



General Assembly

PROVIS IONAL

A/41/PV.45
23 October 1986

ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVIS IONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FORTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 21 October 1986, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. CHOUDHURY (Bangladesh)

- Credentials of representatives to the forty-first session of the General Assembly [3] (continued)

- (a) First report of the Credentials Committee
- (b) Amendment

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 3 (continued)

CREDENTIALS OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE FORTY-FIRST SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(a) FIRST REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE (A/41/727)

(b) AMENDMENT (A/41/L.8)

The PRESIDENT: The draft resolution recommended by the Credentials Committee in connection with this item appears in paragraph 31 of the report (A/41/727) and reads as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Approves the first report of the Credentials Committee."

In this connection, the Assembly also has an amendment (A/41/L.8) to that draft resolution submitted by 20 States.

I call on the representative of Oman, in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States, to introduce the amendment.

Mr. AL-ANSI (Oman) (interpretation from Arabic): With reference to the first report of the Credentials Committee (A/41/727), dated 17 October 1986, I should like on behalf of the following States - Algeria, Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen - to submit the following amendment:

"At the end of the draft resolution, after the words 'the Credentials Committee', add the following phrase:

'except with regard to the credentials of Israel'."

(Mr. Al-Ansi, Oman)

The Arab Group addressed a letter, signed by all the Arab States, to the Secretary-General of the United Nations objecting to the credentials of Israel. That letter was issued as a formal Assembly document (A/41/689) dated 8 October 1986. We asked that the letter be submitted to the Credentials Committee at its first meeting, and that was done. In the first page of its report, however, the Credentials Committee only mentions the number of the document, without, regrettably, stating the subject of the document, the names of the States that signed it, or even its date.

I should like to remind representatives here of the statement made by Itzhak Shamir, the Prime Minister of Israel who has just taken over from his opposite number, Shimon Peres. Mr. Shamir set forth the policy of his Government and the ideological bases thereof. He unashamedly confirmed that, despite Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and the views of countries that have supported Israel, Israel will not accept the international resolutions and the view of world public opinion and will build more settlements in the occupied Arab lands - in the Gaza Strip, the West Bank and the Syrian Golan Heights and in southern Lebanon - and that it does not recognize the well-known legal status of Al-Quds. That is an important statement which should make clear why the Arab States object to the credentials of Israel: Israel is in opposition to the United Nation, its Charter and its resolutions.

Our objection stems, in addition, from the following objective considerations which are well known to us all:

First, Israel has not complied with the Security Council resolutions on the question of Palestine, the situation in the Middle East and other related issues, thus violating Article 25 of the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Al-Ansi, Oman)

Second, Israel has not implemented the General Assembly resolutions on the question of Palestine and the situation in the Middle East which call for the attainment by the Palestinian people of their legitimate and inalienable rights, including the right of return, the right of self-determination and the right to establish their own independent state in Palestine, and which, in accordance with the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, demand that Israel terminate its occupation of the Arab territories and withdraw from all the territories occupied since 1967, including Al-Quds and the Syrian Golan Heights.

Third, Israel has not implemented the General Assembly resolutions on other items related to the question of Palestine and the situation in the Middle East. All those resolutions are well known to members of the Assembly.

Fourth, Israel violates human rights in the occupied Palestinian territories and the other occupied Arab territories; in particular, it is in violation of the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention, of 13 August 1949.

Fifth, Israel has continued its creeping annexation of the Palestinian and other Arab territories, including Al-Quds and the Syrian Golan Heights, in violation of the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the rules of international law.

Sixth, Israel has persisted in its aggression against the Arab States, and the expansion of the area of that aggression to Lebanon, Iraq, Tunisia, and possibly other countries.

Seventh, Israel continues to co-operate with the racist régime in South Africa, particularly in the nuclear, economic and military fields.

Eighth, the credentials of the Israeli delegation to the forty-first session of the General Assembly and the fourteenth special session, having been issued from occupied Al-Quds, are in violation of Security Council resolutions, particularly

(Mr. Al-Ansi, Oman)

resolution 478 (1980) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions, especially resolution 35/169 E of 15 December 1980.

Another practical reservation on the credentials of the Israeli delegation to the forty-first session of the General Assembly and the fourteenth special session is to be found in paragraph 31 of document A/41/728, dated 20 October 1986, which is signed by more than 50 Islamic States members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, and other friendly States. That document underlines the validity of the Arab request that the credentials of Israel be rejected. A precedent in this respect is the courageous stand taken by the international community in rejecting the credentials of the racist Pretoria régime a few years ago. By any criterion, the two régimes are identical. We hope that the Assembly will now take another courageous stand and support the Arab and Islamic request that the credentials of Israel be rejected.

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

Mr. ANDERSEN (Iceland): I raise this point of order on behalf of the five Nordic countries - Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden and Iceland - in connection with the amendment in document A/41/L.8, which proposes the rejection of the credentials of Israel.

On behalf of the Nordic countries, I formally move that no action be taken on that amendment, and ask the President to be good enough to put this motion immediately to the vote. It is made within the terms of rule 74 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure.

The five Nordic countries are convinced that the future of the United Nations is of overwhelming interest and concern to all Member States. Our motion is motivated by our dedication to upholding the capacity and authority of the United Nations to act in fulfilment of its primary purpose, the maintenance of international peace and security.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of Iceland has moved, within the terms of rule 74 of the rules of procedure, that no action be taken on the amendment circulated in document A/41/L.8. Rule 74 reads as follows:

"During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote ...".

I now call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on a point of order.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have asked to be allowed to speak on a point of order because I thought I should express my appreciation and gratitude to the Ambassador of Oman for submitting this very important amendment. The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran requests that its name be included in the list of sponsors of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT: The point has been noted and will be reflected in the verbatim record.

I shall now put to the vote the motion submitted by the representative of Iceland that no action be taken on the amendment circulated in document A/41/L.8.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire

Against: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen

Abstaining: Belize, Botswana, Cameroon, China, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Madagascar, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Turkey, Uganda, Yugoslavia, Zambia

The motion was adopted by 77 votes to 40, with 16 abstentions.*

* Subsequently the delegations of Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Cameroon, Gabon, Haiti, Lesotho, Portugal, Swaziland and Yugoslavia advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegations of Angola, Gambia and Zimbabwe had intended to vote against; the delegations of Burundi and Ethiopia had intended to abstain.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those delegations that wish to speak in explanation of their vote on the recommendation of the Credentials Committee. I remind delegations that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. MAKSIMOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The delegations of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, on whose behalf I have been asked to speak, vigorously protest against recognition of the credentials of a group of private people claiming that they represent the so-called Democratic Kampuchea. It is an undeniable fact that neither in the real international world nor on maps does a State with such a title yet exist. Representatives have presented themselves under the label of the "Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea", but they are nothing but representatives of people who have been expelled from their country, including Pol-Potists, who have been condemned for carrying out bloody crimes against the Kampuchean people. The presence of those people in the United Nations is an insult to the memory of the millions of Kampucheans who were victims of the genocidal Pol Pot clique, and detrimental to the authority and prestige of the United Nations. There is no doubt that sooner or later those self-proclaimed representatives will be driven out of the United Nations.

It is well known that the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which was established as a result of general elections, is exercising effective control over all the territory of the country. It is developing the national economy and, in the international arena, is carrying out a policy of peace and

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

co-operation and actively advocating the normalization of the situation in South-East Asia.

The delegations on whose behalf I speak feel that only the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea and the representatives appointed by it have the legitimate right to represent the Kampuchean people in the United Nations and other international organizations, and they insist on an immediate decision on and solution of this problem by the United Nations.

Mr. VONGSAY (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from French): The Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and the People's Republic of Kampuchea have once again clearly expressed their disappointment and bitterness at the erroneous and extremely regrettable decision taken by the Credentials Committee with regard to the representation of Kampuchea within the United Nations and submitted to the Assembly in a draft resolution. The Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, the sole authentic, legitimate representative of the martyred Kampuchean people, which exercises the full authority of the State over all the national territory, should have regained its rightful place within our universal Organization.

Unfortunately, that martyred people, which, as everyone knows, escaped and survived the genocide committed by the criminal Pol Pot clique, is again this year a victim of the most flagrant injustice. We feel that it is not in the interest of the universal Organization to continue to ignore the legal and political realities of which the People's Republic of Kampuchea and its valiant people are the embodiment, having over the years achieved admirable and praiseworthy successes in their Herculean task of national revival and consolidation, to which they are committed body and soul.

(Mr. Vongsay, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

Such is the reality which must be understood by the international community in full conscience and in good faith. It is time to abandon the legal fiction, because we are convinced that the longer we endorse the illegal and immoral presence within our Organization of the clique of criminals and traitors to the nation that make up the so-called Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea, the more will the prestige and the credibility of the United Nations be damaged. We are happy that the international community is becoming increasingly aware of the necessity of departing from this legal fiction, this illogical argument. It is illogical because, while endorsing the so-called Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea, there are great protestations against the charge of wishing to protect Pol Pot, the executioner, or his henchmen, who in fact constitute the linchpin of this so-called coalition - this stateless puppet entity which represents no one but the foreigners who give it order and protect it. That is nothing but paradox and hypocrisy. In this regard we warmly welcome a proposal we regard as very sound and appropriate calling for the establishment of an international tribunal to look into the monstrous crimes committed by Pol Pot and his clique against their own people during the reign of naked terror in Kampuchea from April 1975 to January 1979. We understand why this idea is being accepted by progressive people throughout the world who care about peace, freedom and justice. Indeed, the fiction at present being entertained with regard to this criminal association of traitors and corrupt people is absolutely contrary to the spirit and the letter of the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. It is regrettable, not to say horrifying, that the author of the crime is not punished. What is worse, some people are even attempting to lend him a helping hand.

(Mr. Vongsay, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

Our feelings of frustration and outrage about the question now before us are eloquently reflected in the message that Mr. Hui Sen, President of the Council of Ministers and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, addressed on 18 October to the Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, from which message I have the honour, with your permission, to read the following relevant passages:

(spoke in English)

"to try by any means to impose the return of a group of traitors and criminals guilty of genocide who are in exile and sold to foreigners is a gross and intolerable interference. Thrown out by the Kampuchean people since 1979, these criminals deserve to be hanged and not to be given a seat at the United Nations ... The Kampuchean people regained - and exercised for eight years now - its full right of self-determination when it threw out those genocidal criminals, installed the present popular Government and re-established fraternal relations with all progressive peoples on the basis of equality and respect for mutual interests ... The Kampuchean people has now grown back to more than seven million inhabitants and is busy with the task of national reconstruction after the Pol Pot holocaust. The pseudo coalition government of Democratic Kampuchea in exile, which is a mask for a handful of criminals, is just a legal fiction destined to prolong its usurpation of the right of the Kampuchean people to a seat at the United Nations, and therefore it represents no one but its masters. The successive United Nations resolutions have not produced the expected solution thus far since they are erroneous, biased, misleading and unjust. Not only is it a futile exercise, but it is also harmful to the good reputation of the United Nations. For all these reasons, once again we denounce and condemn those stratagems and reject any resolution relating to Kampuchea as null and void."

(Mr. Vongsay, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

(continued in French)

For the reasons I have just mentioned, my delegation wishes to ask you, on behalf of the delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, as well as of the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, to record our strongest reservations with regard to the report of the Credentials Committee concerning the credentials of the representatives of Kampuchea.

Mr. NYAMDOO (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): With regard to the report of the Credentials Committee (A/41/727), my delegation would again like to confirm the fundamental position of the Government of the People's Republic of Mongolia concerning the credentials of the representatives of so-called Democratic Kampuchea.

The People's Republic of Kampuchea was established exclusively through the will of the Kampuchean people and as a result of its heroic victory over the genocidal and barbaric Pol Pot régime. Consequently it represents the fundamental interests of that long-suffering people. Implementing the decisions of the Fifth Congress of the Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea, the People's Republic of Kampuchea is quickly repairing the damage caused by the Pol Pot and Ieng Sary to the economy, and it is trying to develop friendship and co-operation with all countries of the world, including the States of South-East Asia.

Therefore the People's Republic of Mongolia feels that it is indeed the People's Republic of Kampuchea that is the sole legitimate representative of the Kampuchean people in international forums, including the United Nations. The Mongolian delegation deeply regrets that within the walls of the United Nations there are still present representatives of the bloody Pol Pot clique. This clearly

(Mr. Nyandoo, Mongolia)

damages the prestige of our Organization, which should not be used for purposes of interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State. We are firmly convinced that the time will come when the People's Republic of Kampuchea, as the genuine representative of the Kampuchean people, will take its place in the United Nations.

Mr. FAREED (Pakistan): With regard to the first report of the Credentials Committee (A/41/727), dated 17 October 1986, my delegation wishes to record its formal reservations concerning the credentials of the delegations representing Afghanistan at the forty-first session and the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. This position is consistent with Pakistan's principled stand on the situation in Afghanistan, where foreign military intervention persists, which constitutes a flagrant contravention of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. VELAZCO SAN JOSE (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): We wish to express our reservations concerning the report of the Credentials Committee now before the General Assembly. The report recommends that the credentials of something called Democratic Kampuchea, which supposedly represents the people of Kampuchea, be accepted. It is inconceivable that those that massacred those people and plunged Kampuchea into a long night of horror and martyrdom should now represent themselves as victims. It was over the corpses of millions of men, women and children that the Pol Pot régime established its supremacy and it is precisely the remnants of those bands of assassins whose credentials the Committee wants us now to accept.

For my country, the only legitimate representative of the Kampuchean people is the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which has brought back the dignity and honour of which they were deprived. To accept the credentials of so-called Democratic Kampuchea is to accept Pol Pot and Pol Potism, although an effort may be made now to present it in a different guise.

Similarly, we wish to express our reservations concerning the credentials of the delegation of Grenada, since that Government represents only the interests of the forces which invaded that country.

Mr. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic would like to record its reservations concerning the credentials of Democratic Kampuchea for the reasons given in our statements at previous sessions of the Assembly on this subject.

Mr. HUANG Jiahua (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation approves the report of the Credentials Committee submitted to the General Assembly. As for the credentials of Democratic Kampuchea, I should like to reiterate briefly the position of the Chinese delegation.

Democratic Kampuchea is an independent, peaceful and neutral sovereign country and a Member of the United Nations. The Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea is the sole legal Government of Kampuchea. This is a fact known to all. Although Democratic Kampuchea is suffering Vietnamese aggression and occupation, foreign aggression can never change the legitimacy of a sovereign State and its Government. The credentials of Democratic Kampuchea are entirely valid from the political and legal points of view.

The so-called People's Republic of Kampuchea is a régime totally imposed on the Kampuchean people by the force of foreign aggressors. It has no right to represent the Kampuchean people. The adoption of the resolution on Kampuchea by an overwhelming majority this morning shows once again that the international community condemns aggression and interference in the internal affairs of other countries and rejects the fait accompli created by foreign aggression.

It is the view of the Chinese delegation that the current session should uphold the correct decisions of previous sessions and accept the credentials of Democratic Kampuchea.

The Chinese delegation wishes to reiterate that the fact that the Afghan representative has been allowed to participate in the fourteenth special session and the current session of the General Assembly of the United Nations should in no

(Mr. Huang Jiahua, China)

way be interpreted as acquiescence in the situation created by foreign aggression against and occupation of Afghanistan.

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the recommendation of the Credentials Committee in paragraph 31 of its first report (A/41/727).

The Committee adopted this draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly, bearing in mind the views expressed by various delegations, wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 41/7).

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their position on the resolution just adopted.

Prince Norodom SIHANOUK (Democratic Kampuchea) (interpretation from French): The General Assembly has approved without a vote the report of the Credentials Committee concerning delegations of Member States of the United Nations participating in this session. In so doing, the Assembly clearly confirms again the status of Democratic Kampuchea as a Member of our Organization and the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea as the sole legal and legitimate representative of the Khmer people and nation.

I therefore wish, on behalf of our people and our Coalition Government and on my own behalf, once again to pay a stirring tribute to the Assembly for this act of justice, which does it the highest honour and brings joy beyond expression to our patriotic, indomitable people.

(Prince Norodom Sihanouk,
Democratic Kampuchea)

That noble, just act shows the world that our Organization remains the vigilant guardian of international legality, the last bulwark against all the policies of force and hegemony aimed at establishing a new international order based on force. Our Organization wishes to demonstrate thereby its unshakeable will to defend at all costs the fundamental principles of the Charter, in which lie the hopes of all countries committed to world peace and justice. In this International Year of Peace those countries cannot but find great cause for satisfaction and comfort in that.

The Cambodian people recognize in the General Assembly's noble decision fresh confirmation of the legitimacy and legality of their patriotic struggle to free Kampuchea from the yoke of Vietnamese colonialism and expansionism and to preserve our ancient culture and 2,000-year-old civilization, freeing it from the Vietnamese peril, manifest today in the Vietnamization of our race and our country. Finally, our people regard the Organization's decision as great encouragement to persevere in their valiant struggle to the end, in spite of the difficulties involved in that struggle, which, thanks to the powerful support of the international community, constantly makes great progress in all fields.

Our adversary, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, which seeks to usurp for the benefit of its puppets in Phnom Penh our country's seat in the United Nations to legalize its war of aggression, must realize the futility of its ambition and the irremediable consequences of its policy of colonial conquest and expansion in South-East Asia for its prestige and dignity as well as its national interests. In persisting as it has for almost eight years along its tragic, endless path Viet Nam is simply increasing its isolation and tension in South-East Asia, where all the States of the region refuse to accept the Vietnamese fait accompli in Cambodia. We

(Prince Norodom Sihanouk,
Democratic Kampuchea)

sincerely hope that Viet Nam will come to its senses and abandon its anachronistic ambition in order finally to live in understanding and friendship with all the countries of our region. Our eight-point peace proposal, which I had the honour to explain to the Assembly in detail, has that objective.

In conclusion, I wish to reaffirm Democratic Kampuchea's deep commitment to our Organization and the ideals and principles it embodies, in this International Year of Peace.

I also take this opportunity to reiterate our deepest and most heartfelt gratitude for the Assembly's noble decision this morning in approving by a massive vote the draft resolution on the situation in Kampuchea, in which it again called for the complete and unconditional withdrawal of foreign forces - that is, Vietnamese forces - from Kampuchea, so that our people may exercise in sovereignty their sacred right to self-determination, through free elections under United Nations supervision.

By its powerful support for the draft resolution the Assembly reaffirmed its unfailing commitment to a peaceful solution to the problem of Kampuchea, thus making its historic and irreplaceable contribution to the restoration of an independent, united, peaceful, neutral and non-aligned Kampuchea - Cambodia - in South-East Asia and of peace and stability to that sensitive region of the world.

Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): This afternoon's exercise was not just another challenge to Israel's credentials. It was a challenge that took place precisely at a time when the United Nations is struggling to survive the worst crisis in its history. It is not only a financial crisis, it is a moral and political one as well.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

The diminished enthusiasm for the United Nations in important segments of the international community has not come about strictly, or even mainly, because of its present financial and administrative woes. As everyone here knows all too well, such ills exist in every large bureaucracy. The main reason behind the erosion of prestige of the United Nations is the decades of political irresponsibility shown by some of its Members.

Nothing better illustrates the corrupting influence of those States than their repeated attempts to expel a Member State. For at the heart of the United Nations is the idea of universality - that all States have an equal and unassailable right to take part in its proceedings. They may disagree, argue and debate; they may even sulk and occasionally smile at one another. But they do so as equal Members of the only universal Organization in our world. What gave life to this body, what keeps it alive, is the principle of universality. Trampling on that principle could destroy this body.

I am happy to say that many Members realize this. And, as in the case of fiscal irresponsibility, they have begun to take a stand against political irresponsibility. They recognize that even excess must have its limits, that without placing such limits there is nothing to prevent the United Nations from sliding into historical oblivion. And they do not want it to disappear.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

The vote we witnessed just now is as clear a statement of that determination as any you will find in the General Assembly. Israel appreciates the fact that many Governments today stood by the principles of the United Nations Charter and fulfilled their elementary duty as Member States. As for those who stood behind this afternoon's attempt, I have a simple question. You seek to isolate and to expel Israel. But who is being isolated? The margin against this vote stands at 2 to 1. It is an overwhelming defeat. Rather than reflecting Israel's isolation, this vote is a barometer of Israel's international acceptance. Now you can persist in this exercise year after year and you will find that you will remain isolated in a small circle of fanaticism which you have drawn round yourselves.

For those countries which do not share these violent impulses but which have still not left this camp, I have a question as well. Do you really wish to align yourselves with mediaeval tyrants like Qadhafi and Khomeini? Is this the moral compass with which you guide your actions in this year of reflection and rededication? And how can some of you seriously speak of an international peace conference, under United Nations sponsorship no less, when in effect you vote for the expulsion of Israel from this Organization?

Every member of this body must decide: either you are for the United Nations or you are against it. If you are for it, then you must be for the principle of universality; and if you are for that principle, and wish to retain a semblance of credibility, then you must vote accordingly.

Mr. DEVER (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The fact that my delegation did not object to the credentials of Afghanistan cannot in any way be interpreted as being a recognition of the present régime in that country, a régime which was imposed upon the Afghan people from outside.

Mr. TILLET (Belize): The General Assembly is a place where all nations should be allowed to express their opinion. Using the rules to prevent nations from expressing their opinion is a dangerous path for this Organization to take and should be taken with the utmost caution. Belize abstained in the motion not to take action on the amendment, because we feel that such a motion deprives Member States of their rights. At the same time, however, the Belize delegation supports the report as submitted by the Credentials Committee because we feel it is a just report. We can best negotiate with Member States while they are Members of our Organization. To withdraw the credentials of any Member State would then be to undermine the peaceful purposes of this Organization.

Belize wishes to leave no doubt that it supports the credentials of Israel as it does those of all the other Member States mentioned in the report. Accordingly, the Belize delegation would now like to record a change in its vote on the motion to take no action from an abstention to a vote in favour.

Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like to put on record our position on the credentials of the delegation of Afghanistan. Our vote in favour of the report of the Credentials Committee does not imply that we recognize the legitimacy of the régime in Kabul.

Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): Our delegation would like to put on record the following points.

First, our support for the procedural proposal presented by Iceland, it is in accordance with the position taken by my Government on the means of reaching a peaceful solution to the crisis in the Middle East and Egypt's efforts to solve the Palestinian problem through the encouragement of negotiations in an international conference dedicated to the achievement of such a settlement.

Secondly, a settlement in the Middle East should include the following points: the Israeli withdrawal from all Arab lands occupied since 1967, the Syrian

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

Golan Heights, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, including Arab Al-Quds; the realization of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, particularly their right to self-determination; and respect for the right of all nations and peoples in the Middle East to live in peace and security.

Thirdly, Egypt, while tirelessly seeking such a settlement, condemns once again the settlement policy of Israel in the occupied lands, and considers it to be obstructive to peace efforts. My country also condemns the oppressive practices against the Palestinian people, which are in violation of the Geneva protocols. We call on Israel to implement the resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly on the Palestinian cause.

Mr. BIRCH (United Kingdom): The fact that my delegation has raised no formal challenge to the credentials of the delegation of Afghanistan should of course in no way be taken to imply that the Government of the United Kingdom will deal with the present régime in Kabul on a Government-to-Government basis.

Mr. FARES (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): Our delegation would like to put on the record the following reservation.

Democratic Yemen recognizes the People's Republic of Kampuchea and its government as legitimately representative of the Kampuchean people in their struggle to achieve their right to peace, stability, progress and rebuild their country after ridding themselves of those who massacred millions of Kampuchians. On the basis of this, our delegation wishes to put on record its reservation concerning the credentials of the so-called Democratic Kampuchea. We call for an end to the legitimate occupation of the seat of Kampuchea in the United Nations by those who do not represent the people in any way so that the people in Kampuchea and their legitimate Government may contribute positively and effectively to this international Organization.

Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): We have heard some stereotyped statements which are merely a repetition of previous statements delivered by the same delegations year after year. Three members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization plus China and Pakistan referred to the credentials of my delegation and expressed their reservations. We have explained our position on these statements in the past. We wish once again to reject their validity and relevance and to state that they are totally impertinent and have no bearing on the legitimacy of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, which derives its legitimacy only and entirely from its own people.

Some statements made during the discussion in the Credentials Committee have been recorded in the report (A/41/727) of that Committee to the General Assembly. I refer specifically to paragraphs 11 and 15 of that report. We wish to put on record our rejection of those statements as reflected in those two paragraphs.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and five minutes for the second and should be made by representatives from their seats.

Mr. AL-ANSI (Oman) (interpretation from Arabic): I had not intended to speak, but after hearing the representative of Israel I found it a moral duty to clarify the situation, in exercise of the right of reply, as President of the Arab Group and as it was I who presented the amendment on behalf of the Arab States.

(Mr. Al-Ansi, Oman)

The Israeli representative spoke of the financial crisis of the United Nations. We are surprised that he should do so while his country is always indebted to the budget of the United Nations and does not pay its contribution, even in the present crisis of the Organization.

The underlying cause of the real crisis of the United Nations is the membership of countries such as Israel in the United Nations. Most of the problems we discuss in the General Assembly and in all the committees, commissions and conferences stem from the presence of Israel and South Africa. If we were to compute the millions of dollars spent on the search for solutions to the problems caused by those two régimes, we shall find that they amounted to much more than the deficits in the annual budget of the Organization. Hence, this exploitation by Israel of a financial situation which has been with us in the United Nations since the 1960s is the sort of obfuscation that bewilders no one.

The Israeli representative spoke of the countries which submitted the proposed amendment to the draft resolution and said that they were pretending. I should like to assure him that the Arab countries have been patient and have found themselves in a position, for the past 40 years, in which they have had to take this stand in the General Assembly year after year. We would have hoped that Israel might listen to reason and that those that are pushing Israel towards perdition might have changed its patterns of behaviour, knowing that Israel could stand up to the Arab States without the support of the powerful parties which stand behind it and encourage it to continue its aggressive actions against neighbouring Arab States.

All the Arab States and the Palestine Liberation Organization have accepted United Nations resolutions on Palestine and the situation in the Middle East, while Israel and those that stand behind it have consistently rejected even those resolutions which they supported in the United Nations.

(Mr. Al-Ansi, Qnan)

How could the representative of Israel say that the situation here is against the international conference on peace? Who rejects that international peace conference? We all call for the convening of the peace Conference. All those who have spoken in the General Assembly, including heads of delegations, have called for the convening of the peace conference. It is Israel that cynically rejects it. We all know who are with Israel.

Our delegation and the delegations of Arab States have tried over the past few years to convince ourselves that there are hawks and doves in Israel. However, the recent statement by Yitzhak Shamir has convinced us there are no doves and no hawks and that all are violent expansionists who want to take Arab land by force. This is a situation that should not be passed over in silence.

I wish to stress from now on that the Arab States, together with other Member States, will continue to submit this amendment every year with an increased number of sponsors, until we find Israel facing what South Africa is now facing in the General Assembly, unless Israel changes its behaviour, stops its aggression and declares openly that it accepts all the resolutions of the United Nations and adheres to the principles of the Charter.

Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): We have listened, as we have for many years now, to the illegitimate representative of the Zionist entity speak once again and, by speaking as he did, show once again the contempt of that entity for the international Organization, its Charter and its resolutions and its persistent violation of the most basic human rights.

For four decades, since that illegitimate entity came into being, it has adamantly rejected the recommendations and resolutions of the United Nations. For four decades that entity has refused to accept the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, which has been established, under resolution 194 (III),

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

for nearly 40 years. For four decades that entity has refused to implement the resolutions of the United Nations, which uphold the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to return to their homeland. For more than three decades that artificial entity has refused to accept the authority of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and declined to co-operate with the Committee, or even permit it to visit occupied Palestine.

The Zionist entity, since it usurped the whole of Palestine and ousted its people, has adopted a policy of expansion and aggression. It has occupied the whole of Palestine and the lands of neighbouring Arab countries, Egyptian and Syrian. In spite of all the Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, the Zionist entity annexed the Golan Heights which is part of the territory of another Member State of the United Nations.

(Mr. Treki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

It has annexed Al-Quds, disregarding all the resolutions of the United Nations. Its counterfeit credentials have been issued in Al-Quds. This artificial, racist régime refuses to recognize the very existence of the Palestinian people.

What does the representative of that entity want us to do? He wants us to accept the universality of the United Nations. Does not that universality entail the right of the Palestinian people to have a country? Are not the Palestinians a people? The normal thing would be for the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to occupy the seat which is now occupied by the representative of the racist Zionist entity. Would he like us to accept the annexation of Al-Quds and the Golan Heights? Can the representative of that entity tell us that the Golan Heights are not Israeli land today? Would he be prepared to accept the resolutions of the United Nations and say that Al-Quds is Arab?

The time has come to take a stand. We can no longer swallow these lies that we have been hearing for years.

That entity is based on terrorism and racism. Everyone here knows Shamir and his role in the murder of Count Bernadotte, the representative of the United Nations. Shamir personally took a hand in his murder; yet he speaks of respect for the United Nations. What respect for the United Nations? To murder its representatives? To violate or ignore its resolutions? To annex other peoples' lands? To indulge in collective massacres of the Palestinian people? To pursue the Palestinian people even in their diaspora and murder their children? What do they expect from us? Do they want us to accept occupation and extermination and welcome them with open arms?

Patience has its limits and the logic of force cannot continue for long. Ian Smith has gone and Shamir will follow him. Rhodesia has gone and Zimbabwe is here. Palestine too will return to the fold. The logic of force cannot continue. It is time to return to the logic of right, and I say to the representative of

(Mr. Treki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

the Zionist entity that the whole of the United Nations has condemned the Zionist entity more than once, in more than one resolution. We all know that. I tell him that his lies will not be swallowed by anyone. The day will come when the representative of the Palestinian people will sit in his rightful place here among us.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am grateful for the opportunity to reply to the improper comments made by the representative of the Zionist base occupying Palestine. It is a very sad moment for all of us. Similar sad moments have come repeatedly and may continue to come for some years. It is a moment at which we see our General Assembly challenged, and even manipulated, by the forces of the Zionist base occupying Palestine and those that are behind it.

I believe that the General Assembly lost a great deal of its credibility 40 years ago when it simply gave recognition to the occupation of Palestine and the terrorists that occupied Palestine and deprived the Palestinian people of their legitimate right to their own homeland, to statehood and to independence and of all the simple basic rights that every individual State represented in the Assembly enjoys.

The terrorist base which has illegally and illegitimately gained the title of State thanks to the imperialist forces behind it and thanks particularly to United States support for the Zionists both in Palestine and in South Africa, knows very well that the Muslims in the region will not for ever tolerate the occupation of their sanctuaries and the land of Palestine by those usurpers. They are going to liberate their land. The manipulation of the General Assembly cannot continue either; that will come to an end soon, and we pray that its end is drawing ever nearer.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

There is probably no need to remind representatives that they have been dealing with the basic issue, the issue of the representation here of a terrorist base which not only has occupied the land of Palestine but is expanding its occupation, has invaded Lebanon, has forced many thousands of women and children into the camps in Sabra and Shatila and continues to keep Lebanon under its illegal occupation.

My delegation, like many others which are either absent or have already expressed their positions openly, believes that this so-called State, this artificial State, cannot subsist, because it is not based on legality; it is a baseless, lawless entity and that lawlessness cannot continue in what we call the General Assembly of the United Nations.

If the same thing as happened to the Palestinians happened to any other of the nations represented here, if any one of those that voted in favour of the draft motion which crippled the amendment moved by the representative of Oman had its land occupied, what would it do? Would it just remain silent or acquiesce? I believe that it would fight, both in the General Assembly and in the region concerned. It is also true that if the enemy - the illegal enemy - is powerful and has access to modern warfare technology and the backing of the United States it is very likely that such occupation will continue for some time, but that does not mean that the victims should just keep quiet. No victim will keep quiet. No matter if we cannot achieve the victory this year or next year, or for 10 years, this is a struggle which started 40 years ago and will continue if necessary for 400 more years.

I can assure this Assembly that this State will be expelled both from our beloved region, the lovely land of Palestine, Muslim land, and from the General Assembly.

Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): First, let me say that I appreciate the fact that several delegations have already indicated a change of vote on the motion by Iceland; we understand that others will be doing so.

As I have said, the exercise this afternoon is a very good indication - I called it a barometer - of the improving condition of Israel's international situation. Year by year, the number of votes supporting us grows. It has grown from 74 in 1982 to well over 80 now. In fact, it appears to have exceeded last year's vote. I am happy to say, too, that there is a decline in the support for those who have sponsored this effort. Thus, many people obviously recognize what the true issues are that are at stake here.

In their comments this afternoon, some representatives have tried to weave into the discussion not only extraneous issues but completely distorted ones. Not all those representatives seem to agree on how strident to be. For example, the representative of Oman directed his remarks to the question of financial probity and responsibility towards this body and its missions.

I think it would be a useful exercise - in fact, I shall circulate a document on this - to look at the relative contributions of the Arab oil-producers. They are awash in oil revenues over a 15-year period; they are awash in riches that the rest of the world has never dreamed of; they are awash in the kind of wealth that could resolve some of the problems we discuss here - and I do not mean only the problems of the Middle East: I mean the problems of Africa and the problems of Latin America, where hundreds of millions of persons are starving. They are awash in these riches that are sitting in coffers in Switzerland and in various boutiques in Europe. These riches are not used for any purpose even remotely commensurate with the noble ideals that are professed here by some well-meaning representatives, and by some who are not so well meaning.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

What I have said applies, of course, to the issue of refugees. I have listened to the representative of Libya; I have listened to the representative of Iran - and please note that I call their countries by their names. Those representatives have a peculiar penchant for putting the cart before the horse. They forget how this thing began and how it has continued. They say that we created this terrible thing; we robbed these people of their land; we expropriated their land and we kicked the people out. That is false - completely false. They say that this thing started 40 years ago. False again. It did not start 40 years ago. It started at the beginning of this century. It started when we came to this barren land, this place where there was nothing. When we returned to our homeland in 1880, the population was 150,000. Mark Twain - no Zionist agent he - was there, and he described it; as did Arthur Stanley, the greatest cartographer of the nineteenth century - British, no Zionist and no Jew - and 300 other travellers and experts: there was nothing there.

We came back because this was our homeland, the one and only homeland we had. We built it and we made it flourish. We accepted the Arab immigrants who came to that country; we welcomed them. Some of them accepted us, as did most of the Arab leaders - such prominent leaders as Faisal and Saud, who recognized the tremendous value to the entire region of a nascent Jewish State.

Now, that did not sit well with a minority, a violent band of men who took their inspiration from the Mufti, who in turn took his inspiration from Adolf Hitler, with whom he made a pact during the Second World War - and even before the Second World War - to exterminate not only a Jewish presence of any

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

kind, but any hope for peace, compromise and coexistence. This is the same Mufti whom Yassir Arafat has called his mentor and his guide, the person whose ideals he follows.

That violent band of men started by killing not Jews but Arabs - many, many more Arabs. And, by the way, that tradition still holds true, because 65 per cent of the victims of the PLO and its offshoots have been Arabs. Why Arabs? Because some people do not believe in the path of violence, in the path of extremism, in the path of terrorism. They believe in coexistence; they believe that there actually ought to be a Jewish State, that they should live side by side with it.

This attempt to destroy what we were building failed. It failed because we shed blood, we fought with our finger nails, to survive against five Arab armies with overwhelming power against us. We did not lose - that is our great sin. Our great sin is that we took in the refugees from that same war - a greater number of refugees from Arab lands than the number of Arab refugees who heeded the call of the invading Arab armies to vacate the arena of battle so that the war of extermination - as the Secretary-General of the Arab League called it - could proceed more rapidly. Well, it did not proceed more rapidly because we refused to die; we had done enough dying over the millenia. We immediately called for peace. We immediately took in our refugees.

Now, we did not have vast stretches of land. We did not have the billions of dollars of oil wealth that are still sitting in those coffers. We had nothing but a sliver of land and our brawn and our dedication. We rehabilitated all these people. They do not sit in refugee camps.

What did the other side do? Most of it - initially, all of it - inculcated hatred. The same hatred that for four decades before the 1948 war had guided their actions continued to guide their actions. They inculcated this hatred; they foisted these incredible myths upon the people. I do not think that since the

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

Second World War, since the time of Goebbels, has the world seen so great a use of myths, of the big-lie technique, as it has seen in regard to the Palestinian Arab question. It is remarkable - but it is not going to change the minds of fair-minded people.

The attempt to continue the war of extermination is not seen only in the acts of Arab terrorists, in the pogroms that they are carrying out, with the support of several of the countries represented in this Hall, in Istanbul and so many other places, against innocent people - and not only Israelis, not only Jews, but many other nationalities. That campaign was, I am afraid, manifested here this afternoon as well. It was manifested by the extreme virulence, the refusal to talk of peace, of acceptance, of compromise. Indeed, the representative of Libya and the representative of Iran called for the outright liquidation of my country. The representative of Iran does not use the word "Israel", because he cannot bring himself to use it; neither can the representative of Libya - although perhaps with a little egging on, they might. They do not recognize that we have any right to exist. Indeed, the representative of Iran called for the happy day when we would be expelled from the region.

Now, it is one thing to hear distortions of history: it is another to hear these distortions and these calls for the observance of principles coming from the representatives of régimes like Libya, a country that bombs -

The PRESIDENT: I am sorry to interrupt the representative of Israel, but the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran wishes to speak on a point of order, and I now call on him.

Mr. RAJAI-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): My understanding is that when the representative of the Zionist base occupying Palestine speaks for the second time, he may speak for only five minutes. I am surprised to see that he has been speaking longer than that. I merely wanted to mention that timing is as important a factor for the General Assembly as it is for the Middle East and Moslems.

The PRESIDENT: I wish to clarify this point for the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The first time the representative of Israel spoke, he was speaking in explanation of vote after the voting. This time, he is speaking in exercise of the right of reply. He is therefore entitled to 10 minutes - of which he has used 9.

Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): I thank you, Mr. President, for that clarification and I shall briefly conclude.

The representative of Iran's concern with time could be put to better use if we eliminated from the agenda all these debates and expressions of the obsessive campaign against Israel, which has not only cost this Assembly and this body millions of dollars, but also cost it, I am afraid, a terrible decline in its prestige, a decline that it does not deserve. We should do better.

Mr. AL-ANSI (Oman) (interpretation from Arabic): I had no wish to waste time. However, the time wasted by the previous speaker in the reiteration of confounded fabrications compels me to speak. I shall use the five minutes allowed me to confirm what I said when I explained my vote, on behalf of my country and the other Arab delegations which did not explain their votes as we speak for them.

The representative of Israel has once again resorted to fabrication. He told us that there were only 40 votes in favour and that that amounts to a vote of 2 to 1. He considers that he has won by 80 or 81 votes. That is not true. We, the Arab countries, are proud of the States which, with courage and on the basis of their principles and their adherence to the Charter voted in the light of their commitments. But the Israeli delegation, directly or by proxy, exerted the customary pressure on certain delegations, even after the vote. Consequently, some delegations changed their positions. We wish to thank those States that supported us. We know that some States did not wish to change their positions and did not wish to support Israel. We know that some of those States signed the reservation addressed to the Organization of the Islamic Conference, but did not vote in favour when the time came. We shall review the whole process in the coming years.

We wish to tell the representative of Israel that he does not represent the Arab Jews of Israel, because those Arab Jews were not originally from Palestine but from the Arabian peninsula. Those for whom he speaks and remembers of his

(Mr. Al-Ansi, Oman)

delegation are not from the region. They are not from the Middle East or Palestine. They came from different parts of the world, and should think of returning to the places they came from. That includes Yitzhak Shamir, who was not born in Palestine but on one of the islands near the African coast where his father worked.

We also have the problem of the refusal of Israel to abide by United Nations resolutions. The day Israel accepts those resolutions will be the day the Arab States will respond. They have been the first to accept those resolutions. Everyone should understand this and should not confuse the bilateral or collective relations of the Arab States with any other State, with the relations between the Arab States and Israel, for Israel is our direct enemy and those that want to take its side should keep that in mind.

Mr. RAJAJE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Several points which were mentioned by the representative of the Zionist base occupying Palestine and which I failed to respond to in my first statement are very important, and I should like to comment on them. One was with regard to the economic pressure that the United States is imposing on this Organization. Those who speak of it and those who do not speak of it, all of them, know why the United States is doing it. Everybody knows that once the Organization took a very courageous stance with regard to the apartheid régime in South Africa and with regard to the occupation of Palestine the United States felt somehow isolated and decided to pressurize the Organization. Everybody knows that.

This financial crisis, therefore, is part of our problem; it is just a part of the whole package, at the centre of which is the fact that the distinguished - or undistinguished - representative of the Zionist base occupying Palestine is crammed

(Ms. Rajaie-Khorassni, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

into the General Assembly. Therefore one part of that package cannot be explained by the other part.

The second point was with regard to the logic of occupation. The logic of occupation can be explained very softly, as it was by the representative of the Zionist base occupying Palestine. But it is absolutely impossible to compare softness of logic to the dangerous and painful act of occupation. If representatives want to know what happened, they have to remember that for 40 years millions of people have been homeless, expelled from one camp to another, going from one country to another, still wandering in different parts of the world like peripatetics, while the occupying forces have had the pleasure of gaining legitimacy and representation in this Assembly. It is a very sad matter.

Of course, the language of occupation can be put very beautifully and softly. That language says, "Yes, we went to Palestine gradually and then we invited the Arabs, and so on and so forth". I think there was no invitation from the Palestinian Arabs or from any other Arabs, or from the Muslims, to the Zionists after the Second World War. They went there without any legal basis and they occupied it without any legal basis.

If representatives of Member States in this Assembly were in the same position, if their countries were occupied, does anyone think they would accept a soft logic of occupation simply because it is put in proper English? I believe that those people would fight exactly as the Palestinians and the Muslims continue to fight.

The third and final point I should like to mention here is that the representative of the occupation forces should be ashamed of saying "my country". He does not have a country; it is a terrorist base. It has been terrorizing all of us in the region, not only the Palestinians. The Lebanese are still being

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassni, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

terrorized. Yesterday they were bombarded. Last week they were bombarded several times. The Zionists are killing everybody they can in the region, and still they adopt very diplomatic language here in order to deceive international intelligence. It does not work. I assure representatives that the right move is that which is gaining momentum in the region. The small but courageous and great people of Lebanon - particularly the Muslim faction - have given a very good lesson to the Zionist forces, which withdrew "oluntarily". I assure the Assembly that they will withdraw "voluntarily" from the whole of Palestine very soon.

Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): I could have confined myself to supporting what has been said by the Ambassador of Oman, current Chairman of the Arab Group, in reply to the representative of the Zionist entity, but I should like to comment on certain points, and would ask my friend the Ambassador of Oman to bear with me if I do so. The representative of the Zionist entity spoke of the people of Palestine as if there were no people in that country and when the emigrants came from Europe and other regions they found an empty land waiting to be taken by the newcomers. This is an unbearable and extremely serious insult, to the intelligence and integrity of every one in this Hall. I should leave it to the representative of the Palestinian people to speak on this point, but I should like to refer to what the representative of the Zionist entity called the Palestinian "terrorists".

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

According to him, the Palestinians have to accept occupation, agree to live as refugees and concede to the entity this representative speaks for the right to carry out mass extermination against them or else bring down upon their heads the stigma of terrorism and qualify for massacre and organized genocide. We should have liked a straightforward answer from the representative of that entity to the straightforward question we put to him. Would he please tell us whether the Golan Heights is now inside what is called the State of Israel? Can he tell us whether Al-Quds is now the capital of that entity? What is at stake here is United Nations resolutions for the non-implementation of which we Arabs are being made to bear the responsibility. The picture is this: we Arabs are delaying the solution of the problem; we insist upon discussing the problem of Palestine; hence it is we Arabs who are squandering United Nations money and not those who occupy the land, violate the Charter, massacre the Palestinian people, murder the representative of the United Nations and do not recognize the resolutions of the United Nations. They are the peace-makers, the good guys.

This is a mammoth perversion of truth which cannot be swallowed. However, this is exactly what has been said by the leaders of Israel from Ben-Gurion to Shamir and Peres, who are all terrorists, and are guilty of the murder of the Palestinian people. I should like to ask the representative of the Zionist entity how many Palestinians he has killed with his own hands. Doubtless he has taken part in the killing of Palestinians and people of other neighbouring Arab lands. I am really sorry to have to take up the time of the Assembly for such discussions.

Before Britain handed over Palestine to the Zionists it had thought of Uganda and even the eastern part of Libya, Cyrenaica, Argentina and even Guinea as a land for the settlers, but it was the wretched lot of the Palestinians to have Palestine chosen. However, right will prevail. Injustice will not continue. The Palestinian people will liberate themselves, as have many other peoples.

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): It is particularly instructive that the representative of Libya and, I think, the representative of Iran as well find bothersome the notion that that land was barren in the late nineteenth century. If it was not as populated and as verdant a homeland teeming with Palestinian Arabs as Yasser Arafat and some here would have us believe, then there is obviously a different history. So they challenge this because it is central to the case that they have built in the last few decades.

I am not going to take up the time of the Assembly now to discuss this, but I promise that in the debate dealing with the Middle East I will discuss this at length. However, since I mentioned Mark Twain and Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, let me tell the Assembly what they said, because they visited the place; they were there in 1869 and 1882 - they and many others.

Mark Twain travelled along the length of Israel. He went to Mount Tabor, which is in the Galilee - a long journey. He said, "We never saw a human being on the whole route." Then he described the general state of the land. He said, "It sits in sackcloth, in ashes. ... Since the loss of Jewish sovereignty, it has gone down and down and down into dust." Then Penrhyn Stanley - and I will give the exact quotations in our discussion on the Middle East - described Judea. This is his term, by the way, not mine, and the term everybody used. Indeed the United Nations used that term until 1948, and I believe that some of the documents in 1949 still showed it. What else was Judea but the cradle of the Jews, who lived there continuously, even though in meagre numbers, once we had lost independence, and were the only ones that continued to strive to rebuild it. He described Judea as "empty" and "vacant". In fact he used almost exactly the same words as Twain: "not a settlement anywhere".

That was the state of that country when our people joined the few who were there guarding that land and rebuilt it, in a kind of miraculous burst of creative

(Mr. Netanyahu, Israel)

and constructive energy such as the world had not seen. Amid all the terrible energies of destruction that we have seen in this century and still see in this hall, that is perhaps our biggest accomplishment.

The point I wanted to complete before time ran out in my previous statement is simply this. Who is challenging us? Iran calls our country a terrorist base. I have no comment on that.

Then Libya talks about occupation of land - Libya. I think that the size of the territory occupied by Libya in Chad is 50 times that of the Golan Heights. Libya, that has sent its bombers into Sudan, that has sent its killers into Egypt, that has sent assassins into more than half a dozen African countries, that has sent out killer squads with terrorist hit lists, as Egypt has uncovered, that include the leaders of the world, from Francois Mitterrand to the leaders of India, not to mention the United States. Libya is lecturing us, and Iran is lecturing us, about human rights, about victims, about women and children - that same Iran that is now engaged in and refuses to stop the most murderous war since the Second World War, with over a million and a half casualties, in which children are used as cannon fodder, as human minefields. When I look at the company that is kept by those against us, when I look at Libya and Iran, I am very proud to be sitting in this seat.

The PRESIDENT: The Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization has requested to be allowed to make a statement in reply. I call on him in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX), of 22 November 1974.

Mr. AL-KIDWA (Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)) (interpretation from Arabic): We have heard a number of statements by the Zionist representative and we consider that what he has said shows total disregard of the facts, which are well known to the representatives here present. We have become accustomed to hearing many lies with regard to the history of Palestine and the alleged historic

(Mr. Al-Kidwa, PLO)

rights of the Zionists in our country, but that sort of insolence has reached new heights. We now hear new, mammoth lies about the modern history of Palestine, the present-day realities of Palestine, the physical, living reality represented by more than 5 million Palestinians in the land occupied in 1948 and the territories occupied in 1967, and now in the many diaspora camps which surround our country. In any event, we do not wish to engage in polemics on this subject as the truth is well known and we believe that there are enough United Nations resolutions dating from 1947 to the present day to refute categorically the fabrications of the representative of the Zionist entity.

For our part, we shall clarify our political point of view with regard to the different areas of the Palestinian cause and the Middle East question in the various Committees of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT: We have concluded our consideration of the first report of the Credentials Committee.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.