



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 115:	
Report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries	
Report of the Sixth Committee .....	
Agenda item 126:	
Registration and publication of treaties and international agreements pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General	
Report of the Sixth Committee .....	1471
Agenda item 31:	
Question of Palestine: report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	1473
Organization of work .....	1494

*President:* Mr. Ismat T. KITTANI (Iraq).

**AGENDA ITEM 115**

**Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries**

REPORT OF THE SIXTH COMMITTEE (A/36/727)

**AGENDA ITEM 126**

**Registration and publication of treaties and international agreements pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General**

REPORT OF THE SIXTH COMMITTEE (A/36/715)

1. Mr. VIÑAL (Spain), Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the reports of the Sixth Committee on agenda items 115 and 126.

2. With regard to item 115, the Sixth Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 10 of its report [A/36/727]. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of this text can be found in document A/36/734.

3. Under the terms of that draft resolution, which the Sixth Committee adopted by consensus, the General Assembly would take note of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruiting, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries, would decide that the *Ad Hoc* Committee should continue its work with the goal of drafting such an international convention at the earliest possible date, and

would request the Committee, in the fulfilment of its mandate, to consider the suggestions and proposals of Member States, bearing in mind the views and comments submitted to the Secretary-General and those expressed at the thirty-sixth session of the Assembly during the debate in the Sixth Committee devoted to the consideration of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. The Assembly would also request the Secretary-General to make available to the *Ad Hoc* Committee at its next session the texts of the conventions drafted by international and regional organizations relating to mercenaries, as well as any other relevant documentation, and it would decide to include the item in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session.

4. With regard to agenda item 126, the Sixth Committee recommends to the Assembly the adoption of the draft decision contained in paragraph 5 of its report [A/36/715]. Under the terms of the draft decision, which the Committee adopted by consensus, the General Assembly would take note of the report of the Secretary-General on the item [A/36/570].

5. In conclusion, may I express the wish that after considering the draft resolution and the draft decision that I have just summarized, the Assembly will, as did the Sixth Committee, adopt them by consensus.

*Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Sixth Committee.*

6. The PRESIDENT: The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the Sixth Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

7. May I remind members that by decision 34/401 the General Assembly agreed that when the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee. May I also remind members that, in accordance with that same decision, explanations of vote should not exceed 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

8. I now invite Members to turn their attention to the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 115 [A/36/727].

9. The representative of Seychelles has asked to be allowed to make a statement at this juncture. As there appears to be no objection, I shall now call on her.

10. Ms. GONTHIER (Seychelles): Mr. President, I thank you for calling on me to address the General Assembly while it is considering the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries. It is most disturbing to note that, in spite of

the constant endeavours undertaken by the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity [OAU] and the non-aligned movement to rid developing countries of the scourge of mercenarism, yet another African nation has had to combat soldiers of fortune in order to safeguard its sovereignty and territorial integrity, as well as the path of political, social and economic development it has chosen.

11. I wish to apprise the General Assembly of the events in the Seychelles since 25 November 1981. The Seychelles People's Defence Forces are conducting mopping-up operations following their successful repulse of an armed mercenary attack on the Republic of Seychelles at Pointe Larue International Airport on Wednesday, 25 November.

12. After very heavy fighting, at a cost of very few casualties, the Defence Forces which included the Police Force and the People's Militia, succeeded in dislodging the mercenaries and regained full control of the airport. Those mercenaries who were not killed or captured, or who had not fled back to the safety of South Africa by hijacking an Air India Boeing 707, fled into the hills around the airport. We are now tracking them down.

13. The operation at Pointe Larue Airport started at 5.30 p.m. on Wednesday, 25 November, when some 45 armed foreigners launched their attack. They had managed to land safely by coming in on a scheduled Royal Swazi Air flight from Manzini, in Swaziland. The attackers took as hostages about 70 people found in the area before taking over control of the air terminal building, the airport control tower and the cargo terminal. The hostages were either ambushed on the main road or captured in the airport offices. While they were in control of the tower, the mercenaries tricked a scheduled Air India flight into landing, and subsequently a few of them forced their way aboard the plane and hijacked it to Durban, South Africa. There the group, which included at least one dead and two seriously injured, was taken by police to a military base outside Pretoria. The Air India passengers and crew disembarked unharmed.

14. Meanwhile in Seychelles, once the civilian aircraft was out of the way the Seychelles People's Defence Forces launched a determined assault on the mercenaries' positions. Unable to hold out, the mercenaries were forced to break up and were either killed or captured or fled out of the airport grounds, across the main road and into the bush up the mountain. By noon on Thursday, 26 November, the airport had been rescued and was once more secure and mopping-up sweeps were being mounted. The country's Defence Forces suffered one martyr and a few injured. We salute the dead and the injured. Their sacrifice was not in vain. The list of enemy casualties is still being compiled.

15. The South African Foreign Minister, Mr. Botha, has said that most of the mercenaries who hijacked the Air India flight were South Africans. However, the Associated Press bureau in Johannesburg has reported by telephone that according to a South African newspaper the mercenaries were South Africans, Rhodesians and a mixture of Europeans especially trained for the job with financial aid from another Power presumably to overthrow the Seychelles Government.

16. According to the Johannesburg media last week, the mercenaries were paid 1,000 rand in advance, to be followed by another 10,000 on the successful completion of their mission. South African security forces have said that

the mercenary hijackers included a number of former members of the élite South African Reconnaissance Commandos, and we know that the one who died had been an active member of South Africa's Defence Forces. A Seychelles Defence Forces spokesman commented that this would account for the very heavy fighting, resulting in damage to both the airport terminal and control tower, that was needed to overcome the mercenaries. The arms used by the attackers included rocket-propelled grenades, rocket launchers, hand-grenades and sub-machine-guns.

17. The Manzini air authorities had thought that the 45 men and two women who boarded the Royal Swazi Air flight to Seychelles were a party of tourists. The group, they said, came from South Africa in a tourist bus. The flight went ahead as normal via Moroni in the Comoros.

18. Everything is now under complete and total control in Seychelles. The vigilance repeatedly called for in the past by the country's leaders has now been justified. The attack is proof that there have always been those who, at any cost, do not wish to allow a peace-loving, progressive and hard-working people to live in tranquillity among idyllic surroundings if its objective is socialism, true democracy and real prosperity for all.

19. The Seychelles, being a beautiful country which is popular with the tourist trade, has also attracted such envy among some that they are always attempting to destabilize its economic prosperity. Nevertheless, Wednesday's action by the people of Seychelles and their People's Defence Forces has equally proved the nation's determination to allow no one to divert it from its chosen path. It has reinforced our strength as a people and as a nation. Our unity of purpose is more determined than ever.

20. Certain people continue to harbour evil designs on the Seychelles—to seize this independent African country physically and transform it into a client State in order to use it as a base for subversion and aggression against free Africa, encircle the front-line States and tighten the stranglehold of the forces of imperialism over the Indian Ocean.

21. The South African racist minority régime has shown in no uncertain terms that it had a hand in the organization of this invasion. Contrary to its own stringent anti-hijacking laws, the South African racist régime has freed all the mercenaries despite the request by the Government of the Republic of Seychelles for their return to Seychelles for trial by a tribunal appointed by the United Nations.

22. If South Africa contends that it is innocent in this affair, it must co-operate fully in an international investigation into the background and financing of this criminal venture. The Seychelles Government is prepared to make arrangements for the criminals, once returned, to be tried by a tribunal appointed by the United Nations.

23. This aggression is in pursuance of the *apartheid* régime's policy of destabilizing legitimate Governments of independent African States. The world is now watching to see if the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, signed at The Hague on 16 December 1970,<sup>1</sup> which obligates South Africa to submit for prosecution or to extradite persons accused of unlawfully seizing aircraft, will be enforced.

24. We call the attention of the General Assembly also to an agreement by the United States and six other major

industrial nations at the Bonn Economic Summit Conference of 1978<sup>2</sup> to cease all flights to a country that refuses to extradite or prosecute persons who have hijacked an aircraft. This is a case of invasion, foreign interference, mercenarism, terrorism and hijacking as well, all wrapped up in one. Surely this Assembly is well acquainted with these issues.

25. On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Seychelles, I wish to express our gratitude for the prompt action taken by the Secretary-General once he was apprised of the critical situation in my country. I wish also to thank all the members of the Assembly for their kind messages of solidarity addressed to my Mission, my Government and me personally in these circumstances. My Government hopes that all nations bound by the Charter of the United Nations will assume their responsibilities, not only in adopting an international convention against the recruitment, use, financing and training of mercenaries but also in sincerely endeavouring to implement such a convention effectively once it comes into force, thus eliminating the scourge of mercenarism from the face of the world.

26. The PRESIDENT: I am certain that I shall be acting in conformity with the sentiments of the entire General Assembly if I make a brief comment on the events described by the representative of the Seychelles: this use of mercenaries and the hijacking of an aircraft are reprehensible and obviously contrary to all forms of international law, and deserve the strongest condemnation.

27. In paragraph 10 of its report [A/36/727], the Sixth Committee recommends the adoption of the draft resolution entitled "Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries". The administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution are contained in the report of the Fifth Committee [A/36/734].

28. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Sixth Committee adopted it by consensus. May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to do so?

*The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 36/76).*

29. The PRESIDENT: We shall consider next the report of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 126, entitled "Registration and publication of treaties and international agreements pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations" [A/36/715]. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts the draft decision recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 5 of its report?

*The draft decision was adopted (decision 36/425).*

### AGENDA ITEM 31

#### Question of Palestine: report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (*continued*)

30. Mr. TRAORÉ (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): In the inexorable evolution of the history of generations it seems that at one particular time events come together in the form of warning signs. On the choice made by men has depended their understanding, their salvation or their destruction. Our generation has already paid heavily for not having seen in time, and for not having understood,

the true meaning of the warning signs of the most terrible of international conflagrations which brought it "untold suffering". Is there any need to remind the Assembly that that conflagration was born of the denial of fundamental human rights, the absurd theory of racial superiority and the policy of territorial expansion?

31. Even though the memory of the horrors of the last world war remains vivid, our common horizon has been darkened by other tragedy-filled clouds which have been developing for more than 30 years. One hangs over Africa and the other over the Middle East.

32. The General Assembly has just concluded its consideration of agenda item 32, on the policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa, which denies fundamental rights, including the right to life itself, to the blacks of South Africa, the legitimate heirs to the land of South Africa, their homeland. In its wisdom and global vision of the problems of safeguarding and maintaining peace, the General Assembly has condemned the system of *apartheid* and has recommended a number of measures aimed at eliminating it.

33. The other threat to the world order comes from Palestine, because of the grave injustice done to an entire people whose rights have been usurped on the very soil of its homeland. The legitimate rebellion of the Palestinian people, translated into a process of regaining by arms its reason for existence, has three times engulfed the Middle East in flames. Last July the deliberately staged military attack on Lebanon once again threatened the world with a generalized conflict. Thus, the question of Palestine is not merely a question of restoring the rights of a people; it is a question of a return to peace in the Middle East, a question of peace or war. To leave the problem without solution, distorted by an immense, cleverly orchestrated disinformation campaign, will mean a more acute international crisis in the future.

34. When I took part in the debate on the question of Palestine in July 1980, at the 10th meeting of the seventh emergency special session of the Assembly, I said:

"Palestine is not something that was thought up in a foreign ministry; nor was it simply a gift offered under the pressure of geo-political demands or as penance for the dreadful events of the last world war. The Palestinians have fashioned their homeland according to their own brilliant civilization. All that they are asking for is to continue that marvellous work for which mankind should be grateful.

"But alas, these children of the Book, of wisdom and of courage are today prisoners in their land, if they have not been forced to leave it, as a result of the manoeuvres of those who hold power today and the unacceptable manifestations of Israeli colonial conquest."

35. That bitter fact remains true. It is nevertheless disturbing to note that it is becoming more and more alarming in its scope, more and more distressing, because of Israel's stubborn persistence in wishing to implement its futile dream of submitting to its laws a people so deeply attached to its lands and ancestral values.

*Mr. Mrani Zentar (Morocco), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

36. Indeed, the policy of colonization practised by Israel in Palestine is similar to all the forms of brutal domina-

tion of one people by another. It comprises contempt, terror and seizure. It aims at depersonalization. Israel's policy in the Middle East, and especially in Palestine, is developing along three essential lines: denying the Palestinian identity, extending to the point of absurdity the limits of its security and claiming to be the sole heir and owner of a culture shaped throughout centuries by the population of Palestine as a whole.

37. The Palestinian people is part of history, which it has enriched and made more beautiful. Israel's militaristic policy in Palestine, from which emerged the voices of immortal messengers of world peace, has imposed on the Palestinian people the martyrdom suffered by peoples doomed to exile or compelled to live persecuted in their own homeland. But all these vicissitudes have not broken the Palestinian people; on the contrary, they have only hardened and tempered it. It has acquired a heightened awareness of its own identity. Out of the turmoil of its present existence, it has raised itself to a level of national unity achieved only by great peoples. It has imposed a reality which is increasingly becoming a determining factor in the search for any just and lasting solution to the Middle East crisis—a crisis which periodically makes the world tremble. This reality is the Palestinian fact which is now recognized in all the countries of the world and, in particular, by a number of high-ranking political figures who only recently considered it a negligible part of a wave of disturbances that gave so much pleasure to some young people in the world.

38. It is this fact, this reality the existence of which Israel denies but which, nevertheless, it is struggling against. Such a contradiction would be left to the talents of humorists were it not a question of the rights of a people, of the lives of millions and of the serious problem posed for the maintenance of peace.

39. The Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO], with which the Palestinian people identifies itself to achieve its hopes and aspirations, has become for the Israeli colonizer a nightmare which it believes it can destroy by the sword. However, the fact is that each time Israel redoubles its attacks against the PLO, more and more Palestinian fighters rise from the ruins to stamp Israel's intemperate use of its weapons with the label of cruel vanity. Periodically, new destruction is added to the already so very costly destruction endured by peaceful Lebanon, a signatory of the Charter but whose sovereignty is constantly violated by a State created by the United Nations.

40. War, it must be recalled, does not settle problems but rather makes them more complicated and more difficult to untangle. The wisdom of nations is built upon tolerance and respect for the values which have been accumulated by mankind throughout the ages and with which it identifies. Hence it is opposed to the Israeli practice of gratuitous destruction of dwellings, leaving Palestinian women and children without shelter. It is opposed to the confiscation of Palestinian property in order to implant the myth of a new Promised Land; it is opposed to the closing of schools, to arrest without trial of persons democratically elected to power by the people; it is opposed to the erosion of the frontiers of sovereign States in the name of a never-defined security.

41. For all those reasons, the international community must pay particular attention to the adoption by the Tel Aviv Government of the master plan for the development of settlements in Judaea and Samaria, 1979-1983, put forward by the World Zionist Organization.<sup>3</sup> As is known,

the implementation of this plan, by accelerating and intensifying the establishment of settlements in these areas of Palestine, has no other goal but their pure and simple incorporation into Israel. When one realizes that 56 settlements have already been established in these areas, it is not hard to conclude that the objective sought by the Tel Aviv leaders is none other than territorial expansionism by concentric circles—today Palestine is the opening towards the Dead Sea, tomorrow the neighbours of Israel.

42. The comprehensive strategy of incorporating Palestinian lands into Israel not only results in the usurping of the land and property of the Palestinians but also violates the conscience of mankind in declaring Jerusalem Israel's "eternal and indivisible capital". The Security Council certainly reflected international indignation at such usurpation of the common heritage of mankind when it adopted resolution 478 (1980), which "censures in the strongest terms the enactment by Israel of the 'basic law on Jerusalem and the refusal to comply with relevant Security Council resolutions'".

43. That refusal persists to this day. It has become an act of sacrilege because, in spite of the disapproval of the General Assembly, Israel continues, in the name of so-called archaeological excavations, the digging of a tunnel under Al-Haram Al-Sharif, thus threatening the very existence of sanctuaries which are among the most venerated in Islam and which are considered the heritage of mankind.

44. The violence unleashed by Israel in Palestine, where so many universal values have accumulated, would deal a fatal blow to our common civilization were it to be perpetuated and generalized. Our conduct and our duty to prevent the collapse of our admirable achievements are therefore clearly set out before us. We must by all possible means assist the Palestinian people to recover its homeland and to live there in keeping with its traditions and the administrative rules of its own choosing.

45. At this session of the General Assembly, the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People reiterates in its report [A/36/35, para. 49-53]—which was admirably submitted to the Assembly by its Chairman, Mr. Sarré of Senegal, and its Rapporteur, Mr. Gauci of Malta—recommendations which go to the core of the question of the rights of the Palestinian people in all their aspects and outline the framework for the search for a peaceful solution to the Palestinian tragedy.

46. We welcome the Committee's initiatives for peace, and in the name of peace we once again appeal to the Security Council to take up the recommendations contained in that report. The Charter of the United Nations requires that it do so because it confers upon it special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. During the current year, the programme of work of the Committee dealt with a number of fields which have been amply described in its report. The Committee has been concerned to have the Palestinian fact become widely known throughout the international community, so that the peace proposals from various quarters may be supplemented and be better understood by all the peoples that love peace and justice throughout the world. Among those proposals are many initiatives which the leaders of Israel have unfortunately not understood as proposals in its own interests.

47. Alluding to these proposals, the President of the Republic of Mali, General Moussa Traoré, on 2 October 1981 in this very Hall, stated the following:

“The latest, highly historic initiative, taken by Emir Fahd ibn Abdul Aziz, Crown Prince and Deputy Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, after the important Third Islamic Summit Conference, held at Mecca-Taif, deserves the full attention of the current session of the General Assembly.

“Indeed, this peace plan aims concretely at finding a comprehensive solution to the problem of the Middle East in general and the Palestinian problem in particular. The peace plan’s eight points are in keeping with the relevant decisions of the aforementioned Islamic Summit Conference. They are in keeping with the . . . recognized and admitted standards of international law.”[23rd meeting, para. 40 and 41.]

48. That plan,<sup>4</sup> like others, is noteworthy by its existence alone, but one of its particular features is that it comes from one of the parties directly concerned by the Palestine crisis and by the generally disturbing situation prevailing in the Middle East.

49. The General Assembly is thus sufficiently prepared to give shape to a real framework for peace in the Middle East with full respect for the interests of all parties concerned, including, obviously, the PLO. The shape of that framework has already been set forth by the delegation of Mali at various international forums which have dealt with the problem of the Middle East. We should like to recall very briefly here that it should be based on the following factors: the inalienable right to self-determination of the Palestinian people, including its right to set up a sovereign State if that is its desire; recognition of the legitimacy of the PLO and of the fact that it is the sole representative of the Palestinian people; total and unconditional withdrawal from the Arab territories occupied by Israel in 1967.

50. The General Assembly is occupied with a series of draft resolutions of which my country is a sponsor. Those draft resolutions have one major goal, that is, to commit the international Organization to adopting the necessary measures for gaining respect for the ideals of justice and for human dignity, which give strength and universality to the Charter of the United Nations. The quest for definitive solutions to the Palestinian problem lies within the United Nations. It is our duty to embark promptly upon this path of peace. The idea of convening of an international conference on the question of Palestine, at the latest in 1984, contained in draft resolution A/36/L.33, is thus of historic significance.

51. By adopting all these texts unanimously the General Assembly will once again show that it is an instrument of peace, that it is working only for peace for the majesty and dignity of peoples.

52. Mr. MONCADA ZAPATA (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The situation of the Palestinian people has continued to deteriorate day by day, and the international community seems powerless to influence positively the attainment of the legitimate and inalienable rights of that people.

53. This Organization has only too often set forth the right of the Palestinians to return to their homes, to their property and to their land from which they were evicted.

It has been stressed that the people of Palestine as well as the peoples of Central America and of southern Africa have a right to self-determination without external interference and to genuine independence. It is not just a question of reaffirming principles recognized by international law, but of perpetuating a situation of injustice which endangers international peace and security.

54. We have demanded the complete and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all the occupied territories, including Jerusalem. We have determined that all measures and legislative acts by Israel aimed at altering the character of Jerusalem are null and void. Once again this is not a moral position, but a position of defending, through these demands, the principle of the non-acquisition of territory by force.

55. The Israeli acts of aggression against Iraq and Lebanon underscore once again that Israel is bent on maintaining its version of stability in the Middle East, a stability which seeks to crush not only the just resistance of the Palestinians, but also the great Arab people, which shares the struggle of the Palestinians and stands by their side.

56. That is why we must emphasize again that it is no longer possible to establish a just, genuine or lasting peace in the Middle East without attaining, *inter alia*, a comprehensive solution of the problem of Palestine, that is to say, a solution based on the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

57. This very basic consideration, which is increasingly being recognized by the countries and peoples of the world, leads us to the logical conclusion that it is necessary to ensure the full participation of the Palestinian people and of its heroic representative, the PLO, in all peace efforts in the Middle East, on an equal footing.

58. Nicaragua, like the vast majority of countries in the world, therefore rejects partial agreements such as Camp David, concluded outside the framework of the United Nations and which constitute a flagrant violation of the rights of the Palestinian people by claiming to determine the future of that people and its territories.

59. But obviously not all States Members of the United Nations share that view. On repeated occasions the just efforts of the international community to attain Palestinian rights have run up against the wall of the widespread abuse of the veto in the Security Council by Israel’s main ally. What is more, the so-called strategic collaboration between the United States and Israel can only encourage Zionist elements to step up their policy of hostility and aggression against the Arab nation.

60. The United States, caught in the intricate web of contradictions which flow from its traditional support for repressive and racist régimes like Tel Aviv, refuses to recognize the recommendations of the General Assembly in defence of the rights of the Palestinian people. It even rejects mere recourse to dialogue, notwithstanding the increasingly urgent appeals by broad domestic and international sectors.

61. Since 1976 the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People has been carrying out patient and persistent work, submitting reports and recommendations to the Security Council which are basically a synthesis of the resolutions of the General Assembly aimed at attaining an equitable settlement of the

Palestinian problem. The Committee has done everything it could, calling the attention of the Security Council to the effects of the resolutions, recalling the main principles on which those recommendations were based, inviting the Council to adopt the necessary measures to implement those resolutions. All this has been done without any concrete result.

62. The Organization remains paralysed, incapable of offering a peaceful and lawful opening to peoples such as the peoples of Palestine, Namibia or El Salvador, who today have to resort, with full legitimacy, to armed struggle in order to defend their sacred rights to freedom and independence.

63. Frankly, given this record it is praiseworthy to see the Palestinian people through its legitimate representative still believing in the constructive role of the Organization in the quest for peace and justice. In order to maintain faith in the United Nations, we need decisive and imperative measures leading to a solution of the Palestinian question and of the problem of the Middle East.

64. The United Nations has a primary duty to assist in the task of attaining peace and stability in the Middle East, which logically, politically and morally entails rejection of the Zionist concept of security based on the acquisition of more lands, on the subjugation of the peoples of the region and on the exploitation of their resources and on giving military support to repressive and genocidal régimes in Africa and in Central America.

65. Today more than ever we must make a start, and the first step would be the adoption of the draft resolutions now before us, in order to show once again who is opposed to legitimate peace and stability in the Middle East and who are the enemies of the noble people of Palestine.

66. Once again we reiterate our firm, solid support for that brother people and its sole legitimate representative, the PLO.

67. Mr. SOURINHO (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): The question of Palestine has been on the agenda of the General Assembly since the very inception of the United Nations, but because of Zionist and imperialist manoeuvres it was taken up only from a strictly humanitarian point of view until very recently. In fact, this question has been considered in its true political context by the Assembly and other bodies in the United Nations only since 1974.

68. In 1974, following events with serious consequences for peace and stability in the Middle East and the human suffering which they caused, and following the decisive turning-point in the stubborn struggle for the self-determination and independence of the Palestinian people under the valiant leadership of its sole legitimate representative, the PLO, the General Assembly, in its collective realism, adopted resolution 3236 (XXIX), in which it clearly set forth the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. To help to achieve those rights, the following year the General Assembly, by resolution 3376 (XXX), established the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, composed of 20 Member States, including my own. In its first report to the General Assembly, in 1976,<sup>5</sup> that Committee made a number of recommendations which were approved by a very large majority of the members of the Assembly.

69. Those recommendations, which have been maintained and reaffirmed during every subsequent session of the General Assembly, have also been approved and energetically supported by the non-aligned movement, the OAU, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and other important international bodies.

70. We recall those facts because they represent the most accurate expression of the international collective consciousness. However, despite that ever-growing recognition of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, it is most regrettable that the pronounced and sustained efforts of the United Nations to date—and especially by the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, under the very skilful leadership of Mr. Massamba Sarré of Senegal—to realize those rights have remained completely fruitless because of the intransigent attitude of Israel, unconditionally and invariably supported by the United States.

71. It is absolutely imperative that our debate not result, as in the past, in a mere recording of facts and verbal condemnation. Ways and means must be found to eliminate the obstacles erected on the path to the exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights, thereby restoring the climate of trust among and peaceful coexistence of all peoples and States of the region that is so necessary for a just and lasting settlement of the question of Palestine and, hence, of the Middle East as a whole.

72. In that respect, it must be emphasized that the main obstacle to the achievement of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people unquestionably is the inability of the Security Council to act. The Security Council, having taken up on several occasions since 1976 the question of Palestine in its new and true context, has nevertheless been unable to take a decision on the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People because of the successive vetoes of the United States, one of the permanent members of the Council.

73. In taking that negative and hostile attitude towards the recommendations of the Committee and of the General Assembly, the United States has resolutely opposed the consensus expressed by the international community that the total and full exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable national rights is a *sine qua non* for a just and lasting solution of the Middle East question. Furthermore, that negative and hostile attitude clearly demonstrates not only the refusal of the United States to take into consideration positive developments in international opinion favouring the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, but also shows that the United States Government disregards American public opinion, which has come out more and more openly in favour of the Palestinian people.

74. The persistence of this unrealistic and isolationist position of the United States has largely contributed to creating a situation of extreme tension in the Middle East which is a serious threat to peace and stability in that part of the world. In view of the primary role played by the United States, as a super-Power and a permanent member of the Security Council, in the maintenance of international peace and security, it is highly desirable that the United States abandon its obstructionist attitude and, in accordance with the rule of democracy, join in the international consensus on the question of Palestine.

75. It would also be a good idea if Israel, which owes its unexpected birth to the United Nations, would give up

its attitude of arrogant defiance towards this Organization—an attitude that has placed it in the dock as the accused for more than 30 years—and would recognize that the Palestinian people has the full right to self-determination and to establish an independent State in its ancestral land.

76. It is a unanimously acknowledged fact that Israel has so far been able to continue to trample under foot all the relevant United Nations resolutions and to turn a deaf ear to all the appeals addressed to it by all the peace-loving and justice-loving peoples and organizations throughout the world precisely because of the support and encouragement given it by the United States. That constant support and encouragement has once again been given to the Tel Aviv régime through the recent signing of the protocol on American-Israeli agreement for strategic co-operation. That agreement, which clearly shows the pro-Israel and anti-Arab direction of United States policy, is a further dangerous step towards increased tension in the Middle East and leaves no doubt about the true nature of United States policy and its tiny ally, Israel, in that part of the world—namely, to bury forever the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and to perpetuate forever the illegal occupation by Israel of the Palestinian homeland and Arab lands, thereby transforming the Middle East into a zone of destabilization and constant conflict, which serves the hegemonist and expansionist aims of both countries.

77. Furthermore, the many facts that have emerged in the last few months, both locally and in the neighbouring areas—particularly the acceleration and intensification of the establishment of settlements in the occupied territories, the illegal proclamation of the Holy City of Jerusalem as the eternal capital of Israel, the acts of bloody repression committed by the Israeli authorities against the civilian Arab population of the occupied territories in violation of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,<sup>6</sup> the ruthless expulsion of the Arab mayors of the principal towns of the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip, and the undertaking of construction through the Gaza Strip of a canal linking the Mediterranean and the Dead Sea—have clearly shown that we are headed not towards the achievement by the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights, but rather towards the total annexation of Palestine and the occupied Arab lands by means of a policy of assimilation, repression and massive expulsion of the Arab peoples.

78. Along with that policy, and with the aim of stifling and eliminating forever the legitimate struggle of the Palestinian people, the Tel Aviv régime has embarked on death-dealing attacks against Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanese territory, thus seriously infringing on the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country. Furthermore, the criminal raid carried out by the Israeli military rabble against the peaceful Iraqi nuclear installation is a further demonstration—if any were needed—that thanks to the support of its great and powerful ally from over the Atlantic, Israel is feverishly engaged, within the framework of the Camp David agreements, in reshaping the military map of the Middle East in accordance with its hegemonistic and expansionistic aims.

79. The time has come, if we want to spare this region another general conflict with unforeseeable consequences to halt the dangerous turn of the situation in the Middle East resulting from Israel's mad schemes. The only way

to do that is to find a just and lasting solution to the question of Palestine, which is the central factor in the problem of the Middle East, within the framework of a general solution of that problem. Such a comprehensive solution can be found only within the framework of the machinery provided for in the relevant United Nations resolutions on the Middle East, that is, the convening of an international conference on the Middle East under United Nations auspices and with the participation on an equal footing of all the concerned parties, including the PLO.

80. Continuing the discussion on internal autonomy for Palestine, which has been universally rejected and condemned, will have no result except to increase further the tension in that part of the world.

81. The time for the various Governments to repeat their positions of principle in the Assembly is over; that must give way to collective action firmly aimed at putting an end to the suffering and humiliation of the Palestinian people and at restoring just and lasting peace in the Middle East. My delegation will support any effort to that end.

82. Mr. KRISHNA (India): A full year has passed since the General Assembly last considered the question of Palestine and adopted yet another resolution reaffirming certain fundamental principles and once again endorsing a set of recommendations for the implementation of the various decisions of the United Nations on the subject. But the question of Palestine is no nearer a solution today than it was 34 years ago, when the United Nations made the solemn pledge of a homeland to the Palestinians. The Palestinians still remain uprooted from their hearths and homes; their land continues to be occupied and colonized by Israel; West Asia remains gripped by tension; the peace and security of the region and of the rest of the world continue to be threatened.

83. By its intransigent and expansionist policies, Israel has thwarted the will of the international community with regard to Palestine and has escalated the conflict in West Asia in total disregard for international law and the basic norms of responsible behaviour. The current debate provides us with another opportunity to reaffirm our full support for the people of Palestine in their quest for sovereignty and to renew our call upon Israel to heed the opinion of the international community and abide by the decisions of the United Nations. But it is clearer now than ever before that a solution to the question of Palestine can be found only if Israel's compliance with the United Nations resolutions is enforced by recourse to the methods available under the Charter.

84. India's sympathy for the people of Palestine in their suffering and our support for the establishment of a Palestinian State go back to the days of our own freedom struggle, when our national leaders saw a parallel between our struggle for nationhood and that of the Palestinians. The continuing struggle of the Palestinians evokes sympathy and understanding among the people of India to this day. India has consistently argued that a just and comprehensive solution to the problems of West Asia should consist of the exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable national and human rights including the right to establish an independent State in their homeland, the total and unconditional withdrawal by Israel from all Arab territories occupied since 1967 including the Holy City of Jerusalem, and the guarantee that all the States in

the region, including Palestine, may live within secure and recognized borders.

85. The Palestinians have the right to return to their homes and property in Palestine from which they have been mercilessly displaced and uprooted. Their right to self-determination should be exercised without any external interference, and, like other States in the region, the State of Palestine should be enabled to live in peace and security and to follow its own domestic and foreign policies.

86. An essential prerequisite for the attainment of a peaceful solution is the full and equal participation of the PLO, the only genuine representative of the Palestinian people, in any discussions relating to their future, or indeed to the future of the entire region.

87. Partial agreements and superficial solutions attempted in the past have shown that unless these cardinal principles are accepted there is very little prospect for genuine and durable peace in the area. Certain agreements arrived at without the participation of the representatives of the Palestinian people and of countries directly concerned with this question have served only to cause dissension among the supporters of the Palestinians and to give Israel lame excuses to delay its withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories, including Palestine.

88. The annexation of Jerusalem and the declaration that it is the eternal capital of Israel have been universally condemned. Security Council resolution 478 (1980), adopted on 20 August 1980, reflects the indignation of the world at the Israeli action with regard to the Holy City. India has consistently held the view that Jerusalem is part of those territories that must be vacated by Israel in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. India has always been, and continues to be, totally opposed to Israeli attempts to alter the character and status of the Holy City:

89. The events in West Asia during the past year indicate that Israel has hardened its position and is determined to work for the systematic elimination of Palestinians and to escalate the threat to the security of its neighbours. In the process of establishing new settlements in the occupied territories, Israel has trampled upon the rights of the local population, crushed dissent by the use of brute force and engaged in a systematic depletion of the basic resources of the areas inhabited by the Arab population. The heroic resistance of the Palestinian people to the Israeli colonizers has been characterized as "terrorism", and massive reprisals against the PLO have resulted in the destruction of life and property in neighbouring Lebanon. The massive attack on Lebanon in July this year as part of Israel's policy of pre-emptive strikes was aimed not only at destabilizing Lebanon, but also at hampering the whole peace-keeping effort of the United Nations in the region. The destruction of Iraq's nuclear installation by Israel was undoubtedly part of Israel's strategy to weaken the supporters of Palestine. More recently, Israel concluded a strategic co-operation agreement, thus bestowing an ideological dimension on the conflict in West Asia. The increased involvement of external forces in West Asia can hardly contribute to peace and stability in the region.

90. In the face of acts of aggression, threats and provocation, Palestinian nationalism and unanimous Arab support for it remained steadfast. Even as Israel's reign of terror in the occupied Arab lands was intensified, the in-

alienable rights of the Palestinian people and the central role of the PLO came to be recognized in more regions of the world, notably western Europe. The enhanced support that the cause of Palestine enjoys today is indeed a very welcome development.

91. The non-aligned movement, of which India is a member, has consistently supported the cause of the Palestinian people. The PLO not only is a fully fledged member of the movement but also serves on its Co-ordinating Bureau. A mission dispatched by the movement to Lebanon on an invitation extended to it by the PLO had an opportunity to examine and assess the damage and destruction which resulted from the Israeli attacks on Beirut and areas in southern Lebanon. The mission observed that, in addition to the tremendous damage and destruction of property, there was indiscriminate slaughter of civilians. It concluded that the Israeli attacks "were evidence that once again Israel had violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon, completely disregarding international law, the resolutions of the United Nations and world public opinion. These barbaric attacks revealed the Israeli intentions to exterminate the Palestinian people." [A/36/547, annex, para. 64.] The mission observed and was impressed by the ability of the PLO and the Palestinian people to make the best use of the assistance received by them and felt convinced that external financial and technical assistance would contribute to the success of their efforts to ameliorate the living conditions of the Palestinian people. We endorse the recommendation of the mission, on which India was represented, that States and international organizations should sympathetically examine the needs of the Palestinian people and make appropriate contributions as a matter of urgency. We condemn Israeli attacks on southern Lebanon and call for the cessation of Israeli aggression against Lebanon.

92. As a member of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, India has fully supported the Committee in its efforts to secure the rights of the Palestinian people and to promote their cause. The report of the Committee bears testimony to its untiring efforts under the leadership of Mr. Massamba Sarré of Senegal. Though the basic recommendations of the Committee have remained unimplemented so far, its activities during the year, particularly the holding of seminars in different regions of the world, have served to arouse the conscience of humanity in support of the cause of Palestine. In a message addressed to the Chairman of the Committee a few days ago, the Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, stated the following:

"On the solemn occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, I affirm to the Committee the full support of the Government and the people of India in the realization of its objectives.

"Our support for the Palestinian cause has been consistent and has been part of our foreign policy since its very inception. Even in the thirties, when we ourselves were struggling for freedom, Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru expressed sympathy for the Arabs of Palestine in the face of Zionist threats and wished them complete success in the attainment of their objectives.

"We are glad there is increasing awareness in the world community of this just cause. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People has a significant role. I send my good wishes for its endeavours."

93. Mr. MAHALLATI SHIRAZI (Iran): Once again, the General Assembly is debating the question of Palestine. Once again, a resolution in favour of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people will be adopted, and once again, that resolution will join its predecessors in the United Nations records for future scholarly research, only to demonstrate the ineffectiveness of the United Nations system in maintaining international peace and security. Statements are made daily in this Hall reiterating the commitment of Member States to the principles of the Charter, while at the same time these same principles are continually ignored by States in practice. The super-Powers preach their devotion to the principle of the self-determination of peoples at the same time that the United States is trying to impose the Camp David accord upon the Arab peoples, when that accord clearly denies the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and independence; and the Soviet Union continues its occupation of Afghanistan, denying the people of that country the right freely to choose their system of government.

94. In fact, the case of Israel represents a typical example of the strategy of imperialism in dealing with peoples who wish to maintain their sovereignty *vis-à-vis* the two super-Powers. Imperialism is stubbornly rejecting the fact that peoples of the world have gained consciousness and can see the dirty tricks used for the sake of exploiting them and that this consciousness will eventually wrench the hands of imperialism from the national resources of the majority of the peoples of the world. To offset this consciousness, imperialism has repeatedly resorted to aggression, whether directly as in Viet Nam, or through its agents, as in the case of Palestine.

95. The method is clear: land is occupied and forcefully held for a period of time that allows the act of occupation gradually to gain some degree of recognition. To gain more time, a limited compromise is offered by the aggressor to create preoccupation and hope while occupation itself is continuously being consolidated. To terminate the whole process, a fraction of the original conquest is in fact returned and this is interpreted as a major demonstration of good faith on the part of the aggressor. In this context, I wish to quote the words of the leader of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Imam Khomeini, who has stated "It is alleged that one of the positive elements of the latest plan is that Israel will retreat from land it occupied in the 1967 war. This in fact is its main negative element because it incorporates acceptance that the rest of Palestine is permanently lost."

96. We believe that the most effective way to fight aggression by imperialism is for the peoples of the world to stick firmly to principle and to refuse to compromise their principles for the sake of some material gains, even if not compromising necessitates sacrifices. The Palestine question will be solved only if the Palestinian people remain faithful to their principles and refuse to adhere to compromising plans like that of Camp David—both the first and the second. Representatives will realize, of course, that we call the Fahd plan<sup>d</sup> the second Camp David.

97. We are not trying to prescribe hypocritical remedies in this forum. What we are arguing for is exactly what we ourselves are applying in our own case. We have accepted every sacrifice in order not to compromise our principles. We condemn aggression and we believe that aggressors should not be encouraged by being allowed to obtain political or material gains through acts of aggression. This is

why we are not accepting a peace imposed by the aggressor in the war he has imposed upon us, so as to deny him any political or material gains as a result of his act of aggression. An alternative to such a stand would be to depend upon others to fight our war of liberation for us by means of United Nations resolutions, in which the principles of the Charter are reiterated by Member States at the same time that the same principles are ignored in practice by those same Member States.

98. Some of the Arab States, for example, while condemning Israeli aggression against the Palestinian people in the strongest terms, proudly support and finance the war of aggression that Saddam has waged on Iran. They condemn Israel for having occupied Arab lands, but they cheer the Iraqi occupation of Iranian lands. They refuse to accept an Israeli-imposed peace, but they expect Iran to accept an Iraqi-imposed peace. It is such selectivity in application of the principles of the Charter that has led to the continued consideration of the question of Palestine for more than three decades without any solution. This is why my Government is not optimistic with regard to the capability of the United Nations system to terminate not only the Israeli aggression against the Palestinians, but aggression in general. And this is why the people of Iran have chosen not to wait for the United Nations to liberate their occupied land but rather to rely upon God and upon their faith to continue fighting their war of liberation to final victory, whatever the cost and sacrifices.

99. When the first movement of the Islamic revolution of Iran took place 18 years ago, the major thrust of the objection of the leader of the revolution and of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Imam Khomeini, to the deposed Shah was his collaboration with Zionist Israel under the auspices of American imperialism. It has become obvious since then that the struggle against the racist and usurper régime of Israel constitutes one of the basic building blocks of the revolution. We have felt the impact of the close collaboration between the deposed Shah and Zionist Israel, and especially its diabolical Mossad organization, in almost all aspects of our lives, and most of all in the prison cells of the Shah's SAVAK. We can still remember that in the days when Israel was destroying the lives and property of our Moslem Arab brothers, the traitor Shah was rendering assistance to the Zionist régime. In fact, many of our youth were martyred or went through torture in the prisons of SAVAK for having demonstrated their opposition to that collaboration.

100. Our opposition to Israel stems from our Islamic ideals. Islam has taught us to resist aggression wherever it occurs. We are supporting our Moslem Arab brothers because we know that they, as well as we, are struggling not for the sake of some material gain, but because they want to protect and promote their ideals and principles. It is those ideals, originating from the message of Islam, that tie us strongly to the cause of the Palestinian people. The leader of our revolution has stated this notion very distinctly:

"Our country, our nation which has had so many martyrs as well as disabled—many of them are present here and may Allah heal them—is faithful to Islam, and we do not consider Islam as limited only to Iran. Islam is Islam everywhere. It is the same Islam in Egypt, Sudan, Iraq, Hejaz and Syria as well as other places. We cannot count ourselves as separate from other Moslems. These losses that are inflicted and all these martyrs, disabled and homeless people are all for the cause of Islam. And since Iran is an Islamic coun-

try we suffered all these hardships. We cannot separate Arabs and their destiny from ours. We cannot consider the destiny of other countries as separate from ours. Islam is Islam everywhere and all Moslems, of whom we are a part, are duty-bound to protect Islam everywhere.”

101. Although the people of Iran were triumphant in destroying the grip of imperialism on the country and freeing themselves from the despotism of its agent, the Shah, we shall not feel the complete triumph of our revolution until our Palestinian brothers have attained victory over the usurper, Israel, and have punished it for its continuous crimes.

102. We believe that there is no way for our Palestinian brothers and sisters to regain their usurped rights except by continuing their just struggle against the Zionist aggressors and by rejecting all compromising plots. Any collaboration with the enemies of Islam leads only to disgrace, as experience has shown, and as taught to us by the Holy Koran, from which I quote:

“O ye who believe! If ye obey the Unbelievers, they will drive you back on your heels, and ye will turn back (from Faith) to your own loss.

“Nay, God is your Protector, and He is the best of helpers.” [*Sura III, verses 149-150.*]

And, as we understand from the Holy Koran, if Moslems stand united, acts of aggression can in no way infiltrate among them and usurp their rights. Again, I quote from the Holy Koran:

“They will do you no harm, barring a trifling annoyance; if they come out to fight you, they will show you their backs, and no help shall they get.” [*Ibid., verse 111.*]

103. We have not mentioned all the innumerable crimes committed by Zionist Israel, since many of them are abundantly clear to all the people of the world. However, we have to bring to the attention of all countries the most recent crime of the barbaric Zionist régime, its criminal excavation of the immediate area surrounding one of the holiest shrines of Islam, in occupied Jerusalem. We warn the Zionists not to toy with the most sacred beliefs of the Moslem people, and once again we urge all Moslems of the world to join the united Islamic front in combating Zionist aggression in order to bring about a just Islamic solution to this tragic issue.

104. We ask all countries to terminate all their political, economic and cultural ties with the aggressor, Israel, in order to demonstrate to it that aggression does not pay. We also ask all Moslem countries to continue to resist Israeli aggression and, in compliance with Islamic ideals, to refrain from any form of compromise until final victory is achieved.

105. I would like to present as a gift to my Palestinian brothers and sisters this quotation from the Holy Koran, which we believe provides the best guidance for them in their struggle against Zionism:

“If God helps you, none can overcome you: If He forsakes you, who is there, after that, that can help you? In God, then, let Believers put their trust.” [*Ibid., verse 160.*]

106. Mr. BEDJAOUI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): The question of Palestine has marked the entire existence of the United Nations. Covered up for several decades, it was finally posed correctly in terms of the restoration of the national rights of a people.

107. Although the question of Palestine is now recognized as being the core of the Middle East conflict, the Palestinian people had to make many sacrifices over more than a quarter of a century before the international community departed from an erroneous approach whereby the origin of the crisis was considered to be its effects, to wit the multiple consequences of the Zionist acts of aggression against the neighbouring Arab countries. In point of fact, the debates and the results of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly marked a turning-point.

108. By proclaiming the Palestinian people's right to self-determination, sovereignty and independence, the General Assembly endorsed the heroic struggle of a people. By granting observer status to the PLO the Assembly at the same time recognized the fact that the PLO was the sole representative of the Palestinian people and approved its mission, won in the heat of battle, to take part in any quest for a just and definitive solution to the Middle East crisis.

109. Since then, developments in the situation have constantly aroused the legitimate concern of the international community. The Israeli leaders continue in their expansionist designs, based upon a permanent policy of aggression in complete contempt of United Nations decisions. Extremely serious manoeuvres have been carried out in order to wipe out the successes achieved in the cause of the Palestinian people.

110. Thus, seven years after the international community came to its senses and undertook to do justice at long last to the people of Palestine, developments in the situation present the disturbing feature of the Security Council's failure to meet the persistent challenge of the Zionist entity. By failing to heed the repeated calls of the General Assembly and by failing to stand firm against the continued acts of defiance of the Zionist entity, the Security Council certainly bears a heavy responsibility for the present stalemate.

111. The difficulties encountered in implementing the international consensus on the settlement of the question of Palestine are the result of an avowed intent to liquidate the Palestinian people. In occupied Palestine as well as in the surrounding areas, a relentless attempt is being made to deny the right of the Palestinian people to live. In the Palestinian and Arab occupied territories the Zionist entity is systematically extending its settlements by resorting to a mindless repression against all the Arab peoples in the area, who have become virtual hostages in their own land.

112. The annexation of Al Quds, the attempts to annex the Golan Heights, the dismemberment of Lebanon, the recent aggression against Iraq and the plan to build a canal linking the Mediterranean with the Dead Sea through the occupied territories all serve to keep the adventurist policy of the Zionist leaders in the forefront.

113. Faced with this attempt at the “de-Arabisation” of Palestine by means of an infernal war machine and a police apparatus skilled in terrorism, the Palestinian people is exercising its legitimate right to resort to liberating violence. It is precisely that national liberation struggle

which has caused the Palestinians to emerge from the status of inferiors in which an entire people was kept. The Palestinian people oppose the Camp David accord and the treaty signed at Washington with the same determination and vigour.

114. The impasse in which the mistaken Camp David peace attempt finds itself today was to be expected, since it was based on a denial of the national rights of the Palestinian people. Over and above the broad current of universal condemnation which that initiative aroused, its failure resulted primarily from the reaction of the Arab masses in the occupied territories, who proclaimed, in the face of the Zionist occupation forces, their rejection of the Camp David accords and their determination to build their own State under the guidance of the PLO, their sole and legitimate representative.

115. The strengthening of the Palestinian popular resistance demonstrates more and more every day the refusal of the Palestinian people to give up control of its national destiny. In other words, no subterfuge can contain the determination of the Palestinian people to be free, and no solution is possible without the restoration of its national sovereignty. Furthermore, that was the conclusion which the General Assembly reached when in resolutions 34/65 B and 35/169 B it declared null and void agreements which ignore, infringe, violate or deny the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right of self-determination and the right to national independence and sovereignty in Palestine. Although the accords have thus been acknowledged a failure, the Camp David protagonists have not learned the proper lessons.

116. The recently announced strategic alliance agreements between the United States and the Zionist entity and the joint military manoeuvres in the region are part of a carefully developed plan whose ultimate goal is to bring the entire Middle East under imperialist influence. It is precisely the combination of imperialist interests and the sinister designs of Zionist ideology in the region which perpetuates the crisis and foils all attempts by the United Nations to restore the national rights of the Palestinian people. Because of its geo-strategic function in the region, the Zionist entity enjoys the protection and support of imperialism, which simultaneously guarantees it impunity and greater potential for aggression.

117. The question of Palestine, whose solution has been too long delayed, calls now more than ever for greater determination by the international community to discharge its responsibilities towards the Palestinian people.

118. Here it is fitting to pay a well-deserved tribute to the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and its Chairman, Mr. Masmaba Sarré of Senegal. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX), the Committee suggested practical measures to allow the Palestinian people effectively to exercise its right to self-determination, independence and national sovereignty in Palestine.

119. Because the Security Council, paralyzed by an abusive use of one veto, failed in its duty to implement the recommendations of the Committee, as endorsed by the General Assembly, the seventh emergency special session was convened. With the solemnity conferred on it by its exceptional nature, that special session strongly endorsed the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people and declared invalid the Camp David accords and other similar arrangements.

120. In its resolution ES-7/2, adopted by a more than ample majority, the General Assembly established the framework for a just and lasting solution to the question of Palestine, based on the following four inseparable elements: the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and national independence and sovereignty, as well as the right to establish a sovereign State in Palestine; the inalienable right of displaced and uprooted Palestinians to return to their homes and property in Palestine; the right of the PLO, as the representative of the Palestinian people, to participate on an equal footing in the search for a just solution to the problem of Palestine; and the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force.

121. That new solemn expression of international consensus on the only way to find a settlement of the question of Palestine was thwarted by the stubbornness of the Zionist entity and, unfortunately, the willingness of its allies to guarantee unconditional support for its policy.

122. Our present debate is a response to yet another loud appeal by the martyred Palestinian people to us all. Over and above the expression of an ever-stronger solidarity, coherent action is essential. Such action is all the more necessary because the mere denunciation of the misdeeds of the Zionist entity seems to encourage it to persist in its defiance of the international community, rather than having the slightest deterrent effect on it.

123. The United Nations has undertaken a commitment to guarantee the Palestinian people the exercise of its right to self-determination. By honouring such a commitment the United Nations will discharge the immense debt that it contracted with respect to justice and right. It will at the same time be carrying out its mission of working for the establishment of peace in the Middle East—a comprehensive peace, which will not be brought about unless the fundamental requirement of the restoration of the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination, independence and sovereignty in Palestine is met.

124. Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Since 1948 the Palestinian people has been the victim of a terrible tragedy, a tragedy that is almost unique in the modern history of the peoples of the world. The reason for that tragedy, as everyone knows, is that that people was the victim of a Zionist, colonialist plot which, during a first stage, divided up their homeland and then chased the real inhabitants from the occupied lands, thus imposing extremely difficult conditions on them for more than a third of a century. Those who remain in their occupied homeland, Palestine, have been subjected to iniquitous laws and procedures stemming from the occupation which has deprived them of their most elementary political, social and human rights. Terrorism, discrimination, racism, massacres have been inflicted on them.

125. The barbaric and hideous actions and criminal methods of the leaders of the Zionist movement, who invaded Palestine from all the European countries before the occupation, demonstrate clearly their inhuman Nazi tendencies. The best known of these leaders is without any doubt Menachem Begin, the present Prime Minister of the Zionist entity. That man's history and his political life, marked by crime, massacre and destruction, are very clear proof of the aims of these leaders who came to the land of Palestine from abroad.

126. Begin was one of the important members of what was called at the time the freedom party. In its organiza-

tion, its history, its political philosophy and its social features, that party resembles nazism and fascism. It was established by former members and followers of the fanatical terrorist, rightest organization, the Irgun.

127. On 4 December 1948, *The New York Times*, an American newspaper, published a message from Jewish leaders in the United States, from which I quote: "Among the most disturbing phenomena of our time is the emergence in the newly created State of Israel of the 'Freedom Party'."\*

128. It is very surprising to see a large number of American citizens, with a good reputation as patriots, welcoming Menachem Begin. They declared their support for him during his most recent visit to the United States, which he made for the purpose of obtaining the greatest support for his party and for himself in the scheduled Israeli elections, which took place only a few months ago.

129. It is really difficult to understand how those who have always worked against fascism throughout the world can lend assistance to Begin and his movement, with all the criminal acts they carry out. Indeed, the scope of that movement is unequalled by any other Fascist party. Proof of this is the deeds done in the Palestinian village of Deir Yassin. The butchery of human beings carried out at that time reflects the morality and conduct of this "freedom party" led by Menachem Begin today. That party has launched fanatical religious and extremist chauvenistic propaganda campaigns, constantly reaffirming the idea of racial superiority. Begin's allegations of his love for democracy and other humanitarian principles cannot wipe out these repugnant facts or make us forget his record and that of his party, and their actions in Palestine—actions of which no other party in the world has ever been guilty. This Fascist party has practised terrorism and violence not only against Palestinian inhabitants but against anyone—Jew, Arab or British—not believing in the stated aim: the sovereignty of the Zionist State.

130. All those who cherish peace, security and freedom in the world have the duty to work sincerely and fruitfully to unmask the real nature of this party and its leadership, represented by Begin, in the entire world and particularly in the United States. It is truly disheartening to see the Zionist leaders in the United States—despite all the trustworthy information available to them on what Begin and his Fascist party really represent—refusing to take any action or engage in any activity whatever against Begin's policy and his criminal efforts and attitude, or to unmask the dangers that these practices entail for the future of the Jews, inside and outside the occupied territory. Begin's partisans continue, with great enthusiasm, to support him and his Fascist policy.

131. One very important and positive initiative in this respect was a message signed and published by Albert Einstein, Sidney Hook, Simon Sellman, Hannah Arendt and others, which revealed a large number of significant truths about Begin and his party and called on all parties concerned to abstain from giving any support to this Fascist movement led by Begin. But we ask ourselves what effect that initiative had in awakening Americans and making them aware of what the facts are about Begin and his fascism and racism and about the dangers of the support given to him and his party by the United States.

132. The great tragedy is not the refusal of the Zionist leaders in the United States to undertake a campaign against Begin's crimes, but the fact that American leaders have discovered that Israel and the United States have a common interest. That is clear from statements by the Reagan Administration, which regards Israel as a friend and an ally. Thus the United States, in spite of 33 years of warnings, surprises us with an agreement of strategic co-operation with Israel and its leaders, while Israel occupies all the Palestinian territory and the territories of three Arab States.

133. Indeed, the United States recently signed with Israel an agreement based on the policy of expansion and aggression, for Israel believes that its existence is based essentially on the destruction of Palestine and of its Arab people. Begin signed that strategic agreement a very short time after the Israeli air attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations and after having killed hundreds of innocent civilians in Lebanon and destroyed a large part of Beirut.

134. Expressions of sympathy, regret or condemnation by the Reagan Administration at the time of the Israeli aggression against the Iraqi reactor and against Lebanon were aimed at misleading opinion, because it is clear that all the combat aircraft and all the weapons used by Israel against the Arab States and the Palestinian fighters are, in fact, American aircraft and weapons offered to Israel from time to time by the United States Government at no cost. It is clear also that Israel could never have committed such acts of aggression without the assistance and support of the United States.

135. Despite all the advice continually given to the United States leaders by friends that it should adhere to the values and principles in which the American people believe, these leaders seem fated to commit the same errors and the same sins against the Palestinian people and the Arab nation. Furthermore, these errors become more serious every time a new American Administration is elected.

136. In the last three decades there has been a descending curve of American opposition to the Zionist movement and its influence over the United States Administration. Given that weakness, the Zionist Israeli leaders evidence an unbridled desire to increase their control, influence and hegemony over that Administration, to the extent of establishing legal bases in Washington.

137. The disinformation spread by the Israeli occupation authorities is taken at face value by the United States Administration. The American media, continuously aligned with Israeli positions, especially under the Reagan Administration, provide further proof of this.

138. President Reagan has said that he does not consider illegal the Israeli settlements in the occupied Arab territories in the West Bank and that he would prefer Jerusalem to be "unified" under Israeli domination. This is in flagrant contradiction with the official position adopted by the United States on the question of Israeli settlements and the illegal annexation of Jerusalem.

139. On the other hand, that attitude is in conformity with the successive allegations of Zionist leaders who claim that the Palestinian nation and the Palestinian people do not exist. Twelve years ago Golda Meir, then Prime Minister of the Zionist entity, said in an important statement that the Palestinian people did not exist, that, rather, there was a problem of Arab refugees. President

\*Quoted in English by the speaker.

Reagan, in a similar statement, said that the Palestinian problem does not exist but that there exists simply a question of Arab refugees. That statement was made at a time when the Palestinian cause had become an irrefutable fact, recognized by the highest international bodies. The statement was made also after important developments had taken place in the positions and policies of a large number of States and persons concerned in the question. It turned a blind eye to an irrefutable fact acknowledged even by some Zionists who have started to speak about Palestinians in Judea, in Samaria and in the Gaza Strip. If President Reagan does not understand that fact, he need only look at the resolutions and positions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, or at the heroic struggle now being waged by the Palestinian people under the leadership of the PLO, its sole legitimate representative, to attain its inalienable rights.

140. As for Mrs. Kirkpatrick, the United States representative, she is opposed to the existence of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories. While the majority of the international community approved the establishment of that Committee, Mrs. Kirkpatrick has recently made some statements and written some articles completely consonant with the Zionist logic that has been rejected by the United Nations and by all the peoples of the world struggling against colonialism, discrimination and racism.

141. During the Security Council debate last June on the Zionist aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations, Mrs. Kirkpatrick said that Iraq's refusal to recognize two earlier resolutions of the Council, 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), was an important factor in the consideration of Israel's attack on Iraq. It was as if she wanted us to recognize the Zionist occupation of all the Palestinian territory and of the territories of three other Arab States in exchange for a guarantee of avoidance of aggression against Iraq. Her opinions would provide a justification for aggression by any State against another State on the pretext that the latter refused to recognize a United Nations resolution.

142. We have a question to put to Mrs. Kirkpatrick: What does she think of a State that has rejected dozens of resolutions of the Security Council, the General Assembly and various committees? What does she think of a country like Israel that each day defies the international community, deliberately disregards its will and shows contempt for international practice and international law?

143. The opposition of the United States to the existence of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population in the Occupied Territories is exactly the same as the opposition to the existence of an international committee elected at Nuremberg because it disregarded the condition of 110,000 American citizens of Japanese origin who had been removed by force from their land and transferred to other places or to concentration camps for the duration of the war, simply because of their race. This strange logic is very surprising; it has no acceptable basis. Yet it was advanced by President Reagan in defence of the treacherous Camp David agreements and to denigrate the Palestinian people and disavow the rights of the Arab States that have rejected Camp David and its unjust agreements.

144. In recent years several peace plans have been born. They have all been doomed to failure because of the position of the Zionists, who continue to refuse to withdraw

from the occupied territories. Some authors of such plans have not escaped assassination—for instance, Count Bernadotte, who paid with his life for his initiative when he was assassinated by the terrorist Stern Gang, led by the notorious terrorist Shamir, now the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Zionist entity.

145. Why, then, have the Israelis now accepted the Camp David agreements? The reason, as can easily be seen, is that the Camp David framework "for peace" is the first plan that has made it legitimate for the Israeli leaders to annex the occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip and legally to deny the national rights of the Palestinians to their territory and their homeland. For example, the Camp David documents make no allusion to the inadmissibility of annexation of the territories of others by means of war, but they confirm the security of all the States of the region. The Camp David agreements omit the provision in Security Council resolution 242 (1967) calling for the withdrawal of Israeli troops, but they confirm the necessity of putting an end to the hostility among the States of the region and confirm the right of those States to live in peace within secure and recognized borders. Resolution 242 (1967) is an unjust resolution in so far as the rights of the Palestinian people are concerned; the Camp David agreements intentionally change that resolution for the benefit of Israel's colonialist and expansionist aims in the region. But the claim is made, wrongly and falsely, that these treacherous agreements are based solely on that Security Council resolution.

146. Iraq, in calling on the Arab nation to oppose the Camp David agreements, was motivated by its unshakable conviction and its clear perception that those agreements amounted only to recognition of aggression and occupation and to surrender to the Zionist enemy and recognition of the legitimacy of its occupation of Palestine and the territories of three other Arab States. At the same time, those accords constitute a denial of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and its just struggle to regain those rights.

147. Iraq has in the past firmly opposed any suspicious initiatives the objective of which has been to liquidate the Palestinian question. It will continue to oppose any plan that disregards the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, struggling for its total independence, its sovereignty, its right to self-determination on its own land.

148. Iraq is a freedom-loving country which believes in peace based on justice. It seeks and promotes just solutions guaranteeing all the inalienable rights of the parties to the conflict. It is thus evident that it will welcome any initiative designed to ensure complete recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people and the Arab nation, rights acknowledged by the international community and confirmed by legal and historic facts.

149. The Zionist danger is to be seen not only in the total absorption of Palestinian territory and the territories of three other Arab States, nor only in the constant Zionist expansionism and the repeated Zionist acts of aggression against Lebanon, its violations of Saudi Arabian and Jordanian airspace, its brutal aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations last June. That danger has taken concrete form in the Zionist entity's alliance with another racist régime which has the same fanatical basis and the same expansionist ideology: I am referring to Khomeini's charlatan régime. The Zionist authorities have begun to provide that racist régime with weapons and other war

*matériel*, as well as food and medical supplies, to help it to continue its war of aggression against Iraq, in the hope that the Khomeini régime will finally be able to achieve one part of its objective of domination of the Arab world.

150. Everyone is of course aware that a few months ago an Argentine aircraft crashed in Soviet territory after having delivered some weapons to Teheran. Although the Iranian authorities have tried to deny this military co-operation with the Zionist entity, the president of what is called the Consultative Assembly, Rafsanjani, admitted on 25 November—as reported by the Kuwait Press Agency, on the basis of a broadcast by Radio Teheran—that there was co-operation between the two régimes in regard to the supply of weapons. The Agency reported that during a meeting of the High Council for National Defence of Iran, Rafsanjani claimed that his country's purchases of military equipment from the Zionist entity were in reimbursement for an earlier Israeli debt. He went on to say that his régime did not really want the debt to be paid by the Zionist entity through the supply of weapons, but that the High Council for National Defence had decided during a meeting to take these weapons from the Zionist entity but not to reveal the amount of money due, the kind of weapons furnished by Tel Aviv or the way in which the operation had been concluded.

151. We in Iraq were not at all surprised by this suspicious collusion between those two régimes—those of Iran and of the Zionist entity. We learned of it right away. Moreover, we firmly believe that the racist and expansionist character of the two régimes and their backward, rightist leaders are important factors which they have exploited to establish the alliance between them.

152. Israel occupies the neighbouring territories; the Khomeini régime continues to occupy three Arab islands, Greater Tunb, Lesser Tunb and Abu Musa, and it has not to this day shown any intention of withdrawing from them. The Begin régime arrests thousands of Palestinian fighters and subjects them to all forms of torture; the Khomeini régime has in its prisons tens of thousands of citizens who had been arrested for resisting the régime of the Shah and who thus had been in the vanguard of the revolutionaries who brought about his downfall.

153. Iraq, with its courageous soldiers, its people's army and its people's militia, is fighting today under the command of President Saddam Hussein, that well-known, courageous Arab warrior, to turn back Khomeini's attempts to occupy our territory, destroy our villages and massacre innocent citizens. We shall continue the fight until Khomeini gives in to reality and gives up his arrogance, his aggression and his expansionist and racist attitude and recognizes our legitimate rights and those of the other Arab States.

154. I think it is appropriate here to remind the Assembly what Lord Caradon said in 1979 about the Camp David agreements, in his "Report on the Middle East":

"We were surprised when we finally understood that the fears had been allayed by the separate peace agreements between Israel and Egypt, other questions having been laid aside."

By "other questions" Lord Caradon meant the future of the Palestinians and that of Jerusalem. He continued:

"Another fact is coming to light: Prime Minister Menachem Begin has started to make a series of public

statements. Although the term 'framework for peace' has been used, he has repeatedly spoken of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and has confirmed his agreement on all the points in it. President Reagan has repeatedly announced that he has succeeded in opposing the conditions of the agreements providing for the rejection of the acquisition of territory by war."

He said also, as reported in the American press, that

"on 12 September 1978 Begin made a statement hostile to the Palestinians, saying that there would be no referendum on the West Bank or on the Gaza Strip, that there would never be a Palestinian State, whatever the conditions, and that there would never be any agreement or contacts with the Palestine Liberation Organization."

Lord Caradon concluded, "Those statements clearly show the duplicity involved in the promise that has been given—that is, autonomy for the Palestinians". Lord Caradon went even further, saying he believed that the Camp David agreements and the other agreements following them were only a subterfuge and a trick so far as the establishment of a lasting peace was concerned and that no one was interested any more.

155. The former United States Ambassador to Saudi Arabia, Mr. James Akins, said in an interview published in *Arab Perspective* in July 1980:

"The President believes that Camp David is a continuous process, a step towards the peace he desires. He is determined that this should be so and is not willing to admit the errors which people are telling him about. He told me that as a result of the Camp David agreements there would be no more Israeli settlements on the West Bank or the Gaza Strip."

The very same day, during a speech in New York, Begin called the President a liar saying:

"We shall continue to establish settlements. We shall continue the annexation of the West Bank. Anyone who claims that there has been a change in the policy of the Israeli Government is implying that that policy is inconsistent."

156. President Carter was humiliated by Begin after that statement was made. Mr. Akins, in the same interview, said, "President Carter speaks of the autonomy of the West Bank, but everybody knows what is meant by 'autonomy'". When the definition was given by the Israelis for the first time, I compared it to that of the South African bantustans. That aroused some rather harsh criticism from Israel and its supporters. But when Begin gave his definition of autonomy, I presented my apologies to South Africa, because it became clear that the bantustans in South Africa probably had more freedom and independence than the West Bank under what is called "autonomy"

157. The aim of Begin's statements, the Zionist policy in the occupied Palestinian territories and the repeated acts of aggression against the Palestinian people in Lebanon is very clear: the total and lasting domination of the territories that have fallen under Israel's yoke. The American leaders, instead of admitting the facts and the evidence and then trying to settle the problem, are obstinately continuing to give unlimited assistance to Israel, encouraging it in its acts of aggression and expansion. They also con-

tinue to encourage Israel to attack Arabs, the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and the United Nations itself because of their continued refusal to recognize the Camp David agreements and their insistence on guaranteeing the rights of the Palestinian people. The United States has said that it would never allow any action to be taken within the framework of the United Nations that violates the sacred character of resolution 242 (1967). We say that neither resolution 242 (1967) nor the Camp David agreements are sacred. What is sacred is the rights of the struggling Palestinian people, and we do not wish to see those rights violated.

158. Mr. MOUMIN (Comoros): The cause of the people of Palestine has become one of the permanent problems on the agenda of the Organization.

159. We are today meeting here again to discuss the question of Palestine, as those before us have been doing since 1948. This question is as old as the United Nations itself.

160. The United Nations has lived with this question since its own inception, as did the League of Nations before it, because it is one of the thorniest issues demanding a just solution, and its continuance constitutes a heavy burden on the conscience of all humanity because of its great threat to international peace and security.

161. In its 35 years of existence this body has left no stone unturned in order to ease tensions in the Middle East. Resolutions have been adopted based on principles of justice and peace, only to remain on paper while there in the arena of conflict Zionist Israel applies racism and the law of the jungle with impunity, using violence, brutality and terrorism and contemptuously defying world public opinion and all the laws and principles upheld by civilized humanity.

162. Indeed, since its admission to the United Nations in 1949 and although it entered into a commitment to observe the rules of the Organization, Israel has ridden roughshod over everything that does not accord with its own ambitions and interests, that is to say, its expansion from the Nile to the Euphrates. It is not content with the territory it obtained under resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947, which partitioned Palestine. It seeks to expand further by means of wars of aggression.

163. If the question of Palestine has not found a solution up to this very day and continues to elude any comprehensive solution by the United Nations, it is not because of any lack of effort by this body, but mainly because Israel has persistently refused to comply with its resolutions and recommendations.

164. There can be very little new to say on an issue that has been debated for the last 33 years, and having heard the brilliant exposé of the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Mr. Massamba Sarré of Senegal [80th meeting], and that of the Head of the Political Department of the PLO, Mr. Farouk Kaddoumi [*ibid.*], who have catalogued the various new crimes and aggressions committed by Zionist Israel against the Arab people, my delegation has very little to add except to reiterate the basic position of the Government of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros concerning this question, a position that has been presented on various occasions and may be summarized as follows.

165. First, my Government has repeatedly confirmed its commitment to the rights of the Palestinian people and recognizes the PLO as their sole legitimate representative. Secondly, the question of Palestine is at the heart of the problem of the Middle East, and consequently no solution to the Middle East problem can be envisaged without taking into account the rights of the Palestinian people. Those rights include the right to return to their land and property, their right to self-determination, independence and national sovereignty and, in simple terms, the right to establish their own independent State in Palestine. Thirdly, the participation of the PLO, the sole representative of the Palestinian people, on an equal footing with all other parties on the basis of General Assembly resolutions 3236 (XXIX) and 3375 (XXX), is indispensable in all efforts, deliberations and conferences on the Middle East. Fourthly, the acquisition of territory by force is inadmissible, and therefore the obligation devolves upon Israel to withdraw completely and quickly from all territory so occupied. Fifthly, my Government rejects all Israeli measures which are contrary to international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and binding international conventions, particularly those concerning building settlements in occupied territories.

166. My Government also rejects the annexation of Arab Jerusalem, a matter of deep concern to two billion Moslems and Christians. For us, that city has historical and spiritual significance. It is a symbol of peace and harmony, and we therefore cannot agree to its present status, which is based on hatred, selfishness and usurpation without regard to legality or legitimacy.

167. Last but not least, the Government of the Comoros condemns the recent attack by Zionist Israel on Tamuz and its repeated acts of aggression against Lebanon.

168. Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone): For some 30 years the Palestinian people have known little else but torment and despair in their daily lives and have woken up many mornings only to find their innocent blood mixed with the debris of their camps. Now, this international forum is once again called into session to deliberate on the question of Palestine, a question that has for too long affected and for too long afflicted the life and destiny of an entire people, the Palestinian people. It is a problem that has in the recent past led to four major wars in the Middle East but which has remained unresolved and which today engages the entire region, with even greater danger and tension disturbing world peace.

169. With every day and every year that passes, not only has the agony and tragedy of the Palestinian people increased and become more and more unbearable, but the entire region of the Middle East itself has become the receptacle for increased and sophisticated weaponry that is fast transforming the entire region into a lethal powder-keg that might one day explode, with deadly consequences for the entire region and its peoples and perhaps for the whole world. Thus, the need to find a comprehensive and just solution to this problem has never been more urgent, has never been more self-evident.

170. The Sierra Leone delegation does not consider this debate ritualistic; on the contrary, for us it represents a reaffirmation of our determination to find a just and comprehensive solution to the Palestinian problem. It also affords us an opportunity to uphold, reaffirm and implement the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people—rights denied them unjustly and unfairly, and for too

long—to return to their homes and to achieve self-determination, independence and national sovereignty, which in turn would contribute to a solution of the Middle East problem. But in any case, those who would have us believe that this debate is ritualistic should search their consciences and tell us whether, if they had complied with and implemented the numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council on this matter, this debate would be taking place at all. Let them also deny that in spite of numerous United Nations resolutions, the policy of establishing settlements, the expropriation of lands, the annexation of Jerusalem, the oppression of the Palestinian people and their expulsion from their homes and lands almost on a daily basis have occurred unceasingly, thus warranting discussion of this item here in this international forum. We are here not only to bear witness against such perfidy, but with a view to finding a solution to the core of the problem, namely the Palestinians.

171. The Head of the Political Department of the PLO, Mr. Farouk Kaddoumi, addressing the Assembly earlier in this debate, complained that at the current session the question of Palestine would have completed its thirty-sixth year at the United Nations. He went on to state that every year we meet here once, and sometimes twice or more, to debate, discuss and formulate resolutions and adopt them by an overwhelming majority. Those resolutions are then deposited with the Secretariat, while his people wait for them to be implemented, but to no avail. It is such an attitude of inactivity, I dare say, that not only harms the just cause of the Palestinian people but entails serious consequences for the authority of the United Nations and its ability and willingness to maintain world peace.

172. It has become the standard practice of the representative of Israel, like that of the racist régime in Pretoria, to accuse the members of the Assembly of partiality whenever the question of Palestine or the Middle East is discussed in this forum. By dint of such unfounded accusations, Israel hopes that it will escape members that the General Assembly, in resolution 181 (II), partitioned Palestine into a Jewish State, a Palestinian Arab State and a *corpus separatum* for the city of Jerusalem, but that contrary to that resolution and to a solution of the tragedy of the Palestinian people, the international community has been able to witness only the partial implementation of that resolution, with the creation of Israel in 1948 and all the dire consequences that have followed for the Palestinian people.

173. Since its creation, Israel has embarked on a policy of deliberately usurping the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and independence, and in the course of the past 33 years it has occupied the entire territory that was Palestine under the Mandate. In addition, it is carrying out a policy of territorial aggrandizement, to the detriment of Syria, Jordan and Lebanon. It is because such policies are not only inimical to the Palestinian people but also immoral and manifestly illegal that they have revolted the conscience of mankind and of the overwhelming majority of the membership of the Organization.

174. The acquisition of territory by conquest is illegal, and no amount of legal chicanery or persuasion could confer legality on this illegal act. Security Council resolution 242 (1967) does not and cannot confer legality, and if it had attempted to do so, either through ambiguity or interpretation, it would have been intrinsically void *ab initio* even without the objection of the Palestinian people

and the other affected parties. The principle of non-acquisition of territory by force is a peremptory norm of international law which permits of no ambiguous construction.

175. It is against this background and not from any other motive that Sierra Leone, and I dare say the overwhelming majority of the membership of the Organization, has called for the implementation of General Assembly resolution 181 (II), for the establishment of a sovereign independent Palestinian State on the West Bank, in the Gaza Strip and in East Jerusalem.

176. Consequently, and in the view of my Government, the notion of some form of Israeli-enforced autonomy for the Palestinians is as incomprehensible as it is insupportable, for nothing short of an independent Palestinian State in fulfilment of the Palestinian people's imprescriptible right of self-determination will put an end to their agony and destruction of life and property and the continued danger to international peace and security posed by the persistence of the problem. Furthermore, such enforced autonomy bypasses the central issue of the Middle East problem, which is essentially the question of the national State of the Palestinian people. My Government also finds incomprehensible and insupportable in law, logic or morality, or indeed in the paramount interests of peace, the continued annexation of Jerusalem by Israel and the maintenance thereof of its capital. Such a policy only sets back the process of peace.

177. My Government, therefore, again calls upon Israel to have the courage, the determination and the basic humanity to let the Palestinian people have what was granted to them 34 years ago, namely, the right to self-determination and to a State of their own, within which they would be able to mould and shape their own destiny. My Government is firm in its belief that the implementation of resolution 181 (II), in all its various facets, will enable the conflicting national aspirations involved to find substantial expression and qualify both peoples to take their places as independent nations in the international community and in the United Nations.

178. In conclusion, the Sierra Leone Government takes this opportunity to reaffirm its support for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty and to return to their homes and property, from which they were displaced and uprooted. My Government also reaffirms its recognition of the Palestinian people as a principal party in the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East and the PLO as their authentic representative.

179. Mr. MAITAMA-SULE (Nigeria): The question of Palestine remains one of the major sources of international tension and conflict in the world today. Unlike any other area of tension, the situation in the Middle East presents the world with the immediate danger of a global war, because the super-Powers have a direct and vital interest in that strategic area. It is a complex and difficult problem, the solution of which calls for a display of great and imaginative statesmanship.

180. It is easy enough to outline the basic elements of the question of Palestine. First, it is the contention of my Government that the claim of the people of Palestine to their own homeland is legitimate and just. The situation now prevailing is that the people of Palestine have been unjustly deprived of their homeland. They have been de-

nied the basic and elementary right of self-determination in circumstances which historically may be described as scandalous. Nigeria does not agree with the contention that the Palestinian people already have a homeland. No amount of legal or diplomatic quibbles will change the basic fact that the people of Palestine are now without a State, a nation, and that since the creation of Israel in 1948 the Palestinians have become refugees in their own homeland. The people of Palestine have been wronged and are entitled to the restoration of their basic human rights.

181. Secondly, peace has eluded the Middle East because the direct interests of the people of Palestine have not been taken into account in all previous attempts to resolve the problem. We believe that any negotiations for a settlement which does not take into account the quest of the people of Palestine for a homeland is bound to fail. For this reason it is essential that the PLO, which is recognized by the United Nations as the legitimate representative of the people of Palestine, be included in any future negotiations on the question of Palestine. To do otherwise would be like playing "Hamlet" without the Prince.

182. Thirdly, it is our conviction that there are other Powers with legitimate interests in the area and that those Powers also have a vital role in the solution of the conflict in the Middle East. In this connection, we believe that the European initiative of June 1980 for a comprehensive Middle East peace conference, which failed to gain momentum, deserves serious attention. Neither super-Power acting entirely on its own or in conjunction with any of its allies is capable of solving this tragic conflict. In addition, other Arab countries with a legitimate interest in the issue should participate in such a conference, without which the tension in the area will continue.

183. With regard to the policies of Israel, the position and views of my Government have been clearly stated in the past. First, we fully support the demand for the withdrawal of Israel from all occupied Arab land. There can be no partial withdrawal. Israel will have to withdraw completely and simultaneously from all occupied Arab land in accordance with General Assembly resolution ES-7/2. Furthermore, we deplore and strongly condemn the creation on the West Bank of Jewish settlements in breach of both Security Council and General Assembly resolutions on this question. This has exacerbated the situation in the Middle East and has added further difficulties to a situation that is grave and difficult enough.

184. In addition, my Government strongly deplores the inhuman and degrading treatment being meted out by the Israeli forces to the people of Palestine, particularly on the West Bank. It is incomprehensible that a people that suffered so much at the hands of Nazi Germany should now inflict the same treatment on others who had nothing to do with Jewish suffering.

185. Israel's purported annexation of Jerusalem remains an affront, a sore point not only with the Arabs but with Islamic people everywhere. So is its continuous desecration of the Holy Places in Jerusalem, a desecration which we condemn strongly.

186. What can be done now? It is my Government's view that a durable, negotiated settlement should contain the following elements. First, a peace conference should involve all Powers with a legitimate interest in the question. The European proposals are, for that reason, acceptable to my Government. Secondly, any settlement arrived

at should include the restoration to the people of Palestine of a homeland of their own. Thirdly, there should be a complete and simultaneous withdrawal of Israel from all occupied Arab land to recognized and secure boundaries which can be guaranteed collectively by the Security Council. Fourthly, the purported annexation of Jerusalem should be declared null and void. My Government is absolutely convinced that any settlement that does not include these basic elements will not lead to a durable peace in the Middle East.

187. Before concluding I should like to pay a warm, personal tribute to my dear brother and colleague, the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Mr. Massamba Sarré of Senegal, for his untiring efforts to resolve the problem of Palestine.

188. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): I call on the Observer of the League of Arab States, in conformity with General Assembly resolution 477 (V).

189. Mr. MAKSoud (League of Arab States) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The debate on the question of Palestine in the General Assembly has become an occasion for the international community to affirm its commitment to the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, its unconditional condemnation of Israel's violation of those rights and its total rejection of Israeli practices, including the incessant and increasing excesses in the occupied Arab territories.

190. The debate also affords the international community an opportunity to expose the behaviour of the Zionist entity for what it is—a carbon copy of the actions of all racists, Fascist and colonialist régimes of contemporary history. Indeed, this debate goes in accurate detail into the new dimensions that Israel has added to the abhorrent policy of colonialist settlements and racial discrimination, as the report of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People [A/36/35] makes so vividly clear. The community of nations, through the current debate, has a chance to discover the magnitude of Israel's attempts to achieve its aggressive, expansionist aims, and to realize the dangers inherent in those objectives, a realization that should confirm the conviction that Israel's policies and actions constitute a real threat to peace.

191. Moreover, the debate is proof of the international community's determination that any review of the Palestinian case must centre on the fact that that issue is the core and root cause of the conflict in the Middle East and that no solution is possible unless the Palestinians are guaranteed their legitimate national rights and are assured of the opportunity to decide their own destiny, including the establishment of an independent State in their homeland.

192. The General Assembly also has an opportunity to clarify various positions and to highlight the isolation not only of those who assist, directly or otherwise, Israel's objectives in the region, but of those who are not firm towards Israel. Israel interprets that attitude as a licence to persist in its violations of the sovereignty of the Arab States, in its scorched-earth policies, its annexation of land and its harsh repression of the rights and liberties of the Palestinians under its occupation.

193. The debate on the question of Palestine, finally, brings the international community face to face with

Zionist ideology, which explains Israel's perception that it is immune to any questioning, scepticism or opposition by the rest of the world. Indeed, Israel takes the line that any such opposition to, or condemnation of, its behaviour stems from reasons and motives unrelated to its actions and conduct.

194. Zionist ideology rests on the thesis that the ends justify the means until Israel accomplishes all its objectives. As long as those aims remain unrealized, Israel is not prepared to heed, much less obey, any international resolutions or views, even those supported by its few remaining allies.

195. Israel not only refuses to be accountable to any authority in the world but acts as if the world must be accountable to it. This arrogance is a natural reflection of Zionist thinking, which at one and the same time defines Israeli behaviour and absolves Israel of any international, legal or humanitarian responsibilities or responsibilities to civilization. This pernicious ideology, in fact, has imbued Israel with the belief that the larger Zionist entity, whose parameters have yet to be fixed, must be established at all costs. So far those costs include the violation of the rights of the Palestinian people, aggression against the Arab States, disregard for international law and the Charter of the United Nations and violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and United Nations resolutions, not to mention brazen rebuffs to world public opinion and even to Israel's own few supporters.

196. Moreover, the Zionist concept of discriminating between Jews and the rest of mankind and the insistence that such discrimination is necessary and permanent reinforce Israel's determination to establish a system that by definition is antithetical to all humanistic, organic, secular and rational ideas of nationalism. Zionism emphasizes for the Jew the reality of alienation, but, like anti-Semitism, it transforms the differences between the Jew and the rest of mankind into hard evidence of the inevitable separation of the two. Thus, Zionists come to perceive non-Jews not only as "other", but also, in varying degrees, as adversaries, even enemies.

197. That is why Israel and the Zionist movement regard any questioning of, or scepticism about, these actions as indications of hostility and evidence of antagonism to their objectives. It is as if Israel were telling the world: "You are in the dock and, to the extent that you remain silent about Israeli actions Israel will not take umbrage at your hostility; and as long as you—the world—do not impede the achievement of Zionist objectives, Israel will try to coexist with the rest of the world". Israel, in effect, is offering the world two choices: helping it achieve all its aims or, failing that, abandoning any role in the conflict between Israel and those who resist its objectives, its aggression, its expansionism, its racism and its very being.

198. In other words, Israel predicates its relationship with the international community on its continuing ability to blackmail the nations of the world and to perceive them as hostages to its threats. Such an attitude permits Israel to scorn international resolutions and opinion, to persist in insulting the United Nations, as the representative of Israel did from this rostrum, by preventing the enforcement of its decisions and to destroy the credibility of United Nations organs when they are assigned even limited roles in this regard.

199. Therefore, as the ideological and philosophic underpinning of Israel, Zionism should be closely studied and watched. The world should realize that it is dealing with a movement which, though it shares most of the characteristics of colonialist and racist entities of contemporary history, has unique attributes that have encouraged Israel to behave as if it were exempt from international standards and values and to expect the rest of the world to accept as a given fact the legitimacy of that exemption.

200. Zionism, by its deliberate separatism, its disdain for shared values and its refusal to comply with international laws, forces upon the international community the need to understand Zionist tenets and motives, as well as the circumstances of the growth of Zionism and its permanence. It is impossible to separate Israeli behaviour from Zionist ideology, because Israel is the product and instrument of Zionism, and Israel's intransigence can be understood only in the context of the racist, segregationist and isolationist concepts of Zionism. In this will be found the reason why Israel treats the Palestinians in their own homeland as if they were human obstacles to the realization of Zionist aims in all of Palestine. Israeli policy dictates that if the Palestinians stand in the way of Zionist interests, then they have to be removed by expulsion, dispersion, persecution, terrorism or outright destruction.

201. The more the Palestinian people prove that their unity is national and organic, the more intense the Zionists' determination becomes to remove Palestinians as impediments. In fact, Israel has reached an irrational stage in its attempts to prevent at all costs any affirmation of the Palestinian identity or achievement of Palestinian self-determination or the restoration of the national, juridical and natural rights of the Palestinians. But even Zionists are beginning to question some aspects of this irrational attitude in the face of the clear determination of the Palestinians to establish the validity of their existence and to regain their rights, all their rights. Zionism postulates that the Palestinians are prone to political extinction. Yet, despite their dispersion and the repression and terrorism they suffer under Israeli occupation, the Palestinians have proved their strength as a counter to that occupation and have shown that they are able to mobilize their nationalism in ways that assure success for the Palestinian cause.

202. It is an irrefutable reality that the PLO is the framework of Palestinian unity and the source of leadership for the Palestinian struggle. That alone makes amply clear that the Palestinians are at the heart of the Middle East problem and that there can be no stability or peace in the region without guaranteeing all their rights without restriction. Indeed, in addition to the historical tasks it has shouldered, the PLO has become a force which restores to the region a balance that is valid, equitable and logical. Moreover, the PLO today represents the effective answer to all Zionist attempts to eradicate the Palestinians as a people, so much so that the Zionists themselves are in disarray, thus permitting Israel's own extremists to hold sway and slam the door on any change that would lead to rational solutions.

203. As Zionism sinks deeper into its historic dilemma, Israel becomes more and more prey to discord and escalates its aggression and its expansion, signalling a hidden fear of the reckoning that must come, as if aggression were a means of delaying the day when Israel must confront itself.

204. When Zionism begins to feel that those in whose name it claims to speak are wavering in support of the policies billed as the "solution" for what has been called the Jewish problem, and when, in fact, the Zionist ideology is unmasked as the other side of the anti-Semitic coin, that is when we see the Zionists conjuring up crises. They create those tensions to silence any Jewish doubts about the soundness of the philosophy of Zionism and the veracity of its claims.

205. These crises also serve to cover up the contradictions within Zionist ranks, thus seeking to preserve the lie that any criticism or condemnation of Zionist policies is a mortal danger to Israel, which is advertised as the ultimate refuge for the world's Jews and as the guarantor of their continued existence as a people.

206. Zionism insists that Israel is qualified to represent the Jews of the world—historically, currently and in the future—and that it is the heir to Jewish destiny. Thus Israel's statehood rests in part on the alliance between Zionism and the West, based on Western guilt towards the Jews. Under this arrangement, Israel absolves the West for what the West did, in varying degrees, to its own Jews in the past; in return, the West absolves Israel for its persecution, dispersion and repression of the Palestinians today and for what it plans to do to them later unless it is deterred.

207. This mutual absolution is one of the real obstacles preventing the West in general from translating its assessment of the Middle East crisis into policy and its correct reading of the issues into action. To some extent, this explains why resolutions on the Palestinian question that have been endorsed by the majority of nations fail to win the support of the Western States.

208. The issue of mutual absolution and the attendant Western reluctance to move from consensus to resolution are exploited by Israel to intensify this duality in the West, and especially in the United States, between word and deed, between policy planning and execution and between announced and actual positions. Hence the extraordinary Western caution in dealing with Israeli excesses and the ambiguous condemnation of violence in general, when what is needed is a clear and categorical denunciation of blatant Israeli aggression.

209. Perhaps the best example of this duality and confusion of judgement is the silence of some member States of the European Community, which under United States pressure, have expressed willingness to participate in the Sinai multinational force, about the humiliating conditions Israel is imposing on them. Their silence is the more peculiar because the projected Sinai force is part of the Camp David accords, which have been generally considered ineffectual, even harmful, by the European Community.

210. Israel, for its part, has turned the Camp David accords into a veritable trap for those that touch them. It insists that deviation from the agreements disqualifies any party from participation in the search for a solution. Israel opposes European participation in the Sinai force on the basis that the European Community's Venice Declaration on the Middle East in 1980 disqualifies its members from any role in the crisis.

211. Yet the American Secretary of State, in a hurried meeting with Israeli officials on 27 November, assured Israel that giving the Camp David agreements some interna-

tional legality was more important than the announced European positions, which he characterized as rhetoric. We should like to ask whether this is true. We should like to know whether the position of the European Community countries towards the Arab-Israeli conflict, especially in regard to the rights of the Palestinian people, is nothing more than words, as the American Secretary of State implied, or if that position is, as we imagine, a considered and serious one.

212. The Arab nations wonder whether the decision of the four European States to take part in the Sinai multinational force was an expression of a real desire to do so, or if they gave in to American pressure to cast an "international" mantle over the Camp David accords, which had been internationally rejected. It is clear that the participation of some members of the European Community in the Sinai force has been described in some Camp David quarters as the way for the Europeans to gain a role in solving the Middle East crisis. But what the members of the European Community may not realize is that the parties to the Camp David accords have already blocked any role for the Europeans in achieving any solution of the central issue in the Middle East, that is, the Palestinian question.

213. It is regrettable that the European Community should succumb to American pressure aimed at giving the Camp David accords a semblance of respectability through a European presence in the Sinai, especially since it indicates failure to consider the warnings conveyed by the League of Arab States to the leaders of the European Community as part of the Arab-European dialogue which we still hope will be fruitful.

214. We have told our friends in Europe—and we continue to tell them—that whether their motives in seeking participation in the Sinai force stemmed from the nature of their strategic relationship with the United States or were based on the conviction that a European presence in the Sinai would facilitate a Middle Eastern role for the European Community later, they should consider this fact: their acceptance of the conditions of Israeli blackmail lands them in a trap and is certain to weaken their eventual role in the search for a solution and the credibility of any commitments that they may undertake now and in the future.

215. The Arab nation not only disapproves of the European decision but finds it strange, coming as it does from countries with enough experience to avoid entanglement in the web of United States policies on the Middle East and to sidestep the trap Israel has devised out of the Camp David accords. Our warning stems not from an attitude of confrontation with the Western European countries, but from a desire to preserve the dialogue between us and to strengthen our relations, as well as from our conviction that a European decision must be independent to be effective. If their decision is linked directly or indirectly to the Camp David accords, it will in our eyes be devoid of value, credibility and seriousness.

216. If I have alluded to this issue in some detail it is only because I want to shed more light on the Israeli attempt to turn the Camp David accords into a trap designed to render ineffective any international force seeking to find a just and comprehensive solution for the Middle East crisis. Moreover, Israel has shown how it has used the accords to buy more time for its efforts to obfuscate the issues so that it can continue to block any process that does not conform to its plans.

217. What is important here is to find out what the European answer will be to Israel's conditions, recently announced in the joint declaration by the United States and Israel, concerning approval of the European presence in the Sinai and to the United States interpretation that the announced positions of the countries of the European Community on the Palestinian question are mere pronouncements that in no way reflect their real attitudes.

218. Do the Europeans think we do not notice this ambiguity? Should we interpret their seeming tilt towards the Camp David framework as the result of pressure or of conviction? If the countries of the European Community are as desirous as we are to preserve the dialogue between us, then they need to answer these questions.

219. Since we debated the question of Palestine at the thirty-fifth session, there have been important developments in this issue. Apart from Israel's stubborn refusal to comply with the United Nations resolutions, its violation of international law and its persistent aggression, expansion and annexation, Israel has, in the period since the thirty-fifth session, attained a level of ferocity and barbarism intensified further by new methods of violence and terrorism.

220. In spite of the condemnation by the international community by every means at its disposal, Israel has bombed Iraq's peaceful nuclear reactor, savagely attacked the Lebanese capital of Beirut, repeatedly violated Arab airspace, closed Bir Zeit University on the West Bank, intensified its repressive measures against Palestinian citizens by the wanton demolition of their homes and indiscriminate arrests and has kept up steady attacks against defenceless refugee camps. These are telling indications that Israel is determined to continue its policy of aggression and to spare no effort to achieve its objectives, whether announced or hidden.

221. Israel arrogates to itself the right to act freely in any Arab territory targeted by Zionism's grand design. That makes aggression inevitable, subject only to timing and opportunity. It also means that treachery has become a means for Israel, violence a method, and ambiguity a habit.

222. We see that whenever the international community exposes a facet of Zionist aims and designs, Israel reacts not only with a denial of what has been revealed but with a campaign of intellectual, political and diplomatic terrorism. This indicates that the increasing international understanding of the nature and reality of Zionist objectives will precipitate an historic dilemma, which Israel wants to avoid while it tries to achieve its aims.

223. The General Assembly is well aware of the many insults Israel has heaped on the United Nations, its organs and its resolutions, and of the fact that Israel, by its shameless attacks on the international Organization, is telling the world that it will not be bound by any resolutions.

224. By its habitual defiance of the General Assembly and its resolutions, Israel is also seeking to portray itself as a force with equal international legality. Indeed, it is trying to convince itself and its remaining friends and allies that it is able to hamper the United Nations and to erode its effectiveness and credibility.

225. We noted in an earlier debate on the Palestinian question, during the thirty-fifth session [80th meeting], the need to delve into the American-Israeli collusion

which enables Israel to persist in ignoring Assembly resolutions as if they were adopted in another world. It also permits Israel to influence the United States decision-making process in a way that invalidates the role and the responsibility of that super-Power in the quest for a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East. We wondered in that debate about the reasons for such public evidence of American indecision and incapacity in the face of Israeli arrogance and aggression. We said then:

“The American hesitation about linking its practices to its beliefs makes it easier for Israel to get around American convictions and push the United States into adopting positions and practices that are often contrary to the convictions of the American decision-makers.

“This pattern of American dealings with Israel leads the United States to adopt a position which formally condemns Israeli practices but which, in reality, supports Israeli policies. Such action demonstrates the gap between the announced intentions of the United States and its actual policies”. [*Ibid.*, paras. 86 and 87.]

226. We have seen how Israel has paid hardly any attention to United Nations resolutions. Indeed, the same behaviour that drew condemnation in the past has prompted Israel to escalate its violation of the rights of the Palestinian people inside the occupied Arab territories and to intensify its wanton attacks—such as the bombing of Beirut—against more and more targets. In this regard and based on this premise, it is incumbent on the United Nations, in our view, not to stop at condemnation of Israel's acts but to fulfil its responsibility under the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter to impose sanctions in order that the international community can implement its resolutions. If the sanctions provided for by the Charter are the means of deterring the aggressor and forcing compliance with decisions taken, the United Nations cannot hesitate to resort to this option to ensure the implementation of its resolutions.

227. We have tried to avoid repetitiveness in the debates on the Palestinian question, but Israel intends to accustom the world to the notion that its aggressive behaviour, its attacks and its repressive and terroristic policies constitute a permanent and even natural condition. If the world acknowledged the inevitability of that policy, that would be an admission of helplessness in the face of aggression and of its inability to put a stop to it.

228. By its continuous defiance of United Nations resolutions and of international public opinion, Israel wants to force the world little by little to abandon the belief that the international community has an effective role to play in solving the crisis in the Middle East. In that sense, the Camp David accords were an attempt to divest the international community of that role. Furthermore, the agreements have also become a protective shield for Israel and an instrument for aggression without fear of retaliation.

229. In addition, the Camp David agreements are now used by Israel to justify its occupation of Arab lands, its expansion and its manoeuvres to create a *fait accompli* to achieve its Zionist objectives.

230. It is in this context that southern Lebanon remains an arena for Israeli acts of domination and disruption that enable it to invalidate Security Council resolutions providing for the restoration of Lebanese sovereignty over all the territory of Lebanon, especially that region.

231. Israel's aim in southern Lebanon is not only to inflict cruel suffering on the Lebanese and Palestinians in the area but effectively to eradicate the right of the Palestinians to return to their homeland. Israel thinks it can thus create a strategic and geopolitical situation that will make partition and annexation inevitable and thus permanently deny the Palestinians the right to self-determination.

232. This policy stems directly from Zionist ideology which seeks to reduce the Palestinians—now a united people aspiring to self-determination and to an independent State—to mere cast-offs of humanity in whatever land they happen to be, thus denuding them of their organic unity and identity. That is why Israel attempts to impose so-called autonomy on the Palestinians in the occupied territories, which in reality is no more than irrelevant administrative functions meant to block Palestinian basic rights.

233. These practices totally contradict the resolutions of the General Assembly, especially resolution 35/169 B. It is therefore imperative not only to reaffirm the Palestinian people's inalienable rights to self-determination and to establish an independent State but to take urgent measures to put an end to Israel's violation of the spirit and the letter of those resolutions and to enforce them in a way conforming to the objectives of the General Assembly.

234. "Autonomy" and other such provisions of the Camp David accords are nothing but a ploy to buy time for Israel so that it can implant more settlements in and impose greater restrictions on the occupied territories, with the aim of suppressing the elements of the Palestinian entity and turning occupied Palestine into an instrument of Judaization and of destroying Palestinian identity and nationalism, as has been done with the usurped part of Palestine.

235. Indeed, "autonomy" as devised in the Camp David agreements pre-empt the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, independence and the exercise of sovereignty in their own homeland. To claim that autonomy negotiations are a transitional phase is to ignore the basic Israeli position, which rejects the notion of a transition. In all the negotiations about autonomy that preceded independence in numerous countries in Africa and elsewhere, the occupying or colonial authority conceded, even before the talks, the right of the country to independence after the end of the occupation.

236. However, Israel rejects from the start the premise that the Arab land under its yoke is occupied territory. On the contrary, Israeli officials have made it quite clear that the occupied areas are destined for annexation and that the question of Israeli sovereignty in those territories could be discussed in a few years, that is, after Israel has established a new reality that would make any discussion of sovereignty a simple and futile exercise in rhetoric.

237. How else are we to explain the fact that Israel, while involved in autonomy negotiations, annexed more than 36 per cent of the occupied West Bank? What other explanations exist for Israel's action in annexing Jerusalem and declaring it its capital, when Jerusalem is recognized by the entire world as part of the occupied land?

238. Why, we ask, if Israel does not intend to seize these territories, are the Israeli authorities carrying out their policy of repression, which is clearly meant to depopulate Palestinian towns and villages and to destroy

their heritage and identity? Is there any doubt that the massive reconstruction of Jerusalem, the demolition of Palestinian houses and other buildings and the closing of schools and universities are anything but preparations for the eventual and total suppression of the Palestinian people and the denial of all their rights?

239. We do not want to dwell here on the details of what Israel has been doing in the occupied territories, but we definitely want to draw the world's attention to the fact that the other parties to the Camp David accords continue to adhere to them despite the flagrant actions of the Israelis.

240. Is the failure to provide for sanctions in the Camp David accords the price that Israel is extorting while it converts more occupied lands into usurped lands? And is the normalization of relations that Israel is forcing upon Arab Egypt the means of removing Egypt from its role in achieving the united Arab destiny and its central position in the confrontation for the establishment of the rights of the Palestinians in their own homeland?

241. We should like to declare here our conviction that Egypt, given a choice between regaining the Sinai and itself returning to its real roots, would choose to be restored to its natural national position in the leadership of the Arab nation. Such a restoration of Egypt to the Arab family would itself ensure the return of the Sinai, not as compensation or an alternative for the achievement of Palestinian rights but as part of the restoration of all Arab lands to their legitimate owners.

242. The Arab nation did not reject the Camp David accords for the sake of rejection, as some charge. Our total and final rejection of those accords was motivated by our desire to see the Palestinian people affirm their right to self-determination under the leadership of the PLO.

243. We were also motivated by our determination to regain all the occupied Arab territories undiminished; by the clear need for the United Nations to safeguard its authority and effectiveness; and by the necessity of the international community's finding a permanent, equitable and comprehensive solution for the Middle East crisis and the Palestinian question. Needless to say, such a solution must conform to the resolutions of the General Assembly and to international instruments; otherwise the law of the jungle will prevail and international peace will be in peril.

244. From this rostrum we salute the magnificent resistance of our people in the occupied territories. Their courage and determination foil Israel's attempt to entrench its occupation, undermine Israel's ability to ignore international public opinion and expose the limits of Israeli blackmail, treachery and obfuscation.

245. Our people realize that their resistance to the occupiers is not just an indication of their devotion to their rights and to their lands but is an expression of the will of the Arab nation and its determination to win back all its rights and to restore the credibility of international legality.

246. Despite the challenges that beset us we retain our faith in the effectiveness of the international Organization, but, as other speakers have noted, there are limits to our patience.

247. The world recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people is important, but it is not enough. The interna-

tional community and the Member States of the Organization must face a fundamental reality, namely that expressions of support, although they soothe wounds, are inadequate as a cure for the disease.

248. It has become imperative to transform United Nations resolutions concerning recognition and support into measures to enforce the international will as expressed in the resolutions of the General Assembly.

249. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): To allow the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee time to consider the financial implications of the draft resolutions concerning this item, voting will take place at a later date.

250. Since we have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item, I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

251. Mr. SABZALIAN (Iran): Today once again we have witnessed the double standards of Saddam's régime. While they are very loud in their words condemning the Israeli aggression, in action they do precisely what the Zionists do. What hypocrisy.

252. The statement by the Saddam delegation clearly exposes the bankrupt mentality of Saddam's régime. They imply that if a brutal Zionist murders a Palestinian it should be condemned, but that, according to the genius of Saddam and his brilliant, fair-minded representative, genocide by Saddam's army of our innocent people is apparently all right.

253. It is because of our Islamic principles that we cannot help but condemn all aggression, by anybody, at any time, anywhere. To us as Moslems aggression is aggression is aggression, whether it be aggression by the Zionist butchers against our oppressed Palestinian brothers and sisters, or the inhuman genocide of the Vietnamese people by the United States imperialists or the aggression of the savage army of apostate Saddam against our schoolchildren, hospital patients and innocent civilians—against our people as a whole.

254. Mr. Saddam, your fuzzy, cloudy words cannot hide the bright sun: you are aggressive, you have invaded our land, you are condemned by the conscience of all humanity.

255. Representative of Saddam, open your ears and listen. According to the Definition of Aggression adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 3314 (XXIX), "military occupation, however temporary . . . or any annexation by the use of force of the territory of another State or part thereof" qualifies as an act of aggression.

256. For the past fourteen and a half months, Saddam's savage but disorganized army, in continuing defiance of all international laws and the Charter of the United Nations, has been occupying our country, bombing our hospitals and schools and committing the mass murder of our innocent civilians.

257. Article 6 of the Charter of the United Nations stipulates that

"A Member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the Principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the Organization by the

General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council".

258. Mr. Saddam, how hypocritical can you get? What is the difference between the Israeli aggression against the innocent Palestinians and your atrocities against the noble peoples of Iraq and Iran?

259. After Saddam's military attack against our people, Ezer Weizman of the Zionist régime of Israel—indeed, South Africa's best friend—said, "We could never have designed a better plan for Israel than Iraq's attack on Iran". Menachem Begin also said that he was very happy when Iraq attacked Iran. Brzezinski, the security adviser to Carter said, prior to the Iraqi-imposed war, "America is out to change totally the direction of the Islamic revolution of Iran. In order to do this we must give complete support to Iraq."

260. Recently, George Ball, the notorious political wizard of the United States imperialist Government, made some revealing comments which were reported by most United States news media. He said that the United States would be better off if it could give more support to all criminal terrorists opposed to the Islamic revolutionary republic of Iran.

261. And today, interestingly but not surprisingly, Saddam's representative, in support of all those terrorist criminals, sought to challenge the only true Government our people has known in the history of our country. We think that the United States imperialists should thank the representative of Saddam for his arrogant, clownish proposal, if they have not done so already. Israel too should reward the Saddam régime for engaging the Iranian and Iraqi armies in a war of attrition that has brought only peace of mind to Zionist Israel.

262. It is precisely owing to that joint recommendation of the United States imperialists and the Zionist Israelis that the mercenary Ba'athist régime of Iraq has been able to commit every crime possible against the Islamic revolution of Iran and against the Moslem people of Iraq. I shall briefly present a picture of those crimes.

263. First there is the mass deportation of Iraqi families racially tied with the Iranians to the war front, seldom at night, to serve as a shield for Saddam's defeated army so that they can bring back order to that army, which is in disarray, knowing that our courageous fighters, because of their Islamic principles, would never fire upon innocent civilians.

264. Then there is the mistreatment, torture and murder of prominent members of the clergy and religious revolutionaries in Iraq, including the martyrdom of one of the greatest Islamic philosophers, the author of numerous invaluable books, Ayatollah Mohammad Bagher Sadre, and his learned and brilliant revolutionary sister. That was indeed a major catastrophe for the world of Islam.

265. Other crimes have included raiding Iranian schools in Iraq, imprisoning the teachers and assaulting and torturing their families. The Iraqi aggressors have also imprisoned thousands of Iranian civilians as prisoners of war, while they have treated genuine prisoners of war in the most inhuman manner possible. Reports by the International Committee of the Red Cross bear witness to the Ba'athists' cruelty. Further, the Iraqi régime recently declared officially that any Iraqi who has a wife or husband

of Iranian ancestry and divorces her or him will receive a generous prize from the Government.

266. How degenerate can the Saddam régime get?

267. Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Egyptian delegation listened with interest to what was said by the last speaker in this afternoon's debate. In this connection I should like to note that some of that speaker's ideas are worthy of study, but many of them should be rejected.

268. Egypt is an Arab country. It belongs to the Arab world and it is there that its destiny lies. It does not need anyone to confirm that. It does not care if this or that person talks disparagingly about or casts doubts on its belonging to the Arab world.

269. The return of Sinai to Egypt is inevitable. It is part and parcel of the Arab struggle and an essential component of the Egyptian struggle. Egypt is not faced, as the speaker said it was, with a choice between the return of the Sinai and its own return to the Arab ranks. These two elements are intimately linked, and we reject the strange logic of Mr. Clovis Maksoud.

270. Egypt wishes to recover its territory, whether the speaker likes it or not. The Egyptian will is to remain steadfast in the Arab ranks.

271. The return of Sinai is part of the return of the Arab land to its owner. The return of the Sinai to Egypt is not an alternative to the restoration of Palestinian rights but a step toward the return of those rights.

272. We reject the fabrications and play on words that have long influenced Arab positivism.

273. Hence we welcome the participation of the European countries and their declared position on the liberation of the Sinai, which we see as a step in the right direction. We find the position of the speaker strange, and we noticed his repeated attempts to prejudice the return of Egyptian territory to Egypt and of the Sinai to its motherland, Egypt.

274. Egypt entered into peace negotiations after 100,000 lives had been sacrificed in the Sinai, and Mr. Maksoud knows this very well. Let us have a little realistic and rational thinking instead of rhetoric and delving into convoluted philosophies, please. The return of the Sinai to Egypt and the matter of Egypt's belonging to the Arab world are not facts for Mr. Maksoud or anyone else to comment on or to prejudice. Our belonging to the Arab world is established, the liberation of our territory is one of our rights, and the maintenance of peace in the Middle East is a commitment that Egypt will stand by until the occupied Arab territories are liberated, until the rights of the Arabs are restored within the framework that has been supported in this Hall and in accordance with the resolutions and principles of the Organization.

275. Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I listened, as did other representatives, I am sure, with extreme interest to the cacophony of lies and fabrications put forward by the representative of Iran, a cacophony of lies that he makes a habit of producing every chance he gets. And here I must testify to his genius in falsifying facts and playing with words. Therefore, I am not going to answer those lies. However, I will put certain questions

to him, and I hope that he will answer those questions so that the Assembly can test the truth of what he says.

276. First, prior to the commencement of hostilities between Iraq and Iran, who occupied the other's land, Iraq or Iran?

277. Secondly, who is still occupying the three Arab islands, and why has he not relinquished them?

278. Thirdly, who has more than once declared that the Arab lands between Aden and Baghdad are Iranian Persian lands that must be recovered?

279. Fourthly, who claimed that if the Iranian army wanted to it could occupy Baghdad and we could not prevent it?

280. Fifthly, who addressed the Iraqi people as if they were a small part of Iran, and who tried to stir up the Iraqi people to rebel against the régime in Iraq?

281. Sixthly, who appealed to the Iraqi armed forces to carry out an armed rebellion against the military leadership?

282. Seventhly, who called the 1975 agreement between Algeria, Iraq and Iran the dead agreement, the suspect agreement, and said that that agreement would not be respected?

283. Eighthly, who has insisted on every occasion on the export of the Islamic revolution, and what was meant by that?

284. Ninthly, who sent saboteurs into Iraqi towns to murder children, students, and innocent civilians, and why did all those hostile acts and acts of sabotage stop completely after the hostilities began? Who bombed the frontier towns of Iraq—Khanaqin, Mandali, Zurbatiyah and Naft Khaneh—and who demolished houses and killed their innocent inhabitants? Who started bombing our economic installations in the city of Basra, and who blocked the passage of ships in the Shatt al Arab before 22 September?

285. I should like to ask here what the response of the representative of Iran is to the statements of Rafsanjani broadcast at Teheran on 25 November about the relations between that régime and the Zionist régime.

286. Tenthly, who took the initiative of accepting mediation and declared that he was ready for a truce by mutual agreement? Was it not President Saddam Hussein?

287. Eleventhly, who announces daily through all the mass media the murder of scores of innocent citizens? Is it the Iraqi régime or is it Teheran?

288. Twelfthly, who boasts of murdering children and women, including pregnant women? I read in an international newspaper that two women had been executed by a firing squad a few days earlier, and that it was discovered that both had been pregnant, and the woman who performed the final ablutions on the bodies became insane and is now in an asylum.

289. Thirteenthly, who kills Kurdish citizens every day? Is it Iraq or Iran? And against whom are the Kurds conducting their national revolution? Is it against Iran or Iraq?

290. Fourteenthly, who refuses to recognize the national rights of minorities? Is it the revolutionary régime of Iraq or is it Iran?

291. Fifteenthly, does the Iranian representative know what is going on in his country at the hands of Khomeini's intelligence service, which is the successor to SAVAK? Does he know how many have been murdered in Iran since Khomeini took power? Who claimed that only blood could purify the Islamic revolution? Does the Iranian representative know that Khomeini suffers from a serious disease, namely, that of committing crimes, because not a day passes that he does not commit murder, as was reported by the former delegate Mansour Fahig in his interview on Channel 13 of American television? Does he know that every day a number of Iranian officials resign their posts in order to join the national front which is struggling to liberate Iran from the junta of the ignorant régime in power? Lastly, does he know that the damage caused to Islam and to Moslems by Khomeini's criminal régime through oppressive and repressive measures to satisfy its bloodlust can never be effaced by time?

292. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on representatives who wish to exercise the right of reply a second time.

293. Mr. SABZALIAN (Iran): There is no way that in five minutes I can answer all those fabrications and allegations of Saddam's representative. The representative of Saddam has made many very interesting allegations against us, including the one about Radio Teheran's admission of an arms deal somehow with Zionist Israel, in their usual manner of fabrication.

294. Recently, while I was walking along a New York street and observing some of the crowded bookstores, I came to the conclusion that, indeed, there is a great market for fiction and fantasy in the United States. Since Saddam Hussein al Takriti's régime is on the verge of inevitable collapse, and that will leave the representatives of Saddam and Saddam himself unemployed, we suggest that with their superb ability in the field of fantasy and fiction they should seriously consider the profession of fiction writing, and we guarantee a very successful future for them.

295. I cannot answer all their fabrications and all their allegations. However, I will attempt to answer only one of their stories, one of the issues. Saddam's representative tried to show a very deep and sincere regard for Islam and for the Moslems of Iran. Let me quote one statement. Saddam's delegate must have lots of guts to talk about Islam and sectarianism. We know why they are doing this, why they are enumerating all these items; we know they are using these baseless allegations to cover up their crimes committed during their invasion of our country.

296. But we will catch them with their own trick. In November 1980, Saddam al Takriti, in the so-called parliament of Iraq, said "The Persians are not Moslems, because the Koran is in Arabic. The Prophet was an Arab, and Islam belongs to the Arabs." This is not the only time, of course, that they have made such statements.

297. The history of the Ba'ath party is full of such nonsense. According to this incredible logic, no Afghani can claim to be a Moslem, no Indonesian, Chinese or Russian should dare to become a believer of Islam, and no Nigerian can practice the faith. Accordingly, the arrogant and racist-minded Saddam implies that no Christian should believe in Jesus—peace be on Him—because they are not racially tied to the Prophet Jesus and they do not speak the Hebrew language.

298. How like that arrogant Menachem Begin Mr. Saddam sounds. I wish I had more time so that I could go on and answer more of the allegations. Perhaps on a future occasion, when I have more time, I can shed some more light on this type of nonsense. I will try to present our point of view then regarding who was the aggressor, who started the war; it is a very interesting story.

299. Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I must beg the Assembly's indulgence once again. I will not use my time for reply. I would simply like to repeat before our dear brothers and friends the following: I asked direct and clear questions and I should have liked to have answers to those questions.

300. I have one final question that I should like to add to those I put to the Iranian delegate. Which country has stipulated in its constitution that the Iranian head of State must belong to the Persian ethnic group? What does this mean? I am still awaiting an answer to this question.

#### *Organization of work*

301. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I would like to inform the members of the General Assembly that the President of the Assembly today received a letter from the Chairman of the Special Political Committee requesting a further postponement, until Monday, 7 December, of the time-limit for the submission of proposals containing financial implications so that the Committee can consider the new draft resolutions before it under the agenda items that it has yet to examine. May I take it that the General Assembly approves the request of the Special Political Committee?

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 7.40 p.m.*

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 860, No. 12325, p. 106.

<sup>2</sup>See "International Terrorism: Joint Statement, July 17, 1978", *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1978), vol. 14, No. 29, pp. 1308-1309.

<sup>3</sup>*Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fourth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1979*, document S/13582, annex.

<sup>4</sup>Expounded in a radio interview broadcast by Riyadh Domestic Service on 7 August 1981. For a transcription of the interview, see Foreign Broadcast Information Service, *Daily Report*, FBIS-MEA-81-153, of 10 August 1981, vol. V, No. 153, p. C 3.

<sup>5</sup>*Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Supplement No. 35*.

<sup>6</sup>United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973, p. 287.