to strike terror into (the hearts of) the enemies of God and your enemies, . . . " [Surah VIII:60].

95. Experience will show, and has already shown, that a small, united, faithful Muslim group can defeat the Zionist enemy. The enemy has been so well defeated for the first time in Lebanon that withdrawal is its only choice and it is trying to find a face-saving solution. It can be imagined, then, what will happen if only the Muslims of the Middle East unify against the enemy and mobilize all their resources.

96. It should be well remembered that the solutions of the international body are inevitably divisive and competitive because they are based on divisive presuppositions, whereas Islam is unifying and uniting because it is based on Tawhid. Islamic unity is the only solution. Palestine cannot be liberated by anything less than the divine dictum which says: "If then any one transgresses the prohibition against you, transgress ye likewise against him" [Surah II:194]. Do not attack them through resolutions. They did not occupy by means of resolutions. "But fear God, and know that God is with those who restrain themselves" [*ibid.*].

97. The enemy from the very beginning has been wanting certain things that it thinks it can secure through internationally recognized methods—negotiation, I mean. The games that are played here in the United Nations are not our games. They are their games, invented by them, and they do not play them unless they are fully convinced that they will win the games. So do not waste time here. Do not bother the Secretary-General. He is really willing to be helpful, but he cannot. And do not become a member of that certain gang, at least not in issues which must be handled on an Islamic basis. They have only one solution, which is an Islamic solution.

98. Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): The question of Palestine constitutes one of the oldest issues on the agenda of the General Assembly.

99. The question of Palestine, which came into being as a result of the machinations by world imperialism and its illegitimate brain-child, Zionism, centres on the arrogant denial to the Palestinian people of its national inalienable rights. This question lies at the crux of the whole Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East and has occupied the minds of many nations and international organizations in their search for a just solution. Thousands of hours have been spent at hundreds of international and regional conferences and gatherings in considering this issue, and dozens of declarations, decisions, communiqués, resolutions and plans of action have been adopted with the sole purpose of putting an end to the prolonged tragedy of the millions of Palestinians through achieving a lasting and comprehensive solution.

100. None of those efforts, however, has brought closer the attainment of a settlement, or the establishment of peace, for that matter: Palestinian territories, together with other Arab lands, still remain under the firm grip of Israeli occupation; acts of violence and repression against Palestinians and other Arab populations of the occupied territories are affecting even larger segments of those peoples, and there seems to be no end to the Israeli policy of acquisition of territory by force.

101. Continuation of the plight of the Palestinians can in no way be attributed to lack of endeavour on

the part of the international community. Nor can it be based on the pretext that there exists no realistic and just basis on which a permanent solution could be built.

102. The United Nations inherited the problem of Palestine when it had already acquired dangerous dimensions. The developments that have occurred since then greatly added to the tension which plunged the region more than once into all-out armed confrontation, resulting in enormous loss of life and property. Conscious of its direct responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, the United Nations remained seized of the situation and exerted every effort in order to bring about a comprehensive and durable peace in the Middle East through a just solution to the Palestinian problem. In the resolutions of its most important authoritative organs, the Security Council and the General Assembly, the United Nations has given a clear definition of the nature and scope of the problem.

103. By its resolution 3376 (XXX), the General Assembly established the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, of which the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan has the honour of serving as a vice-chairman. At its thirty-first session, the General Assembly endorsed the recommendations of the Committee [see A/39/35, annex I], which were designed to enable the Palestinian people to exercise its inalienable rights as previously recognized and defined by General Assembly resolutions. Those resolutions not only reflected the verdict of the international community towards the Palestinian issue, but also drew the basic guidelines for achieving an acceptable solution to it.

104. It is highly disquieting for peace-loving humanity to note that none of its repeated demands for the restoration of peace in this war-stricken region of the world, through the implementation of the United Nations resolutions, has been complied with by the Zionist régime of Israel and its imperialist mentors.

105. In gross and repeated breaches of the Charter of the United Nations and in violation of the Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, Israel stubbornly refuses to withdraw its forces and administration from the Palestinian and other Arab territories it has occupied since 1967. In line with their cynical ambition for establishing the so-called greater Israel, the Zionist rulers of Israel have embarked on the path of absorbing the territories of others. Despite the strong warnings of the international community, the Zionist régime promulgated the "Basic Law", declaring the Holy City of Jerusalem as the "eternal" capital of Israel. In the same vein, Israel not only refuses to return the vast territories of the Syrian Arab Republic in the Golan Heights to Syria's sovereignty, but has enacted legislation purporting permanently to annex them to Israel.

106. Clear reflection of the same illegal practice can be observed in the occupied territories of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Israel has persistently continued its policy of proliferating Jewish colonial settlements in those areas. As in the past, further thousands of the indigenous inhabitants were forcefully evacuated during the past year from their homes and towns or had to abandon them owing to enormous pressure and intimidation by the occupying authorities and the Zionist settlers. Land and properties thus confiscated are usually put to use for

establishing new settlements and expanding the old ones, or for constructing new military facilities for the occupying forces.

107. Other laws and regulations enforced by the Israeli authorities, in complete violation of the Geneva Conventions of 1949, have extended their ominous effects to every aspect of life in the occupied territories. Local administrations such as city, town and village councils are dismantled and their elected officials are dismissed and replaced by military or civilian administrations of the occupying Power. Academic and social institutions such as schools, universities and trade unions are repeatedly closed down. Muslim mosques and holy shrines are vandalized, and peaceful civilians remain targets of constant harassment by the terrorist groups of settler vigilantes or police of the occupying Power.

108. These and many similar practices have remained permanent causes of alarm for the population of the occupied territories and for concerned humanity. The bitter memories of the massacre of innocent Palestinian refugees in the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps are still fresh in our minds. If we are to prevent the recurrence of those bestial and abhorrent actions, then we must take serious steps towards defusing the tension which is increasing as a result of the atrocities committed by the Zionist régime.

109. It needs no elaboration that the Zionist arrogance could not have prevailed over the repeatedly expressed wishes of the overwhelming majority of mankind had it not been defended and encouraged by its imperialist allies—first and foremost, United States imperialism. The United States, which has forged a so-called strategic alliance with the Zionist régime, has been rendering it enormous and unconditional political, economic and military support which has enabled it to perpetrate acts of aggression against sovereign Arab countries of the area, notably Syria and Lebanon. It is United States imperialism which has effectively paralysed the Security Council by using its veto power to prevent the adoption of measures that would call to order the outlawed régime of Israel.

110. The perpetual conspiracies of the United States against international peace and security were once again manifested by its negative response to the call of the General Assembly for the convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East. We strongly condemn that irresponsible attitude towards one of the most burning issues of our time. In this connection, we hail the constructive position of the Soviet Union and voice our support for its timely and realistic proposals of 29 July 1984 [see A/39/368].

111. While expressing appreciation to the Secretary-General for his endeavours aimed at preparing the ground for the holding of the proposed conference, we urge him to redouble his efforts in that direction.

112. It is, of course, necessary that the PLO, the sole representative of the people concerned, participate in such a conference on an equal footing. We reject any attempt at isolating the question of Palestine from the rest of the Middle East problem and consider all collusive and partial agreements, including the Camp David deals, to have no moral or legal validity. Past experience has shown that only a just and comprehensive settlement can bring about a lasting peace to the Middle East, the *sine qua non* of

which is the attainment by the Palesti: an people of their inalienable national rights.

113. In their struggle to recover their territories and to exercise their national sovereign rights, the heroic people of Palestine and the valiant patriots of Syria and Lebanon have the full solidarity and support of the Afghan people and Government.

114. I wish to conclude my statement with a quotation from the message of Babrak Karmal, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and President of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, commemorated on 29 November 1984. He said:

“Today, it is a task more urgent than ever before to contribute, through the collective efforts of States, towards achieving peace in the Middle East, peace for all States and peoples in the region.

“While reaffirming the strongest condemnation of the Zionists' savage actions, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan supports the continued efforts of the United Nations towards finding a just and comprehensive solution to the Middle East problem based on the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from the occupied Arab territories and the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, truly represented by the Palestine Liberation Organization, including their right to establish an independent national State of their own.”

115. The PRESIDENT: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item. The Assembly has before it four draft resolutions [A/39/L.37 and Add. 1, L.38 and Add. 1, L.39 and Add. 1 and L.40 and Add. 1].

116. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting on any or all of the four draft resolutions. Representatives will also have an opportunity to explain their votes after all the votes have been taken. I should like to remind the Assembly that, under rule 88 of its rules of procedure: “The President shall not permit the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment.”

117. Mr. EU Mun Hoo (Singapore): My delegation believes that the question of Palestine is at the core of the Middle East conflict. We will therefore vote in favour of the draft resolutions before the Assembly, as we regard them as positive contributions to the search for a solution.

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

119. My delegation supports the establishment of a Palestine homeland in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and cannot accept the annexation of those territories by Israel. My delegation also fully supports the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, particularly resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which established the fundamental basis for a genuine, stable and lasting peace in the Middle East.

120. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The consideration of the question of Palestine by the General Assembly reveals the lack of specific progress in finding a solution to this problem. In spite of the many peace initiatives, some of which have been echoed in the United Nations, the problem of Palestine and its repercussions on the Middle East situation remain one of the most serious elements of tension confronting the international community today. The Spanish Government regrets that situation.

121. The history of the 37 years that have passed since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 181 (II) makes it clear that only the solution of the problem of Palestine will make it possible to bring about just and lasting peace in the region.

122. Throughout all these years, the Spanish position on the question has been constantly set forth both in the General Assembly and in the Security Council. For the Spanish Government, the solution of the Palestine problem should be based on Israeli withdrawal from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967; on the right of all States in the area, including Israel, to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries; and on respect for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination.

123. It is from this standpoint that the Spanish Government understands that Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), although constituting basic decisions in the search for a peaceful negotiated solution to the conflict, do not touch on all the aspects of the problem. For these resolutions to become a real starting-point for an authentic peace process, they must be supplemented by the Security Council through a clear, unequivocal assertion of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

124. For my country, the continuation of the present situation, in which the rights of the Palestinian people continue to be disregarded, is unacceptable. Therefore, we shall vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.37, L.38 and L.39. Similarly, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.40, because we believe it to be the duty of the international community to leave no path to peace unexplored, provided that it is liable to lead to a just and comprehensive solution. Nevertheless, my delegation would like to state for the record its opinion that the convening of an international peace conference for the Middle East should not be taken to exclude other peace plans for the region.

125. Mr. COSTA (Portugal) (*interpretation from French*): The question of Palestine is of concern, first of all, to the Palestinian people and the States of the region. However, because of its human aspect and its implications for the security of States—which far transcend the regional context—it is also of interest to the entire international community, for the latter, having recognized the existence, identity and rights of the Palestinian people, must contribute to the

search for a political and diplomatic settlement of the Palestinian question.

126. The position of Portugal on this issue stems from a realistic policy based on the recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination on a national territory, and on the need for all States of the region to have secure and internationally recognized frontiers.

127. In this context, Portugal participated in the work of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, at which the representative of Portugal had the opportunity to stress the extent to which this attitude forms the crux of the position of the Portuguese Government regarding this problem. He said, in particular:

“Such recognition should not remain an abstraction, leaving the Palestinian people frustrated in its legitimate national rights, including its right to govern itself. It should be part of an overall Middle East solution. It should, in particular, be reflected in the right of the Palestinian people to participate, through its representatives, in negotiations to achieve that same settlement. But, at the same time, it would be unthinkable without the recognition of the right of the Palestinians to return to their homeland, if such is their wish. The humanitarian aspect of the problem is so closely linked to its political aspects that it would not seem possible to draw a rigorous distinction between them, nor to conceive of a theory of a just, comprehensive, peaceful and lasting solution to the conflict which ignores them.”

128. Portugal, therefore, will continue to support all efforts and all initiatives likely to contribute to a solution to the Palestinian problem, and my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.37, L.38 and L.39. It reserves its position regarding draft resolution A/39/L.40 because of the wording of paragraph 3. However, it shall do so in the same spirit which motivated it during the formulation of the consensus achieved at Geneva during the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held there last year, above all with regard to the role given to various bilateral contacts likely to promote the putting forward of proposals and the establishment of conditions aimed at ensuring the success of such an initiative.

129. Mr. MIZERE (Malawi): The fact that to date a solution to the question of Palestine has not been found only highlights the complexity and diversity of the dispute. The problem encompasses four principal elements: the human suffering and the existence of refugees in the region; the political inertia stemming from the world community's failure, so far, to reconcile self-determination for the Palestinians with the recognition of the existence of Israel as a sovereign State; the potential that exists that the dispute may explode into another full-fledged war, the consequences of which are difficult to contemplate; and the primary responsibility of all representatives here present for creating an atmosphere of trust conducive to a constructive dialogue among the parties involved, with a view to finding a satisfactory solution to this problem.

130. An analysis of the statements made over a span of years shows that there are three alternatives to the question: first, either continued violence or armed conflict; secondly, armed conflict combined

with diplomatic efforts; or, thirdly, a political solution through negotiations without pre-conditions.

131. My delegation opts for a political solution of the dispute. For this reason, it will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.37, L.38 and L.39 and abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/39/L.40.

132. In conclusion, my delegation supports the call for negotiations without pre-conditions in order to discuss all points arising from the 1967 war in general and to reconcile self-determination and establishment of a State for the Palestinians with recognition of Israel as a sovereign State within secure borders in particular.

133. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The four draft resolutions before us essentially are based, as they were last year, on the Geneva Declaration on Palestine¹ and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights,¹ adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva last year.

134. The affirmative vote of Uruguay on these four draft resolutions is consistent with the participation of my country in the Geneva consensus and our constant concern to bring about peaceful solutions.

135. Nevertheless, we believe it to be necessary to confirm the reservations my delegation expressed with regard to both the Geneva Declaration and the Programme of Action.³

136. Mr. GROSER (New Zealand): New Zealand has consistently held that a key element in the negotiation of a comprehensive and lasting Middle East peace settlement must be the realization of the rights and aspirations of the Palestinian people. Their most basic right is that of self-determination, including the right to establish their own State, if that is their wish. New Zealand's recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to establish their own nation is balanced by our recognition and support of Israel's own sovereignty and independence. Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which New Zealand has always supported, affirms that every State has the right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force. Clearly that affirmation applies to Israel.

137. At the same time, resolution 242 (1967) reaffirms the principle that it is unacceptable to acquire territory by force. New Zealand does not recognize the validity of a number of steps Israel has taken since 1967 in defiance of this principle and calls on Israel to withdraw from territories it has occupied since that time.

138. My delegation is not able to support the draft resolutions before us today. A number of the provisions in them do not adequately reflect the balance of principles in resolution 242 (1967) or contribute realistically towards the search for a settlement of the Palestinian problem. With regard to draft resolution A/39/L.40, New Zealand's reservations concern the practicality of convening an international peace conference on the Middle East at this time. In principle, New Zealand supports the idea of such a conference, but until all parties concerned are prepared to participate with realistic expectations of contributing to a settlement, New Zealand remains cautious about committing United Nations resources in this way.

139. Mr. RAJAJIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/39/L.40 only because it is against the

Zionist base. We just cannot refrain from voting positively for a draft resolution which our Palestinian brothers consider in their favour and the Zionist enemy considers against it.

140. So far as the Palestinians' right to a State is concerned, our position is very well known. We believe that Palestine belongs to the Palestinians and the flag of Palestine alone will soon, by the grace of God, be hoisted over the entirety of Palestine.

141. We look forward to seeing the State of Palestine, including all the occupied territories, restored to the Palestinians, and we look forward to seeing the Zionist usurpers return permanently to where they came from.

142. Regarding the draft resolutions which refer to the withdrawal of the Zionist forces from the occupied territories, there again we believe that the Zionist forces must withdraw from the whole of Palestine, and from our point of view the phrase "occupied since 1967" is irrelevant. We therefore declare our reservation regarding that phrase wherever it appears. We believe that the occupied territories must be returned to the Palestinians whether they were occupied before or after 1967.

143. Mr. LEVIN (Israel): Draft resolution A/39/L.38 provides for the continuation of the activities of the "Division for Palestinian Rights". This unit, a mouthpiece for Arab extremists and their backers, has compromised the integrity of the United Nations Secretariat. The discriminatory nature of this "Division" is illustrated by the fact that, whereas terrible tragedies on the globe, like that of Kampuchea, have not been fully discussed at the United Nations, the "Division for Palestinian Rights" drains the United Nations purse in providing a sinecure for the staff of a propaganda organ of a terrorist organization.

144. Draft resolution A/39/L.39 is yet another wasteful drain on United Nations funds. If adopted, this draft resolution will continue the effect of providing a sounding-board for interests and forces extraneous to the United Nations system. The sponsors of this draft resolution would monopolize the time and funds of the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat to the detriment of the Department's other legitimate responsibilities.

145. Draft resolution A/39/L.40 is not the General Assembly's first attempt to undermine Security Council resolution 242 (1967) by setting guidelines which would undermine and sabotage the carefully balanced intent of resolution 242 (1967)—which is not even mentioned in this draft resolution. The sponsors seek to eradicate the only viable resolution for a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Some countries represented here would have us sanction a diktat regarding the vital interests of sovereign States. The expression of regret in this draft resolution at not attending a conference is utterly superfluous and reveals the true colours of the draft resolution: those negating conciliation. Everyone here knows the extremist thrust of the proposed international conference, and it is perfectly legitimate for Israel to keep away from it.

146. Rather than introduce barren formulas and hostile rhetoric, the sponsors of the draft resolution would be well advised to try to turn the United Nations into an instrument of conciliation and understanding. Instead, its machinery is being used through these draft resolutions, which the Iranian

representative calls "silly" resolutions, to deepen dissension and promote conflicts. Israel will register its condemnation of this negativist attitude by voting against the draft resolution.

147. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now begin the voting process and take decisions on the various draft resolutions before it. We turn first to draft resolution A/39/L.37 and Add.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, 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, 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, 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, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 127 votes to 2, with 21 abstentions (resolution 39/49 A).⁶

148. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/39/L.38 and Add. 1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic

of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, 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, 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, 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, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Canada, Israel, United States of America.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 130 votes to 3, with 17 abstentions (resolution 39/49 B).⁶

149. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution A/39/L.39 and Add.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, 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, 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, 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, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Canada, Israel, United States of America.

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

The draft resolution was adopted by 131 votes to 3, with 15 abstentions (resolution 39/49 C).⁶

150. The PRESIDENT: I understand that a question has been raised concerning the programme budget implications of certain activities called for in draft resolution A/39/L.39, which has just been adopted. The Controller has assured me that the resources are available within the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat for the implementation of these activities.

151. Next the Assembly will turn to draft resolution A/39/L.40 and Add.1. A separate vote has been requested on paragraph 2. If I hear no objection, I shall put that paragraph to the vote first. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

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

Abstaining: Belgium, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 120 votes to 4, with 22 abstentions.

152. The PRESIDENT: A separate vote has been requested on paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/39/L.40 and Add.1. If I hear no objection, I shall put that paragraph to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African

Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Cameroon, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Malawi, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Uruguay.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 96 votes to 18, with 29 abstentions.

153. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/39/L.40 and Add.1 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: Canada, Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominica, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 121 votes to 3, with 23 abstentions (resolution 39/49 D).⁶

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

155. Mr. PAPAJORGJI (Albania): This year, as in the past, the Albanian delegation has made clear the position of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania on the question of Palestine, expressing the full support of the Albanian people and its Government for the just cause of the Palestinian people. It was in conformity with that attitude that we voted in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.37, L.38 and L.39. Nevertheless, we have our reservations, which we have explained in the past.

156. Our delegation did not participate in the voting on draft resolution A/39/L.40, which deals with the well-known Soviet proposal on the convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East. Several times in the past, we have made known our position in relation to such a conference. Our position was stressed again by the Albanian delegation in its statement before the General Assembly on 27 November 1984 [75th meeting], during the discussion of the situation in the Middle East. The aim of the Soviet socialist imperialists is to consolidate the positions of the Soviet Union in the Middle East in rivalry with the American imperialists and to secure a greater involvement in the whole course of events there.

157. Mr. LEHNE (Austria): The Austrian delegation supported draft resolution A/39/L.40, which has just been adopted by the General Assembly. It did so in view of our consistent support in principle for the proposal to convene an international conference on peace in the Middle East. We still believe that such a conference, held in the right conditions and with good preparation, could contribute to progress towards a comprehensive, just and lasting solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

158. It is obvious to us, however, that the successful convening of the international peace conference presupposes the agreement of all parties concerned to participate in it. We fully share the assessment of the Secretary-General that the conditions required for convening the proposed conference with any chance of success are not met at the present time.

159. Mr. McGRADY (Ireland): I speak on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community in explanation of their vote on the draft resolutions.

160. The views of the Ten on the principles necessary to secure peace in the Middle East are well known and were set out in the Ten's address to the Assembly on this item. [89th meeting].

161. The Ten are ready to support any constructive effort aimed at negotiating a just, lasting and peaceful settlement of the conflict in the Middle East.

162. As previously stated, the Ten have no objections of principle to the holding of international conferences. At the right time, the holding of an international conference could make a major contri-

bution towards achieving a negotiated settlement. The Ten believe, however, that much groundwork must first be done between the principal parties to overcome their fundamental differences in order to secure the elements necessary for a successful outcome.

163. As stated at the meeting of the European Council, held at Dublin on 3 and 4 December 1984, the Ten regard it as vitally important that renewed efforts should be made towards negotiations for a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

164. The Ten do not believe that wording such as occurs in paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/39/L.40, which singles out for criticism two of the proposed participants in a conference, is either helpful or productive in this context.

165. The Ten trust, in regard to draft resolution A/39/L.39, that the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat will continue to be guided in its activities by the principle of impartiality and maintain its normal decision-making process. Finally, they believe that, given the difficult international financial situation, every effort should be made to avoid placing unnecessary burdens on the United Nations budget.

166. Mr. LUNA MENDOZA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Peru voted in favour of all four draft resolutions.

167. As regards the Geneva Declaration on Palestine¹ and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights,¹ adopted by acclamation at the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983, my delegation wishes to recall that on that occasion, the Government of Peru stated the following:

"Through this statement, the Peruvian delegation wishes to reiterate its support for all efforts directed towards enabling the Palestinian people to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination and to independent statehood. The Peruvian delegation also supports the right of all the States of the region to exist within secure and internationally recognized boundaries, in accordance with the provisions of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and of other decisions taken by the international community.

"However, the approach and drafting of several of the paragraphs in the Declaration and Programme of Action prevent the Peruvian delegation from supporting the document as a whole. This is true, in particular, of paragraphs (5) and (18) of part I of the Programme of Action."⁵

168. Mr. FERM (Sweden): It is Sweden's position that the most appropriate forum for serious negotiations towards a peaceful solution of the Middle East conflict is to be found within the framework of the United Nations. As my Government sees it, agreement on holding a peace conference under United Nations auspices along the lines recommended by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva last year, would be a promising sign that real progress was within reach.

169. My Government therefore regrets that it has not been possible so far to arrive at the consensus among the proposed participants which is a necessary prerequisite for the convening of a peace conference. It cannot be the intention of draft resolution A/39/L.40 to attempt somehow to force Governments to come to a conference or to convene one

without their agreement to participate. The support of my delegation for that draft resolution in no way implies that we would question the sovereign right of the Governments concerned to decide for themselves on their participation.

170. Our vote expresses our continued support for the concept of a peace conference on the Middle East.

171. Mr. FARMER (Australia): A fundamental principle guiding Australia's policy on the Middle East is the recognition of the urgent need to achieve a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement of the Middle East dispute. Australia supports a peaceful, negotiated solution to the conflict in the Middle East region. Consistent with this support, Australia believes that the concept of an international peace conference, agreed to by the parties—and I repeat "agreed to by the parties"—should not be excluded as a means of achieving this objective.

172. However, it is, in our view, essential that the framework of such a conference should not seek to prescribe the outcome of negotiations among the parties on the elements of a Middle East settlement. General Assembly resolution 38/58 C sought to make such a prescription. For this reason, Australia cannot support a proposal for a conference "in conformity with the provisions of resolution 38/58 C" or the Geneva Declaration on Palestine,¹ adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983, which the General Assembly endorsed in resolution 38/58 C. Australia voted against resolution 38/58 C and has, accordingly, voted against paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/39/L.40 on this occasion because of its reference to resolution 38/58 C.

173. Our negative vote on paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/39/L.40 also reflected Australia's continuing opposition to the reference in General Assembly resolution 38/58 C to the status of the PLO. The Australian Government will maintain its refusal to recognize the PLO while the PLO maintains its denial of Israel's right to exist. The Australian Government acknowledges that the PLO, which represents the opinion of a significant portion of the Palestinian people, should be included in the process of seeking a comprehensive settlement. It believes, however, that the PLO's opportunity to engage productively in such a process is limited and perhaps non-existent while it persists in denying Israel's right to exist.

174. The statement to be made later in explanation of vote by Australia on the draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 36, on the situation in the Middle East, applies equally under this item in its references to Australia's fundamental commitment to Israel's right to exist within secure and recognized boundaries, the central importance to a settlement of the Palestinian issue, and the right of self-determination of the Palestinian people.

175. Mr. KOKHONEN (Finland): The position of the Government of Finland on the question of Palestine is well known and remains unchanged. There can be no lasting peace in the Middle East without a just solution of the problem of Palestine through the attainment and exercise by the Palestinian people of their legitimate rights, including the right of national self-determination. Therefore, Israel must withdraw from the Arab territories occupied

since 1967. The Palestinians must be given their right to participate in all negotiations on their own future.

176. Conversely, the Government of Finland continues to conceive of the realization of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians as part of, and within the framework of, a comprehensive settlement of the question of the Middle East through negotiation on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). Accordingly, all States in the region, including Israel, have the right to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized boundaries, free from threats or acts of force.

177. The draft resolutions just adopted, unfortunately, fail to represent the balance which my Government finds a prerequisite for a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement. My delegation therefore abstained in the votes on draft resolutions A/39/L.37 and L.38 and, while voting in favour of draft resolutions A/39/L.39 and L.40, did so with reservations.

178. With particular reference to draft resolution A/39/L.40, it will be recalled that Finland participated in the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva last year, and joined in the consensus on the final documents of that Conference. However, we did so with reservations, and in this connection I should like only to refer to those reservations.⁵

179. Mr. TELLMANN (Norway): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/39/L.37. However, my Government has reservations concerning paragraph 2 of that draft resolution and would have voted against that paragraph if there had been a separate vote on it.

180. We also abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/39/L.40. We have, however, serious reservations about paragraph 3 of that draft resolution, in which two Member States have been singled out in a way that we do not find acceptable. My delegation therefore voted against that paragraph.

181. Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation supported and voted in favour of the four draft resolutions. Indeed, only a few Member States opposed them, and they are well known to us all. However, my country wishes to reaffirm here its consistent position on the question of Palestine. One of the basic elements of that position is that we have reservations concerning any reference in draft resolutions that could be interpreted in any way as expressing my country's readiness to recognize the Zionist entity or to ascribe any legality to it.

182. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): The United States voted against the draft resolutions because we found them to be unbalanced, unfair and unpromising. They will not achieve their stated goal.

183. The United States has great sympathy for the people of Palestine, sympathy which we express through large and continuing humanitarian support and social-service support of many kinds through many years. We see these human victims of political warfare as we see refugees everywhere: as tragic residues of the violent politics of our times.

184. The United States regards these draft resolutions as an unwarranted and outrageous interference in the internal affairs of the United States. The Charter of the United Nations does not give the General Assembly jurisdiction over the foreign poli-

cies of Member States, except in those rare instances where those foreign policies are a clear threat to peace and international security, determined by the Security Council to be so.

185. In considering the call for a Middle East conference in draft resolution A/39/L.40, the United States believes it is also necessary to take into account draft resolution A/39/L.20, which has been submitted to the Assembly under agenda item 36, on the situation in the Middle East. These two items must be linked in our consideration because they are linked inevitably in their subject-matter.

186. Draft resolution A/39/L.20 charges Israel with not being a peace-loving State. Yet that charge will be linked by our actions this afternoon to the call for an international conference on the Palestine question. Obviously, it is at best inconsistent to apply sanctions against a country and, at the same time, invite it to a conference. It is the justice of Alice in Wonderland: judge first, investigate later. Such an attitude could not possibly lead to good-faith negotiations. Good-faith negotiations include the subjective concept of honest intent and purpose, and also include the objective test of how the matter would appear to a reasonable person in the same circumstances. This draft resolution, by its very nature, violates both these concepts: of subjective honest intent and of objective fairness. It neither evidences intent and purpose aimed at negotiated solutions nor is likely by any subjective test to induce all concerned parties to join in a negotiated solution.

187. Yet the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, of 23 May 1969,⁷ imposes on us all an obligation to negotiate in good faith. This means that each side is to propose and counter-propose, to listen to the other side and to speak with the intent of actually arriving at an agreement with which the two sides can live. The process is very important. There is to be give-and-take, constantly narrowing the original differences until an agreement is finally reached. Good faith requires that such a process be gone through.

188. Unfortunately, the draft resolution before us subverts the very idea of process. It precludes a negotiating process. It declares at the outset what the aim of the negotiations is: it is to confirm what the General Assembly declares to be the truth, the totally untenable and unfair assertion that the State of Israel—of all States in this body—is a non-peace-loving State.

189. There are many reasons why the idea of an international conference is fatally flawed. One wonders how many nations in this body would support an international conference to resolve the border disputes in which they find themselves. Would Peru and Ecuador submit their border dispute to an international conference of the sort called for here? Would Venezuela and Guyana submit their border dispute to such determination? Indeed, would the United Kingdom and Argentina submit their border dispute to this outcome?

190. We all know that the conference called for here, the outcome of which is already provided, would be an exercise in ideology and in war by other means against the State of Israel, a propaganda exercise. By calling for a conference under these prejudicial conditions, the fairness of this body is put in question.

191. The United Nations, we believe, should not put its fairness in question. We believe that the United States has the right to have its sovereignty respected, that the State of Israel has the right to expect fair play from this body and, indeed, that the peoples of the world have the right to expect that our efforts towards peace and the resolution of conflicts will be good-faith efforts towards peace and the resolution of conflicts.

192. I find that one of the draft resolutions, A/39/L.39, provides as good evidence as any of the caricature of fairness present in these draft resolutions. I refer to subparagraph (d) of paragraph 2, which calls upon the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat, in full co-operation and coordination with the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, to: "Publish newsletters and articles in its respective publications on Israeli violations of the human rights of the Arab inhabitants of the occupied territories".

193. I ask: where is the dispassion in that requirement? Where is the concern for the human rights of all the inhabitants of that region? Where is the judicious spirit which all members and all peoples have the right to expect from the General Assembly?

194. The PRESIDENT: The observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization wishes to make a statement. I call on him in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX).

195. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): As we approach the celebration of the birth of the Prince of Peace, we the people who come from the land of peace shall also today celebrate the affirmation and reaffirmation of the determination of the international community to attain peace through a peaceful solution and a peaceful process.

196. During the voting we saw three red lights, but may I assure the General Assembly that those three red lights will in no way deter us from our perseverance in our endeavours to attain the long-overdue peace for the peoples of Palestine, the Middle East and the rest of the world.

197. Crocodile tears were shed this afternoon by the representative of the United States over the Palestinian victims of force, when it is the United States that refuses to admit that it is the political and diplomatic mainstay and main support of Israeli policies and practices. It is the Government of the United States that supplies bullets and the many millions of dollars in investments for the malicious and aggressive expansionism and *lebensraum* of the Zionist entity. It is the United States that helps perpetuate the current state of affairs. It is the United States that obstructs the call for a peace conference.

198. Only three weeks ago, the Palestine National Council asserted that the appropriate framework to achieve a solution was an international peace conference under the aegis of the United Nations, in consultation with the Security Council and, of course, with the participation of the parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict. Naturally, the principal party here is the Palestinian people, which is represented by the PLO. A United Nations-sponsored peace conference is the proper forum, for it is the United Nations that helped create the question of Palestine. I do not see any parallelism between the question of Palestine and the situation between neighbouring States throughout the world. It is not the United Nations that created the dispute between Peru and

Ecuador. But on the question of Palestine, it was the intervention of the United States and its pressure demanding the imposition of the partition of my country, the fragmentation of my people and the displacement of millions of Palestinians.

199. This morning, the Assembly heard some untruths about history. It was Count Folke Bernadotte, the first United Nations envoy of peace, who described the origins of the Palestine refugee problem; and it was Count Folke Bernadotte who was assassinated by none other than the current Foreign Minister of Israel and the party which has a representative sitting here, that same party that collaborated with the Nazis during the Second World War and called for co-operation with Hitler against the English. Yes, it was Count Folke Bernadotte who in his first report referred to the genesis of the Palestine refugee problem.

200. In his statement this morning [94th meeting], the representative of Tel Aviv said that the cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict was not rooted in the territories Israel has occupied since 1967, nor was the refugee problem a result of those attacks, and so on. I quite agree. The roots are in the plans, the ideology and the *lebensraum* policy of the Zionists who found a base in my homeland, in Palestine.

201. They call for negotiations. How much more can we add to the decision of our National Council that a peace conference be held in which the parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict would sit together and discuss peace? How much more civilized can we be? But, of course, if what is demanded is *Pax Americana* and *Pax Israeli*, then those red lights we saw during the voting will remain and continue to be the obstacle to peace.

202. The PRESIDENT: Some representatives have asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

203. Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): This morning we heard a new attempt to rewrite history. That attempt will suffer the same fate as previous such attempts made in this Hall and in committees at every session of the General Assembly. The representative of the Zionist entity has tried to twist historic truth by describing the Arabs as the aggressors and the Israelis as the victims who had to repulse aggression and threats, and by saying that the territories were occupied during legitimate military defence operations.

204. We should like first of all to speak of what happened in 1948. The representative of the Zionist entity in this Hall in previous years, and its representative this year in the Fifth Committee, described the Zionist movement as the greatest liberation movement in the world. They speak of large-scale military operations undertaken by Zionist armies and Haganah gangs against the British Mandate and against Palestinian citizens to put an end to the Mandate and to empty Palestine of its indigenous inhabitants, whose fathers and forefathers had lived there for centuries. These military operations extended to other Arab States close to Palestine. This led to the well-known military confrontation which the Zionist entity has used to consolidate its occupation of Palestine.

205. The aggressor in 1948 was the Zionist party that applied the slogan of the founder of world Zionism: "Palestine is a country without people and the Jews are a people without a country." In fact, the Zionist armies emptied Palestine of its indigenous

inhabitants. They drove out 900,000 Palestinians and replaced them by Jewish emigrants from Europe. Thus, in 1948 the aggressor was the Zionist party. 206. In 1956, it was the Zionist entity, with the participation of two other States, that launched an attack on Egypt in protest against the nationalization of the Suez Canal. Its troops reached the banks of the Suez Canal. Did the nationalization of the Suez Canal in fact represent aggression against the Zionist entity? President Eisenhower was not convinced by that Zionist argument and firmly opposed the aggression, demanding the withdrawal of the Zionist invasion troops.

207. On 5 June 1967, the Zionist entity carried out a surprise attack on Egyptian airports and launched intensive air raids against Egypt in protest against Egyptian operations at Sharm El-Sheikh. Did those security operations give the Zionist entity any right to attack? The French President, Charles de Gaulle, was not convinced by that argument and took a firm attitude against that aggression. That attitude was a turning-point in French policy with regard to the Middle East and Palestine.

208. In 1973, the Arabs, for the first time, had to have recourse to legitimate defence to free their territories and put an end to six years of aggression by repelling the occupier.

209. In all these confrontations and wars, it was the Zionist entity which, militarily, politically and morally, was the aggressor. The attempts to distort history that we heard this morning can serve no purpose. The Palestinians did not flee at the instigation of the Arabs but from fear of the massacres—like the well-known massacres of Deir Yassin and Qibya—perpetrated by the Israelis against the Palestinians. No one was safe, not even the United Nations Mediator, who was assassinated by the Israelis. Not a single Palestinian has fled of his own accord. The Palestinians never leave their country voluntarily. They leave under the threat of Meir Kahane, who compels them to leave alive or to leave dead.

210. These refugees must return to their homeland, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 194 (III).

211. This morning we heard statements which cast doubt on the legitimacy even of Palestinian rights and United Nations principles and denied the right of the Palestinians to self-determination and to establish their own State on their national territory.

212. Mr. LUNA MENDOZA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am obliged to speak at this stage of the debate for the following reasons. The representative of the United States, in her explanation of vote, mentioned the relations between Peru and Ecuador as an example of situations which I would describe as inaccurate and unusual. As is known, Peru has no dispute with any of its neighbouring States. The boundary dispute which lasted for many years between Peru and Ecuador was ended by an international instrument signed more than 40 years ago, which was not only binding on the parties but guaranteed by four friendly countries, including the United States.

213. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): With regard to the statement by the representative of Peru, the delegation of Ecuador would like to reiterate what the Minister for Foreign Relations of Ecuador, Mr. Terán Terán, stated on 28

September 1984, when he reaffirmed Ecuador's rights as an Amazonian country

"from the epic discovery of the Amazon River by the Quito expedition of 1541 to the time when Ecuador, faithful to its tradition of peace and legality, sought to strengthen friendly relations with Peru and sought a sincere climate of mutual understanding in order to promote a just and honourable solution to its territorial controversy" [13th meeting, para. 59].

214. The PRESIDENT: The observer of the League of Arab States has requested to make a statement in reply. I call on him, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 477 (V).

215. Mr. MAKSOUD (League of Arab States): We listened this morning [94th meeting] to the Israeli representative turning the cannons of distortion on the reality and the background of the Palestinian question. I do not think that there is any need to repudiate many of his utterances, except to state that in much of what he said there was an assumption that the Member States of this body are not only gullible but amenable to persuasion by his distortions.

216. At the outset of his speech, he equated the question of the Palestinian people and Palestinian legitimate rights to slogans. To reduce issues which have assumed sanctity for a whole nation and have the respect and recognition of the international community to mere slogans is to insult the intelligence of the international community. But it has become habitual to insult the intelligence of the international community. Furthermore, he reduced the terms "Israeli expansion" and "Israeli aggression" to an ideology of myth, as he described it. This is not the time to say where Israel was born under the partition plan and where it is now; or to mention that Israel has withdrawn from the Sinai as a matter of "concession" when the large potential oil resources available indicate that that kind of withdrawal was effected with a historical grudge.

217. Such distortions have become habitual in this body. This attempt to make the issue an issue of the transfer of refugees—Arab Jewish refugees and Palestinian refugees—has two basic defects. One is that there are people of Jewish persuasion in many Arab countries, and we know what happened in Baghdad when a trickle of people, individual Jews, were incited to go to Israel. There was a Zionist plan that there should be many more. We heard at that time how synagogues and Jewish-owned shops were being bombed, only to discover at a later stage that these were the actions of the intelligence operatives of the Zionist organization and of the Israeli State. By the same token, we know what happened in 1952 with the Lavon affair, when Israeli intelligence agents bombed the library of the United States in order to cement the disruption of Egyptian-American relations. It was discovered at a later stage that those Israeli agents were received in Israel as heroes when an exchange of prisoners took place.

218. I do not want to repudiate or try to argue against these various distortions. What is more important is what the Australian representative said—that an international conference should be agreed to by the parties. Of course it should, but can the representative of Australia tell us how long this international body can wait? Is there a time-frame that might be acceptable? Then he said that the terms of reference of that international conference should

not prescribe "the outcome". What would we negotiate on? We would negotiate on the feasibility of a mutually acceptable outcome. We would not negotiate for negotiation's sake. In the view of the Australian delegation, is there in the terms of reference a denial of Israel's right to exist within secure boundaries? At this moment, the question for the Australian representative—and supposedly also for the representative of the United States—to answer is this: what boundaries do they recognize and what boundaries of Israel do they want us to recognize? When we say "prescribe the outcome", the outcome has to be predetermined, not in its details but at least in its principles and in its modalities.

219. The United States representative said that the United States has shown sympathy with the people of Palestine and she referred to humanitarian and social services. Let me say very openly and frankly that we appreciate the humanitarian concern and the social services of many educational and other foundations, governmental and non-governmental. We take cognizance of United States Secretary of State George Shultz's statement that the United States is interested in the improvement of the quality of life of the Palestinians. However, the question is not one of philanthropy; it is not one of charity for the Palestinians; it is not one of humanitarian concern, although that has a dimension of nobility. What is important is that these are victims. The representative of the United States has stated that they are human victims, and we agree, but human victims of what? They are victims of the displacement of Palestinians, the disfranchisement of Palestinians, discriminatory practices against Palestinians, carried out deliberately by the Israeli State in the occupied territories and inside Israel itself. I do not need to give details of the separateness and alienation which Israeli citizens of Arab origin experience. Israel has created a "Jewish State" which by definition is exclusionary, which institutionalizes discrimination against non-Jews and therefore against the Palestinians who happen to be non-Jews in these circumstances; they are systematically discriminated against, they are disfranchised.

220. Therefore, when the representative of the United States objects to the convening of an international conference and objects to the fact that we have stated that Israel is not a peace-loving State, let her remember the Camp David agreement, which was an American-brokered agreement. After the agreement was signed, Israel established more settlements in the occupied territories, attacked Baghdad and invaded Lebanon, in addition to the daily raids against the people of Lebanon and against Palestinian refugees.

221. Good-faith negotiations, yes; honest intent, yes; but in view of what the representatives of Peru and Ecuador found to their amazement, and to our amazement, let me ask this. Is what is involved a border dispute, or is it the destiny of a people?

222. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): I spoke this morning [ibid.] of the importance of history, and indeed what I have heard from representatives of some States here has confirmed this importance, because to justify their implacable hostility to my country the Arab leaders offer arguments purportedly based on history.

223. The basic Arab claim—we have heard it today many times—is that the Jews seized Palestine from a Palestinian people which had lived there for ages and are its rightful owners. At the twenty-ninth session of

the General Assembly, for example, Arafat stated: "Its Arab people"—the Arab people of Palestine—"were engaged in farming and building, spreading culture throughout the land for thousands of years, . . ." [2282nd meeting, para. 40]. The Jews came "to usurp our land". This string of assertions has been repeated so tirelessly that for some it has acquired the cachet of self-evident truth, but it is not supported by history. "For thousands of years," the country was in fact inhabited by Jews. The antiquity of the Jewish nation and its ancient struggle for independence are of course universally known through the Bible. Not so well known is the Jews' struggle for their land in the thousands of years that followed the biblical period. Despite the dispersion of large numbers of Jews, Jews continued to live throughout the centuries in the land, through the Roman conquest, the Byzantine conquest, the Arab conquest—and, by the way, the Arabs sought the support of the Jews for their conquest—the Mamelukes, the Turks. I could go on—the British.

224. After Jewish independence was ended in the country, no other people laid claim to it; no other people reclaimed it as uniquely their own and rebuilt it. The country was laid waste, it was devastated, it was in ruins, and when great numbers of Jews returned in the nineteenth century to this country they found a desert.

225. Arafat, and many of the speakers here, I am sure, describe Palestine before the return of the Jews as a "verdant area teeming with people", but Western travellers, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, without exception told a different story.

226. In 1738, Thomas Shaw, an Englishman, wrote of "the absence of people to till Palestine's fertile soil". Was Thomas Shaw a Zionist propagandist?

227. In 1785, Constantine François Volney, a Frenchman, described the "ruined" and "desolate" country. Was François Volney a propagandist for the Zionists?

228. In 1824, Alexander Keith, recalling Volney's description, wrote this: "In his day the land had not fully reached its last degree of desolation and depopulation." Was Alexander Keith a Zionist propagandist? Well, maybe not him, but how about Alphonse de Lamartine, who in 1835 said this:

"Outside the gates of Jerusalem we saw indeed no living object, heard no living sound, we found the same void, the same silence . . . as we should have expected before the entombed gates of Pompeii or Herculaneum . . . a complete eternal silence reigns in the town, on the highways, in the country . . . the tomb of a whole people."

Was Lamartine a Zionist propagandist, too?

229. How about that most famous traveller to the Holy Land, Mark Twain? He visited Palestine in 1867 and described the trip that he took to the Galilee. This is what he said: "We never saw a human being on the whole route." Was Twain also a Zionist propagandist? Of course he was not.

230. None of these great men was. They were objective reporters of the scene that they saw with their own eyes. And in fact in a report in the work of the great cartographer, Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, in 1881, he observed this: "In Judea"—members will notice that he did not refer to it as the West Bank; that term was not invented until Jordan seized control of that territory—"In Judea, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that for miles and miles there is

no appearance of present life or habitation." Was Arthur Penrhyn Stanley a Zionist propagandist?

231. Let me close with one more quotation from Mark Twain, who said: "Palestine was a desolate country, a silent mournful expanse . . . Even the olive and the cactus, those friends of a worthless soil, had almost deserted the country."

232. Now, somebody here is lying. Somebody here is not telling the truth. It is either Mark Twain or Arafat. And I suggest that we put this to the test of all the hundreds and hundreds of travellers, the cartographers, the reporters, the people who travelled to this land before there was an Assembly such as this where lies and distortions could be put forward without any challenge. But there is history, there is history. How did this "worthless soil", to use Mark Twain's expression, come about? How is it that in 1880 there were fewer than 100,000 people in this country? How did it come to life, and how do we have now all these millions of people? They did not procreate; that is impossible biologically.

233. It was through the efforts of the returning Jews that this worthless soil came back to life. Arabs from the surrounding lands migrated to it in droves to partake of the growing economy established by the Jews. Between 1893 and 1947, the Arab population in the areas inhabited by Jews increased an astonishing fivefold. As Winston Churchill noted in 1939: "Far from being persecuted, the Arabs have crowded into the country and multiplied."

234. I did not say that Jordan is Palestine and Palestine is Jordan. Yasser Arafat did. King Hussein did. The Arabs of Palestine already possess a State of their own, Jordan. It comprises 77 per cent of Mandated Palestine's area, while the Jewish State, Israel, covers the remaining 23 per cent.

235. Those who uncritically accept Palestinian nationhood and its right to a separate State must surely ask themselves this: are there two Palestinian Arab nations, or does that single nation require two States? History gives us that answer.

236. Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq): I had not intended to exercise the right of reply, since the hour is late, but I feel impelled to do so, especially after listening to the representative of Israel.

237. When history comes to be assessed in relation to territory, one should not forget about law. I am quite convinced, as a modest lawyer, that international lawyers tonight would be tremendously amused to hear that, as the representative of Israel has just stated quite clearly, when the Jewish people claimed their independence, namely, in 1947, as he put it, the territory of Palestine was what we call in international law *res nullius*.

238. I think this is the height of folly, the height of sophistry, the height of ridiculous imagination. As we all know, the theory of *res nullius* in relation to territory had long been abandoned at the end of the nineteenth century.

239. Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*Interpretation from Arabic*): If we accepted the quibbles heard in this Hall, we would give the Phoenicians, the Greeks and the Romans the right to return to this territory where traces of their ancestors are found. Those who have expelled the Palestinians from their homes and farms and have seized their belongings emigrated from Europe and Asia. I need mention only a few of those refugees who have played a major

role in the movement to empty the occupied Palestinian territories of their indigenous inhabitants.

240. For example, David Ben-Gurion, the founder of Mapei and leader of Rafi, who was Prime Minister 10 times, emigrated to Palestine at the age of 20. Menachem Begin, the founder of Herut, who was twice Prime Minister and who called the Palestinians "animals on two feet", emigrated to Palestine at the age of 29. Shimon Peres, who heads the occupation Ministry, emigrated to Palestine at the age of 11. Levy Eshkol, who was four times Foreign Minister, emigrated to Palestine at the age of 19. Golda Meir, in reply to a question, said there was no people called the Palestinian people. She was twice Prime Minister, and she emigrated to Palestine at the age of 23. Moshe Sharett, who was twice Prime Minister, emigrated to Palestine at the age of 12.

241. Abba Eban, who at one time held the post of Foreign Minister in the occupation Government and who is now Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the Knesset, emigrated to Palestine at the age of 25. Yitzhak Ben-Zvi, who was three times President of the occupation State, emigrated to Palestine at the age of 22. Zaiman Shazar, who was twice President of the occupation State, emigrated to Palestine at the age of 35. Mordecai Ben-Borat, who was Minister of State in the Government of Menachem Begin and author of the well-known phrase, "Justice does not demand that a refugee return to his homeland", and who is now President of the "Borat" Committee in charge of organizing settlements in occupied Palestine, emigrated to Palestine at the age of 12.

242. It should also be noted that Mordecai Ben-Borat was born in an Arab country in which a presidential decree was promulgated that authorizes all Jewish citizens to return to the country if they so desire. However, so far he has not returned and is now planning to empty our country of its original inhabitants by the application of the maxim "Justice does not demand that a refugee return to his homeland" and on the basis of the principle that any Jew has the right to establish himself in any part of the territory of biblical Israel.

243. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should just like to mention three points in exercising my right of reply. One is that, when my delegation refers to the occupied land, we usually refer to it by its original name and say "occupied Palestine", or we refer to it by its real present name, which is the "Zionist base". If I refer in my speeches to its artificial label, "Israel", it is simply because I am quoting someone. That is the first point.

244. The second point is that the representative of the Zionist base has been trying to justify recolonization. Many colonies and colonialists know very well that colonization has often been wrongly justified simply by appeal to the illogical reasoning that it produces development and economic prosperity and brings material happiness to the area.

245. We come from the third world. In many of our countries there are areas of devastation and deserts. We have never wished the Zionists to come and repair and build on them for us. We love our home countries as they are and we hate to see Zionist hegemony and intervention in our countries. I am sure that the Palestinians have the same feeling. Therefore, no justification can be found in the load

of nonsense we heard from the Zionist representative.

246. Thirdly, regarding the residence of the Zionist elements in Palestine, my delegation has no objection to the Jews who have been residing in Palestine for centuries, or to the Ashkenazi Jews who may wish to stay there when the flag of Palestine is hoisted over the entire land of Palestine. This would be the only policy left to the Palestinian Government. We object only to the Palestinian State being occupied and then run under an artificial label, which was given to it, regrettably, by the United Nations. The State of Israel, they call it, and it is a Zionist racist State. We object to that, but if some of the Ashkenazi Jews even wished to stay in Palestine after its liberation, we would have no objection to that.

247. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): I did not say that there was no Arab claim to Palestine in 1948; I said that there was no such claim throughout the centuries—to use the words that I heard here, "from time immemorial"—on the part of the Palestinian people. The fact that the representative of Iraq chose to deflect his answer to 1948, I suggest is revealing.

248. I did not say either that Jews did not continue migrating into Palestine after the twentieth century; I said it began in the nineteenth century. But I cited the fact that the country was indeed desolate, as the various travellers whom I cited confirmed. What I said was that we did not develop in other peoples' land. We came back to our own land, where we had a continual presence, albeit not very flourishing, because there were not very many people there in the first place. But it is our development. It is my great grandfather's farm that he built in 1896 and the many farms that were built elsewhere, that produced a tremendous surge of Arab immigration into the country. We welcomed those Arabs. As far as we are concerned, they have a place in our land, contrary to their position.

249. I must confess that I heard a very unpleasant note today, because the Arab refusal to view the problem for what it is—not, by the way, as a refugee problem, I did not suggest that either—a border dispute, and their insistence on demanding a second Palestinian Arab State makes one wonder if they are willing to give more than lip-service to Israel's right to exist, or if their tactics are merely a different strategy in their campaign to destroy Israel. This refers, of course, to those Arab countries that have still refused to recognize Israel.

250. Nothing serves to increase this suspicion more than the insistence of Arab leaders on designating the PLO as the sole representative of the Palestinian Arabs. Does the PLO represent the Palestinian Arabs? Until recently, it was—how shall I put this—inadvisable for any Arab to question, let alone challenge, these claims or the PLO policy. In fact, it was mortally dangerous. But there are many who have, and among them are Abd-al Nur, who, member of the Ramallah Municipal Council, who came out publicly against the PLO; Hashem Khozandar, the Imam of Gaza, who supported Camp David and was known for his moderate view; Muhammed Hameo Abu Warda, the deputy head of the Jebalia Council, who came out in favour of the Egyptian-Israeli peace; Youssef Al Khatib, Chairman of the Ramallah District Village League, who advocated coexistence with Israel; and a name that I am sure all delegations here will be familiar with, Issam Sartawi.

who recommended a peaceful settlement with the Jewish State.

251. None of these people is alive today. Janho was assassinated in 1978, Khozander in 1979, Abu Warda in 1980, Al Khatib, along with his 23-year-old son, in 1981, and Sartawi in 1983. There have been more murders since. All these murders were carried out by the PLO, the group which "democratically" claims to speak on their behalf. In fact, from June 1967 to January 1982 alone, the PLO murdered 346 Palestinian Arabs, often including their women and children, who dared to speak out against the PLO.

252. Now we have a new development. There are at least two mortal enemies claiming the dubious mantle as sole representative of the Palestinian Arabs. They continue to use the traditional method of disposing of each other, and of any others who would try to represent Palestinian Arabs, with bullets.

253. Now there are many Palestinian Arabs who, free from the threat of assassination, would speak out for Arab-Jewish coexistence. The tragedy of the Palestinian Arabs is that since the 1920s, from the Grand Mufti, Haj Aminel Hussein, through Ahmed Shukairy, through Yasser Arafat, they have been under the tyranny of a small, violent band that is bent not on coexistence with the Jews but on their annihilation, and any Arab with a dissenting voice is gunned down.

254. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the observer of the League of Arab States.

255. Mr. MAKSOUD (League of Arab States): I am disturbed by two things. First, I am immensely disturbed by the convergence of the American position with the Israeli position on treating the question of Palestine within the framework of a border dispute.

256. I do not mind the Israeli record, which is replete with distortions, but I do mind such a judgement on the part of a country, a super-Power, with global responsibilities for international peace and security. I do venture to hope that that convergence is accidental and not intentional. However, the record of the last few years suggests that it is much more than an accidental convergence, and it is disturbing because it reduces the Palestinians' right to self-determination to a mere matter of border dispute, without mentioning which border, or between whom and for what; in fact, that dispute involves the perpetuation of the political and national disfranchisement of the Palestinian people, and that is a major obstacle indeed, not only towards the convening of the international peace conference, or towards bringing about modalities for a sound outcome of a negotiated settlement, but also towards understanding between the United States and the Arab world.

257. I do hope that the United States will reconsider this over-simplification, which seems to be in total harmony with the propagandist line of the Zionist entity.

258. I mention the Zionist entity at this moment deliberately, because the Israeli representative insists on talking about the PLO as a terrorist organization, and unless he respects what the international community has recognized—the PLO—he cannot ask for respect for the name he has assumed for himself.

259. The second cause of disturbance—but it is more than a disturbance, it is a violation at the

historical, if I may say so, hysterical, argument which during the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s we thought had been submerged in the process of decolonization throughout Asia, Africa and in many parts of Latin America. Surely it is disturbing that somebody should come here today and talk about desolate lands, about transforming deserts into gardens, repeating and restructuring this old colonial argument, as if Israel now, at a time when colonization has receded into history, wants to project itself as a successful colonization enterprise. It is very disturbing that such arguments of the nineteenth century racial, colonial period should have credence and circulation in this body.

260. I am furthermore disturbed by the claim that there has been a continuous Jewish presence in Palestine and in other Arab countries. Of course there has been a Jewish presence, a Jewish-Arab presence, throughout, and Arabs of Jewish faith are part and parcel of the Arab national community. Therefore, to say that the fact that there are Arab Jews constitutes a claim to separate them into the ghetto of a nationalist, racist State is an insult to the Jewish Arab tradition, to the Arab world in general and to the humanist and integrationist policies and values that we entertain.

261. Mr. KASRAWI (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation, in a speech earlier this afternoon, responded to the untruths and fallacious arguments of the representative of Israel. However, he has once again given us a version of history; the reason behind that might be his keen interest in showing his credentials as a representative of expansionist and aggressionist Israel.

262. The Israeli representative resorted to the style of the long and short memory in dealing with history. When it is in the interest of Israel to have a long memory, he does that and begins his narration at the year 2000 B.C.; then, in his abridgement of history, he passes quickly over the plight of the Palestinians and jumps directly to the year 1900 A.D.

263. We do not expect the representative of Israel to understand the historic unity between Palestine and Jordan and between the peoples of the two countries. He is used to dealing with Palestinians and Arabs from the point of view of power, occupation and expansion. The logic of the Israeli representative when he tries to refer to Jordan as Palestine is only an attempt to enable Israel to perpetuate its occupation of the West Bank and Gaza, to deny the Palestinians their right to their national soil, to deny the responsibility of Israel towards the Palestinian question and to attempt to solve it at the expense of the rights of others.

264. As for the legal relationship between Jordan and Palestine, I should like to draw attention to the following fact: if Jordan is part of Palestine, as the Israeli representative claims, how could part of it be occupied? This contradiction might be accepted only according to Israeli logic, but how can the Israeli aggressors justify their aggression against the Palestinian people?

265. The PRESIDENT: The observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization has asked to make a statement in reply.

266. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): What we are here for is to find a proper course and a proper process for a solution. Be that as it may, apparently somebody is trying to divert our attention

from finding a solution. Let me recall that the League of Nations assigned my country, Palestine, a category A Mandate, which meant that the people who lived in Palestine in 1922 were eligible to have their own administration and just needed the know-how.

267. Later the British took over as the Mandatory Power and we were issued with passports that read "British Passport: Palestine". They were issued under the Palestine Citizenship Ordinance. We were Palestinians, and every time we thought we would like to go and visit our relatives in Amman across the river, we needed a visa. So there have been two distinct entities at least since 1922. As I recall, we used to pay one shilling for that visa, and the process took one month. I am sure some of the members of the United Kingdom delegation will remember those things.

268. Thirdly, my country in 1947 had a population that was 66 per cent Arab and 33 per cent Jewish. Yet the United Nations took it upon itself to divide that country arbitrarily. I repeat that what we are here for is to find a way, a system, a process, to resolve the problem and bring peace to the area.

269. With regard to the PLO, of course we are proud, happy and gratified that the General Assembly welcomed the PLO in 1974 and invited us to be here as the representatives of the Palestinian people. What we are more proud of is that the Palestinian people itself has recognized the PLO as its sole and legitimate representative. In 1976, the occupying Power carried out some municipal elections in occupied Palestinian territory. What was the result? I would say that Israel would not dare to repeat that process. If, as PLO supporters in 1976, we received only 85 per cent, Israel, as the occupying Power, knows very well that today 100 per cent of the people would support the PLO, despite Israeli tanks, despite Israeli bayonets and despite the presence of some members of the Israeli Knesset like Kahane and the Tehiya party and all those criminals who collaborated with the Nazis and are perpetuating racism in our country.

270. Let me tell you this. When the United Nations convened the International Conference on the Question of Palestine at Geneva in 1983, there were a number of Jews there. As a matter of fact, our representative at one of the sessions of the Commission on Human Rights held at Geneva was a Palestinian Jew. We could not care less what religion he belongs to. That is his business. We are Palestinians, whether we are Christians, Muslims or Jews. We were brought up in that life. However, how many Israeli Jews were at the International Conference on the Question of Palestine? When they returned, only the Arab was placed in prison. The Jewish Israelis who came to the Conference were not put in prison.

Is that not the meanest and lowest form of racism that could be exercised?

271. But again I should like to remind the General Assembly that we are here to find a process, a method, of terminating the misery of our Palestinians. Five million Palestinians are still striving to go back to their homes and live in peace. Chairman Arafat, from this very rostrum, addressed the international community and said that there is plenty of room, that we can all live together without discrimination as to colour, race or church affiliation. I may repeat here that this is what we are striving for: that in Palestine, the land of peace, we may all live as one.

Programme of work

272. The PRESIDENT: I wish to consult the members with regard to our programme of work. We already have 28 speakers who wish to explain their votes on the situation in the Middle East. On the basis of our present experience, it would not be surprising if we also had requests to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I suggest that we defer consideration of agenda item 36 on the situation in the Middle East, until Saturday morning, since the remainder of our work programme is full. I am in the hands of the members. I could go on for 28 hours non-stop, as I did in 1982, but of course I was two years younger then.

273. Is there any objection to the suggestion that we hold a meeting on Saturday morning?

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 7.45 p.m.

NOTES

¹See *Report of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Geneva, 29 August-7 September 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21), chap. I.

²See A/40/87, annex, resolution AHG/Res.123 (XX).

³See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1982*, document S/15510, annex.

⁴United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 9:3.

⁵See *Report of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Geneva, 29 August-7 September 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21), annex V.

⁶The delegation of Ghana subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

⁷See *Official Records of the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties, Vienna, 26 March-24 May 1968 and 9 April-22 May 1969* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.70.V.5), p. 287.