

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTIETH SESSION

Official Records



**2397th
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 7 November 1975,
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 27:	
Question of Palestine: report of the Secretary-General (continued)	727
Organization of work	742

**President: Mr. Gaston THORN
(Luxembourg).**

AGENDA ITEM 27

**Question of Palestine: report of the Secretary-General
(continued)**

1. Mr. VELLA (Malta): Whatever the range of differences that may exist in the perspectives of each country on the question before us, one essential point stands out: we are dealing here with the future of an ancient population which for decades has had its genuine grievances ignored and overridden, which has with difficulty maintained its identity under impossibly adverse and degrading circumstances imposed from outside. A historical analysis would require volumes to catalogue the innumerable wrongs inflicted on this population displaced from its proper homeland. It is a tragic history of miscarriage of justice abetted by the violent use of superior force.

2. Against this background, the strong feelings which have finally found an opportunity for expression in this Hall should not be a source of censure, but rather of a deeper understanding of what gave rise to them. So far, and after so many years of indifferent disregard, the United Nations has not gone beyond recognizing that the question of Palestine is a matter which should be discussed on its own merits and endorsing the right of the recognized representatives of the Palestinians to state their case and to be involved in the work of this Organization.

3. There is also a strong feeling, accompanied by varying degrees of conviction, that the Palestinian question is central to the problems of the Middle East, and that, consequently, this aspect cannot be ignored in any attempts at a just and peaceful solution in that troubled region. Finally, there is an increasing awareness in all parts of the world, that the wrongs suffered by the Palestinian people must be redressed.

4. The passion and bitterness can be easily understood, but it should be our purpose to write a new chapter, to foster the glimmer of hope that is appearing on the horizon. It is not an easy situation to deal with, but our approach should be on the side of generosity and, difficult as it may appear, we should look less on the bitterness of the past than on a peaceful approach

to the future. This requires understanding and dedication on the part of all countries, but particularly of the parties directly involved, as also of the countries most directly concerned in the continuing turbulence in the region. Too many opportunities for disinterested approaches have been lost in the past. These omissions should not be repeated.

5. One essential step is for those countries which still refuse to recognize the representative capability of the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO] to do so without further delay, and to grasp the peaceful hand that has been extended by its accredited representatives, so as to enable them to participate in the unfolding of their own destiny. Recognition in itself, however, is not enough; it must be followed by genuine negotiations. Failure to do this involves the danger of the rejection of moderation as an approach to peace, and the substitution of this potentially positive attitude by one of extremism.

6. But I must emphasize that events in the past have clearly shown that intransigence and reliance on the force of arms do not provide the answer. Intransigence is matched by irritation, violence breeds further violence and, with sophisticated weaponry readily available and constantly replenished, that method can only lead to an escalation of the dangerous spiral of war which has already ravaged the area several times in the past, with far-reaching consequences that constantly assume more ominous dimensions. Clearly, the approaches of the past have not provided the right elements for a solution. Equally clearly, we must come up with an alternative.

7. The broad guidelines for this approach must remain the purposes and principles of the United Nations and the pronouncements of its various bodies on this question; particularly relevant is the non-admissibility of the acquisition of territory by the use of armed force. The basis for an over-all solution is provided by the terms of the historic resolution which was adopted by the General Assembly at the twenty-ninth session. It now behoves us to consider the best ways and means for giving effect to resolution 3236 (XXIX). It is with those considerations in mind that my delegation has been introduced to announce its sponsorship of both draft resolutions that have been informally circulated.

8. Mr. GROZEV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from Russian*): At its twenty-ninth session, the General Assembly adopted three resolutions on the question of Palestine. They mark a turning-point in the evolution of the attitude of the international community and of our Organization to that problem. Those resolutions show that the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine and their legitimate right to fight for self-determination and independence are now generally recognized. At the same time, the international community and the United Nations have recognized the

true facts of the Middle East situation and have unequivocally stated not only that the question of Palestine is ripe for settlement but also that a just settlement there is an essential factor in the elimination of the conflict in the Middle East.

9. Both the debates held and the resolutions adopted at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly on this question, as well as the discussions at this session, have made an important contribution to the struggle to gain recognition for the legitimate rights of the people of Palestine and the elimination of a dangerous source of war in the Middle East.

10. It is particularly significant that the Palestinian people now have an opportunity to take part directly in the debates of the United Nations on the question that directly concerns their destiny and the struggle they have waged for so many years to gain recognition of their national rights.

11. Today it is clear to everyone that the question of Palestine is an acute political problem of present concern, which affects the interests of an entire people. It is more than clear that it is impossible to reduce the problem to the question of the refugees, as those who have trampled underfoot the rights of the Palestinian people have tried to do for many years.

12. Shortsightedness and a neglect of the true facts in politics have always been harmful. They are particularly dangerous when they apply to a very complex situation such as the one that has been created by imperialist circles involved in the Middle East. It is time now to understand that it is only by guaranteeing the rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination and to the creation of an independent national State, that we can find a comprehensive and just settlement in the Middle East. In other words, in that part of the world we cannot establish a just and lasting peace until we find a solution acceptable to the Palestinians that accords with the Charter of our Organization.

13. The fact that for more than a quarter of a century the Palestinian people have not been given a chance to exercise their legitimate rights is one of the primary sources of tension in the Middle East. That tension has arisen as a result of Israeli aggression. In essence, the conflict and crisis in the Middle East have come about primarily because of the violation of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, and the cruel subjugation and the inhuman persecution from which they have suffered.

14. Flagrant injustices have been inflicted on the Palestinian people. A million and a half Palestinians have been driven from their homes. They have been illegally deprived of their lands and have been subjected to systematic colonization. The terrorist war against the national liberation movement of the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples has been intensified. If to that we add the criminal aggression of the Zionists and their conquest by force of other Arab territories, the real reasons for the present and continuing tension in the Middle East and for the transformation of the area into a dangerous hotbed which threatens peace not only there but throughout the entire world will become clear.

15. More than a year has passed since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX). By

that resolution the Assembly reaffirmed the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination without external interference and to national independence and sovereignty. The legitimacy of its struggle in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations was recognized. The General Assembly expressed its grave concern over the fact that no just solution to the problem of Palestine had yet been found and asserted that the problem continued to endanger international peace and security. In addition, the General Assembly stressed that the Palestinian people was a principal party in the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

16. Unfortunately it must be stressed that, United Nations resolutions notwithstanding, in spite of the clearly expressed will of the overwhelming majority of the Members of the Organization and the resolutions of the Organization of African Unity and of the non-aligned countries, no progress has been made towards a settlement of the Palestinian question, and no movement has been made towards a solution of the crisis in the Middle East. In practice, there has not been compliance with General Assembly resolutions. The warnings of the international community and the authoritative statements made in international forums have not been taken into account. In addition, the Israeli authorities persist in their policies of aggression and, in spite of United Nations resolutions, refuse to recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestine people and their national liberation movement, the PLO. This course of action, promoted by Zionism and its foreign protectors, cannot fail to cause concern, particularly now, at a time when the leaders in Israel and certain circles are trying to convince the international community that some steps are being taken to resolve the crisis in the Middle East. Actually, these are palliatives which will hardly lead to a lasting settlement of the problem in the Middle East. A settlement cannot be just and lasting if it does not include recognition and realisation of the legitimate aspirations of the long-suffering people of Palestine. A country's position on this key problem is a clear indication of whether it desires to effect a permanent improvement in the political climate of the Middle East.

17. The Government and people of Bulgaria have been following developments in the Middle East with constant concern and interest. That is perfectly understandable, because the area is very near our country.

18. In accordance with our unswerving principles, socialist Bulgaria firmly supports the struggle of the Arab peoples, including the people of Palestine, against the expansionist, aggressive policies of Israel and against imperialist forces. We have advocated and continue to advocate the establishment of a lasting peace and a just settlement of the questions of the Middle East, so that the Arab peoples may confidently and without the interference of foreign forces move in the direction of social and economic development.

19. The position of Bulgaria on the problem of the Middle East is quite clear and constant. It is in line with the position of the overwhelming majority of the Member States of the United Nations, and Bulgaria has repeatedly expressed support for the cause of the Arab peoples in the United Nations both within and outside the United Nations. Our position was quite

clearly once again confirmed by the President of the Council of State of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov, in his statement of 14 October to the National Assembly of the Republic of Tunisia. He said:

"Bulgaria has always been, and today remains, a faithful friend and ally of the Arab people against Israeli aggression. It is our firm position that lasting peace and security in this region cannot be established unless Israeli forces are withdrawn from all the territories occupied in 1967, unless the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine and, above all, its right to create its own State are recognized, and unless the independence and sovereignty of all the peoples and countries of the Middle East are guaranteed."

20. It is with satisfaction that we have noted that that policy is recognized and considered by our friends as one aimed at establishing peace and mutual understanding. In that respect I should like to quote the words of the President of the political division of the Executive Committee of the PLO, Mr. Farouk Kaddoumi, who, during his visit to Bulgaria this year, stated:

"We are proud of our friendship with the countries of the Socialist community. The Arab peoples, and particularly the Arab people of Palestine, are deeply grateful for this great political, moral and material assistance. Whenever we have occasion, we reaffirm the fact that we have made major progress thanks to the active support which the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have given us and continue to give us. We are proud that our friend Bulgaria is the country in which, four years ago, the first International Trade Union Conference for solidarity with workers and the Arab people of Palestine was convened."

21. That is the best response to the slanderous statements of the chairman of one delegation who is known to be the champion of gross and unfounded calumnies, repeated *ad nauseam*, against the Soviet Union and the Socialist community. At this rostrum, the representative of the PLO has several times stressed the great and decisive assistance received from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in the struggle of the Palestinian people. The representative I have in mind, who indulges in the most unbridled anti-Soviet slander, has once again slanderously attacked those who are the staunchest allies, not just in words but in deeds, of the just struggle of the heroic Palestinian people. Let every delegation judge for itself who speaks the truth and who is deliberately distorting it. I should like to stress the words of a well-known Bulgarian writer: "When the slanderers are at work, remember this: wasps do not spoil their sting on rotten fruit."

22. The leaders of Israel should respect the clearly expressed will of the overwhelming majority of the Member States of the United Nations and finally face realities soberly. However, the facts show that Israel continues arrogantly and obstinately to pursue its expansionist and aggressive policies, with all the attendant dangers for peace in the Middle East and for the people of Israel themselves.

23. This policy was reaffirmed at this rostrum not many days ago. Absolute disregard for the United

Nations and little concern for its resolutions were again demonstrated. The leaders of Israel are apparently prepared to recognize the international Organization, its decisions and its resolutions only if they are in the service of world Zionism and become its instruments. This proves only their political blindness.

24. This aggressive course of the Israeli leaders is in stark contrast to the general tendency in international relations towards détente, mutual understanding and co-operation among peoples. The improvement of the international atmosphere, the implementation of the principle of peaceful coexistence and the elimination of the dangers of a new world confrontation are constantly being reaffirmed as the dominant features in the development of international relations. The successful conclusion of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, the historic victories of the peoples of Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia, and the notable achievements towards the final liquidation of colonialism are new and particularly important links in this irreversible process.

25. In the light of these positive developments, the anachronistic nature of the foreign policies of the Israeli leaders, their aggression and expansionism, their stubborn violation of the sacred rights of an entire people and their complete disregard for United Nations resolutions and the will of the international community become increasingly clear. The Israeli authorities seem to be living in another era. One cannot but wonder anew how long they will continue along this path, which can only lead to the destruction of their own people, among others. For how long can they count solely on the brazen political, military and economic assistance of the overseas supporters of international Zionism? Can Israel continue to live for ever in isolation? How much longer will the Israeli people tolerate this situation, and will the patience of the Palestinian Arab people and others not soon come to an end?

26. We Bulgarians know from our own historical experience that no form of slavery can last for ever. Our people for centuries were under a foreign yoke, but nothing could break our spirit and our national pride or destroy our desire for national independence and freedom. The will and the aspirations of the heroic people of Palestine will never be defeated. That is even less likely to happen since the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the fifty-eighth anniversary of which is being celebrated today, 7 November, by the Soviet people and the workers of all countries, and after the defeat of fascism and colonialism.

27. It is time for everyone to understand that the present policies of the leaders of Israel are completely at variance with the interests and aspirations of all the peoples of the world, great and small. Those policies do not and cannot lead to the establishment of peace and mutual understanding in the Middle East nor achieve for the Israeli people either security or peace.

28. Those policies respond only to the interests of those forces which in various parts of the world are trying to slow down the process of détente and are not in the interests of a solution to the problem of the Middle East or the establishment of lasting peace in the world.

29. The Israeli authorities may rest assured, however, that they cannot much longer trample under foot the right to self-determination, independence and national existence of the Arab peoples, including the Arab people of Palestine; nor will their back-door manoeuvres to create mistrust, hesitation and division among the Arab peoples for long be successful. They cannot halt the victorious and irreversible trend of the national, democratic revolution of the Arab peoples and the national liberation movement of the Palestinian people, which is an inalienable part of that revolution.

30. If anyone still has any doubts about this, it is necessary only to recall the notable statement of the Chairman of the PLO, Mr. Yasser Arafat,¹ at this rostrum about a year ago, and to consider carefully the words of a leader of that movement, Mr. Farouk Kaddoumi, who made a statement in this Assembly [2390th meeting] a few days ago.

31. It should be clear, even to the blind, that the PLO is the only legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and is today a primary factor on the political scene in the Middle East. The restoration, then, of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people within the framework of an over-all solution to the conflict in the Middle East is impossible without the participation on an equal footing of their representatives at all stages of any negotiations on the problem of the Middle East.

32. Furthermore, experience has shown that in order to achieve a just and lasting settlement of the crisis in the Middle East, it is indispensable that we not resort to partial and intermediate measures. There must be an integral solution to the entire problem. A solution of that kind is only possible within the framework of the effective machinery already set up—and I am referring to the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East—the resumption of whose work has been systematically sabotaged by the leaders of Israel and other well-known circles, in spite of the insistence of the socialist countries and of other countries. Any further attempts to bypass that Conference can only complicate the situation and create additional difficulties. Only in that forum can we consider and resolve all aspects of the Middle East problem, including the key question: the recognition and restoration of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. That is why all the parties concerned, and particularly the PLO, should participate in the work of the Geneva Conference.

33. At the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly a great stride was taken towards a just settlement of the Palestinian problem. We are confident that at its present session the General Assembly will reaffirm the results achieved and will take one more stride forward. It is necessary that we should accelerate a just settlement of this question for the sake of peace and security in the Middle East and of the principles on which our Organization was founded 30 years ago.

34. The Bulgarian delegation is, as always, prepared to co-operate actively in the drafting of resolutions on the problem of Palestine which are in keeping with the principles of our Organization and with the hopes placed in it by the heroic people of Palestine.

35. Mr. SLAOUI (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): The question of Palestine reached a decisive turning-point at the last session of the General As-

sembly after the Assembly, virtually unanimously, adopted a resolution that accorded to the Palestinian people the place due to it in the international community.

36. That is the interpretation given by the Moroccan delegation to the resolutions in which, refusing to continue considering the Palestinian problem as a marginal element, the Assembly made of that problem a principal element independent of the Middle East crisis. Therefore it is only just that this position should have been made official by the General Assembly, particularly in view of the fact that the Palestinian question was at the origin of the crisis in the Middle East which itself, as is now recognized, can only be resolved by a just and objective settlement of the tragedy of the Palestinian people.

37. My delegation considers, moreover, that the recognition of the representative character of the PLO by the General Assembly is a positive factor. It is a guarantee that future discussions concerning this agonizing question will have every chance of leading to satisfactory solutions for the Palestinian people, which itself considers the PLO as the essential intermediary between itself and the United Nations.

38. It is fair to reaffirm and to recognize that the solution adopted by the United Nations is merely the consequence of the tenacious struggle which our Palestinian brothers have been waging for the past 30 years to defend their life as human beings and their existence as a nation against the war of political and physical extermination, which Israel has never ceased to wage against them with a ruthlessness that is only equalled by the immorality of those who decided upon it and who wish to carry it to its conclusion.

39. By adopting resolution 3236 (XXIX), the United Nations, increasingly aware of the true Palestinian problem and ever more convinced of the legitimacy of the rights of the Palestinian people, has partially corrected the positions it had formerly adopted, the injustice of which we believe was at the root of much suffering which could have been averted many years ago through a clearer assessment and a more understanding analysis of the situation.

40. The history of the Palestinian struggle abounds in sacrifices and acts of heroism. As early as 1936, the Palestinian people, feeling that a plot was afoot against their existence, went on strike for more than six months, stoically bearing the economic and political consequences of such an act. The Second World War took place; the principle of the liberation of oppressed peoples was adopted at the inception of the United Nations and from that time the Palestinian people expected to be treated like other peoples, which were promoted to independence and the restoration of their national dignity.

41. But it received a terrible shock when the State of Israel was recognized on its own territory. The Zionists and imperialists plotting against it were not satisfied with subjecting it once again to foreign occupation; on the contrary, once again they wished to disperse it, to decimate it, to take over its property, to confiscate its land and to impose foreign sovereignty on its homeland with the sole aim of satisfying the interests of some groups of immigrants, settlers and imperialists.

42. Thus, through those insidious and pitiless machinations, the Palestinian people was deprived not only of the right of governing its country but even of the right to continue to live in its own territory.

43. This is the tragedy which the Palestinian people has been living through for more than 30 years and which has deeply shocked the collective conscience of mankind.

44. The Palestinian people, however, has never admitted defeat. With perseverance and determination, it has opposed all the forces of evil with unwavering resistance and its sons have unhesitatingly bared their breasts to murderous weapons.

45. Convinced of the legitimacy of its cause, it has resisted the language of force and has maintained its existence by means of its awareness of and the strength of its faith in its thousand-year-long history.

46. Many years have passed since the Palestinian people was called upon to abdicate its right to existence and renounce its nationhood. Throughout these long years of trial it has affirmed its right to life, thus giving a worthy example and winning first the interest and then the respect of the international community.

47. When the General Assembly invited the PLO to participate in its debates as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people [*resolution 3210 (XXIX)*], it was merely giving official recognition to what everyone feels in his heart with regard to the Palestinian people, whose courage and sacrifice have won for it the highest esteem and consideration.

48. A draft resolution adopted by the Third Committee [*see A/10320 and Add.1, para. 13, draft resolution III*] is about to be submitted to the General Assembly. It states that zionism with its abject characteristics, its hegemonic aims, its immoral ideology and its inadmissible practices should be considered as a form of racism and condemned as such.

49. By adopting that kind of resolution the General Assembly will be taking the first step towards redressing the situation created in 1947.

50. In its resolution 3236 (XXIX), the General Assembly indicated unequivocally the political line to be followed, which recognizes the inalienable right of the Palestinian people, deprived of its homeland, to independence. The time seems to have come to give that resolution real content, to ensure for the Palestinian people a national territory in Palestine and to restore to that people the homeland of which it was unjustly deprived.

51. The United Nations has recognized the legitimacy of the national liberation struggle of the Palestinian people. The Palestinian people was driven from its homeland by the Zionist movement, which established a settlement in that region and built up a power founded on racism and an expansionist policy.

52. Noting the true nature of zionism, the General Assembly reaffirmed the national rights of the Palestinian people, and particularly its right to independence and sovereignty. The next stage in the action of our Organization should therefore be to find the ways and means of implementing the national rights of the Palestinian people. It must proceed on the basis of the massive support for that brave people which became evident in this forum at the twenty-ninth session.

53. Thus, the General Assembly would establish, on the basis of the draft resolution that will be submitted to it, a committee on Palestine to follow closely the development of this question and to propose all the measures necessary to assist the Palestine national liberation movement.

54. Along the same lines, it will be necessary to establish, as proposed recently by the representative of the PLO, a special committee to combat zionism. That committee will in particular inform international public opinion of the nature and objectives of this racist and colonialist doctrine.

55. We could not recall too often the obstinacy and arrogance of Israeli militarism, which goes so far as to deny the very existence of the Palestinian people, the first victim of Zionist colonialism. In addition, the Zionist movement has always attempted politically to liquidate the Palestinian people. Morocco is convinced that, in order to respond to this Zionist challenge, the PLO should be represented in all international institutions and conferences, as well as in all meetings aimed at resolving the Middle East crisis. Indeed, this crisis can be settled only if the Palestinians take part in those meetings and if their national rights are recognized.

56. International efforts should first of all be focused on the substance of the problem, namely, the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. In these conditions, we cannot confine ourselves to a settlement of the consequences of Israeli aggression.

57. It is true that disengagement agreements have been concluded on a bilateral basis. We hope that those agreements will be followed rapidly by others so that the process of Israeli withdrawal from all occupied territories may be hastened. But the problem of the national rights of the Palestinian people unfortunately remains in all its seriousness. The international community must use all the means available to it to compel Israel to abandon its racist and expansionist ideas.

58. The Palestinian people unquestionably and necessarily has the right to live. It has the right to a territory. It has a right to its territory.

59. While awaiting a settlement, which we hope will soon be forthcoming, the international community must prevent Israel from continuing its present policy of oppression and persecution over all the occupied territories, particularly the West Bank.

60. We are all aware of the actions carried out by Israel against the life and property of the people. We are aware of the initiatives aimed at destroying the national Palestinian heritage. We have already rebelled, several times, against the Judaization of Arab cities and villages and the profanation of the Holy Places; we are continuously revolted by the usurpation of mosques and the destruction of places of prayer.

61. More than ever before, the international community must assume its responsibilities and put an end to the criminal acts perpetrated against our Palestinian brothers. More than ever before, it must provide justice. In that way, and in that way only, can we earn the confidence of our peoples, can our Organization do justice to its noble ambitions.

62. We can, by ensuring for the Palestinian people a national homeland in Palestine, appease our con-

sciences and make sure of achieving other successes in the advancement of mankind.

63. Mr. MOYNIHAN (United States of America): Our discussion comes to focus again this year on one aspect of an over-all settlement in the Middle East which is, especially in human terms, most sensitive and demanding.

64. The Government of the United States remains determined to exert its fullest efforts towards the peaceful achievement of this settlement, dealing justly and durably with all issues which the Arab-Israeli dispute comprises. Let me quote what the Secretary of State, Mr. Kissinger, told the General Assembly on 22 September:

“... I want to emphasize that the United States did not help negotiate this agreement”—referring to the most recent Sinai Agreement²—“in order to put an end to the process of peace, but to give it new impetus.

“President Ford has stated that we will not accept stalemate or stagnation in the Middle East. That was true before the Sinai Agreement was signed; it remains true today. The objective of our policy is not merely to create another temporary truce but to sustain the momentum of negotiations. The United States is determined to take every feasible step to help promote further practical progress towards final peace.” [2355th meeting, paras. 88-89.]

65. We recognize, in particular, that an equitable negotiated solution of the Palestinian problem must be an important element in such a settlement. As Mr. Kissinger said earlier this month, there will be no permanent peace in the Middle East unless it includes arrangements that take into account the legitimate interests of the Palestinian people. No one can disregard the Palestinians as an important element in the Middle Eastern equation or denigrate their legitimate aspirations.

66. The Palestinian question has always been broader and more complex than the issues of humanitarian relief to refugees, crucial as that may be at this moment. Its aspects and ramifications have multiplied in recent years. No one can ignore this reality in the context of our current and future peace efforts in the Middle East, and we shall not do so.

67. Peace-making efforts are carried out within the framework established by the Security Council in its resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). This framework has been agreed to by the parties to the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East, has facilitated the notable progress that has been made in the last two years, and provides for the further progress for which we are now striving. We commend the effort to pursue Palestinian interests by means outlined in the Charter. Nevertheless, because of our support for this framework, we must take issue on the working paper proposing to establish a committee.

68. Last year, as the Assembly is aware, the United States voted against resolution 3236 (XXIX). Our reason was our reservation about the efficacy of meeting the interests and concerns of the Palestinians through resolutions of the General Assembly rather than through the give-and-take of the negotiating process. We believe also that the exhortation to

exercise any Palestinian rights in Palestine creates a serious political and legal problem. Part of the geographic entity known as Palestine now constitutes the territory of a State Member of the United Nations. Thus a claim to exercise rights in Palestine appears as a claim which, at least in part, involves the internal jurisdiction of a Member State.

69. Regarding the proposal to invite the PLO to Geneva, we note that there are various views among the present parties to the Geneva Conference. We believe that this is the crux of the problem, and our policy is that any new participation in the Geneva Conference can only be the result of careful consideration, negotiation and agreement among the parties. We are prepared actively to participate in such negotiations. Our own views on the obstacles to recognition of, or negotiation with, the PLO are a matter of public record.

70. President Ford has made it clear that the United States will assist the parties in any way it can, as the parties desire, to achieve a negotiated settlement within the framework established by Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). We are ready to encourage further negotiations between Syria and Israel. We are ready to discuss and consult with all the countries involved about the substance and form of a reconvened Geneva Conference. We are prepared to discuss how best to ensure that legitimate Palestinian interests are brought into the negotiating process. We are ready to explore possibilities on one or several tracks. We are determined to persevere.

71. But we are not prepared to participate in or support changes by the General Assembly in the painstakingly negotiated framework for negotiations established by the Security Council and accepted by the parties. Nor are we prepared to support rights for one group at the expense of the rights of others. We are prepared, however, to encourage negotiation and the pursuit by peaceful means of the settlement we all desire.

72. It is in this manner that the legitimate interests of the Palestinians can be met, and they must be met for peace to prevail. The United States stands ready in that spirit to assist as best it can, and promote, as it must, true peace in the Middle East.

73. Mr. HERZOG (Israel): It is indeed a matter for regret that my prognostications at the beginning of the debate have been fully vindicated and have proved to be correct. Instead of a fruitful debate, which would encourage the present trend towards peaceful negotiations and accommodation between nations on the basis of mutual respect and recognition, we have been subjected to the inevitable barrage of hatred and calumny and to a process of rewriting of history, the inaccuracy of which is difficult to conceive.

74. Surely there is a limit to gullibility. Surely there is a limit to the naïveté of representatives who proceed to rewrite history in a most unashamed manner, history which should still be fresh in the minds of the representatives in this Hall. Surely there is a limit to the degree to which the intelligence of this Assembly can be insulted.

75. The ancient historic and religious rights of the Jewish people in the Holy Land, in which the Jewish people have maintained a constant, unbroken presence

for thousands of years and which has been consecrated by thousands of years of religious, national, political and historic experience, were confirmed by the League of Nations after the First World War. The re-establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine was welcomed by, among others, leaders of the Arab resurgence who recognized that there was room for one small Jewish State within a total area of 4.5 million square miles in which the Arab nation exercised its sovereignty in 20 States.

76. In 1947, the General Assembly, in an historic act, confirmed to the Jewish people its historic right to a State of its own in its ancient homeland. The scheme put forward by the United Nations called for the partition of the country into two States, a Jewish State and an Arab State. The Jewish people formally accepted the United Nations resolution. The Arab nations rejected the United Nations resolution out of hand. On 15 May 1948, with the conclusion of the British Mandate, seven Arab armies invaded Palestine with the avowed purpose of destroying the State of Israel in its infancy. Those Arab military operations were described by the then Soviet representative to the United Nations, Mr. Andrei Gromyko, in the Security Council as being "aimed at the suppression of the national liberation movement".³

77. It was as simple as that—and, as has been said, truth does not change just because those who proclaim it get tired of their own veracity.

78. A small Jewish population, outnumbered and outgunned, fought back desperately and successfully, losing 1 per cent of its manpower in the process, and the State of Israel was established. The allegations repeated again and again, without foundation, by the Jordanian representative and the PLO representative about the expulsion of Palestinian Arabs are complete fabrications and constitute nothing but a series of falsehoods. The Palestinian Arabs, as everybody who will take the trouble to read of those tragic days will know, left their homes on the specific instructions of their leaders—who, incidentally, were the first to leave. They were promised that they would return in the wake of the victorious Arab armies and would inherit the spoil and the loot of the Jewish population, which would be annihilated and thrown into the sea.

79. Let me quote one small excerpt from the memoirs of Haled al Azm, who served as Prime Minister of Syria in 1948 and 1949. These memoirs were published two years ago in Beirut. Mr. al Azm writes:

"Since 1948 we have been demanding the return of the refugees to their homes. But we ourselves are the ones who encouraged them to leave. Only a few months elapsed between our call to them to leave and our appeal to the United Nations to resolve on their return. Is this a wise and stable policy? Is there harmony in such a programme? We have brought destruction upon a million Arab refugees by calling upon them and pleading with them to leave their land, their homes, their work and their business, and we have caused them to be barren and unemployed, though each one of them had been working and qualified in a trade from which he could make a living. In addition, we accustomed them to begging for handouts and to making do with what little the United Nations Organization would allocate to them".

That is a quotation from a distinguished Arab leader of that time.

80. Only last week members of the Assembly read in the press reports from Lebanon that the local population refused to leave the areas of strife, citing the Palestinian precedent of 1948 and pointing out that "this time we will not listen to our leaders and leave".

81. An entire library has been written by the Palestinians themselves, describing those tragic days and the callous advice they were given by their leaders.

82. Time and again over the years we offered compromises. But the Arab States would not agree, because they wanted to perpetuate the conflict and did not want to lose this political pawn. We offered compensation for their property, but they refused because this implied a recognition of the State of Israel. Every proposal that we made over the years indicating a willingness for compromise was turned down by the Arabs, who were invariably controlled and ruled—as members will have gathered from their observations at these sessions of the General Assembly—by the most extreme element.

83. Following the Sinai campaign in 1956 we withdrew from all the territory occupied in that campaign—namely, the whole of Sinai and Gaza—on the understanding that United Nations Emergency Forces would be stationed along our borders with Egypt and at the Straits of Tiran on the Gulf of Aqaba, and that shipping to and from the Gulf of Aqaba would be free and unimpeded. Ten years later, in May 1967, President Nasser of Egypt ordered the United Nations Emergency Forces to withdraw. The then Secretary-General of the United Nations agreed to withdraw the forces without demur and without so much as consulting the Security Council or the General Assembly. President Nasser then closed the Straits of Tiran to all Israeli shipping, thereby creating a *casus belli*. He paraded his armies through the streets of Cairo as they moved to Sinai, announcing on 26 May 1967 to the Arab Trade Union Congress that this time he would liquidate the Palestine problem—in other words, he would destroy Israel. Arab armies ringed Israel—250,000 troops. The Arab world was seized by mass hysteria. The world looked on in horror, powerless to do anything. The Security Council excelled itself again in debating, but did nothing else. Sinister forces encouraged the Arab assault on Israel. Valedictory articles were written in the world press about the model society and democracy that had been Israel. The Arab world rejoiced and promised every man, woman and child in Israel the most horrible fate imaginable. Mass hysteria such as has never been seen gripped the Arab world as their armies poised around Israel prepared to strike and, in their words, to throw the Jews into the sea. Again we fought back against heavy odds, and within a week the combined Arab forces had been defeated and the territories now being administered by Israel in the West Bank, Sinai, Gaza, and the Golan Heights were in Israeli hands.

84. We did not make war for conquest. We did not plan to go to war. We did not and do not seek territory or expansion. All the Arab statements at that time are on record for members of this Assembly to read. The war which the Arabs brought on us and on themselves led to the results of the 1967 war. To talk of Israeli aggression, as many delegations have done here,

is untrue and venal. To talk of Israeli aggression is to repeat a barefaced lie which does not bear examination in the face of facts. All of the representatives here were grown-up people in 1967. Let them not try to pretend that they do not recall what occurred in 1967. Any self-respecting delegation, from whatever group or bloc of countries, which indulges in this cynical rewriting of history is but condemning itself in its own words.

85. Less than two weeks after the conclusion of hostilities in June 1967, the Government of Israel offered to return the whole of Sinai to Egypt and the whole of the Golan Heights to Syria in return for the demilitarization of those areas and a peace treaty. But the Arabs were advised otherwise and again did not agree to negotiation or compromise. The Jordanian representative's description of the outbreak of the 1967 war is an utter travesty of the truth and an insult to this body. All the Arab leaders, including his own King Hussein, are on record in writing, in speech, in film—and if he needs copies I shall let him have them—describing their plans to annihilate Israel and urging forward their troops to accomplish their task.

86. On Monday morning, 5 June 1967, General Odd Bull of Norway, the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization at that time, transmitted a message from our then Prime Minister, the late Mr. Levi Eshkol, to King Hussein, warning him against joining in the attack against Israel. Let me quote King Hussein:

“It was a little after 11 a.m. The Norwegian General informed me that the Israeli Prime Minister had addressed an appeal to Jordan. He added: ‘If you don’t intervene, you will suffer no consequences’.”

He continues:

“By this time we were already fighting in Jerusalem and our planes had just taken off to bomb Israeli air bases . . .”

87. The Jordanian reply was, for the second time in 19 years, to open a massive artillery bombardment on the Holy City of Jerusalem, to launch Jordanian forces against the United Nations Compound in Government House in Jerusalem and to bomb and shell villages, farms and cities of Israel, including Tel Aviv, indiscriminately.

88. Let me quote yet another little item from King Hussein's memoirs about that fateful morning:

“I’ve given our artillery orders to occupy the front lines. An infantry battalion of the Iman Ali brigade has been ordered to occupy Mount Scopus in Jerusalem.”

Then he explains:

“Mount Scopus is in the demilitarized zone of Jerusalem. The headquarters of the Norwegian General Odd Bull, Chief of Staff of the United Nations Security Force, have been in this isolated spot since the first Israeli Arab conflict in 1948. Mount Scopus was occupied by our troops a short time later.”

89. That is why the West Bank is today in Israel's hands. I ask my Jordanian colleague: Whom are we supposed to believe? His statement, which like many

of his other statements, bears not the slightest relation to the facts, or the statements of his head of State, of his King, published in this book. Would he like me to read the book published by his own monarch describing those events which shows that his description is one complete fabrication of untruths, or would he perhaps like to declare that he considers that the history written by his King is false. If he still has his doubts, I suggest he go upstairs to the Secretariat, or perhaps we can save him the trouble and we can ask to have, down here, for all delegations, the report of the United Nations personnel on the spot at the time, describing that Jordanian attack which caused the West Bank to fall into Israeli hands.

90. It is interesting to see to what degree the Palestinian Arab people have become pawns in the inter-Arab game of politics. My Jordanian colleague avoids the issue by using the time-worn phrase: “the historic borders of Palestine are well known”. I agree with him. The historic borders of Palestine are those of mandatory Palestine, as defined by the League of Nations in 1920, and I repeat, 80 per cent of Palestine is what is today the State of Jordan. Furthermore, I repeat that, notwithstanding his statement that the vast majority of Palestinians live in Gaza and the West Bank and as refugees, the fact is that 80 per cent of the Palestinian Arabs live in Jordan, in Israel, in the West Bank and in Gaza. He talks about a very limited number of Palestinian Arabs. The PLO representative talks about 3.5 million people. Frankly, I do not understand why they cannot get together and make up their minds. At least on this one issue they should be able to agree. Our figures, according to verified statements, show that there are approximately 2.8 million Palestinian Arabs of whom 1,678,000 are Jordanian citizens and 468,000 are Israeli citizens. They talk endlessly about the process of annihilation of the Palestinian Arabs. And yet their own figures reveal that the Palestinian Arabs have more than doubled in number in 25 years.

91. My Jordanian colleague tries to differentiate between the East Bank of Jordan and the West Bank. He apparently denies the existence of any Palestinian entity in Jordan. It is touching to see how he has joined forces with the PLO in this Assembly. I wonder if he would care to explain in that case, how he reconciles his approach with the statement published by Yasser Arafat in a letter to the Jordanian Student Congress in Baghdad in November 1974:

“Jordan is ours, Palestine is ours and we shall build our national entity on the whole of this land after having freed it of both the Zionist presence and the reactionary traitor presence.”

How does my Jordanian colleague reconcile that statement with the enthusiastic support which he seems to be giving to the cause of the PLO at this Assembly?

92. He continues in his remarks to point out that the Jordanian Government is committed to the Arab Summit Conference at Rabat in October 1974.⁴ As one who considers himself reasonably well informed on Middle East affairs, I note, with not a little surprise, his enthusiasm for the decision taken at the Rabat Conference. Does he in fact really accept the PLO as the legitimate representative of all the Palestinian Arabs, including those on the East Bank of the Jordan?

93. I challenge him to address himself to this issue so that at least we will all know what and whom we are talking about.

94. It is time, however, that we exploded once and for all the myth about Israeli aggression in 1967. Let me nail it down for the blatant lie and untruth that it is. We were threatened with annihilation. The threats are all on record. The move-up of the armies was in full view of the world. The United Nations forces were ignominiously expelled. We were left on our own, and we were left to protect our lives and the lives of our wives and children. We did not seek aggression; we do not seek aggression. But we do not propose to withdraw in order to enable the Arab forces to commence a fifth offensive against us. We are prepared for discussions between the parties within the broad framework of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) which assume the creation of normal, civilized relations with Israel and the establishment of secure and recognized borders for Israel. We do not deny, nor have we ever done so, that many outstanding problems remain to be solved. But we do contend that without a change of heart as far as Israel and its right to exist is concerned, little or no advance can be expected. We have no intention at this stage of negotiating our own suicide.

95. I have no intention of going into a detailed refutation of the baseless and unfounded allegations made by the PLO representative before this Assembly in his recurrent appearances before this body, each of which has been so eloquent in highlighting Israel's problems. Seventy-five thousand Arab workers cross daily into Israel of their own volition and are protected by one of the most advanced and socially conscious trade unions in the world, earning exactly what their fellow Jewish workers earn. They work with their Jewish colleagues, they earn the same salary, they produce together, they strike together. They earn the same benefits given to them by one of the most socially advanced countries in the world. The PLO tries to stop them from coming to work. But against the will of the Palestinian Arabs they are powerless. That is their problem. They just do not represent them.

96. The Jordanian representative's statements constitute one long series of falsehoods which it is beneath my dignity to attempt to refute—and the same is true of the statements of the PLO representative. After all, the State of Israel is a very open society, free for everybody to visit, to see and to criticize. You do not have to pass terrifying barriers of sinister hooded armed guards, in the manner of the PLO, to enter Israel or to move around the country freely.

97. I do not propose to answer the numerous points raised in this debate. It is time-consuming and really unproductive, especially since one cannot escape the conclusion that many delegations here have preconceived notions and do not want to be confused with facts.

98. Several representatives have addressed themselves to the question of what is the core, the heart, of the Middle East conflict. Those amongst us who know the complex history of the conflict, although they may have changed sides and wish to forget statements they once made at the United Nations, are fully aware of this fact that, while it is an important part of the Middle East conflict, the question of the Palestine

Arabs is not its core. At the heart of the Arab-Israeli conflict it is not the question of finding a satisfactory solution to the problem of Palestinian Arab identity, although, as I said, we consider that very important; nor is it the question of territories that came under Israeli administration as a result of Arab aggression in 1967 or for that matter any other related problem in this complex conflict.

99. You may solve all the problems mentioned above and yet not settle the Arab-Israeli conflict because at the heart of the conflict lies the Arab refusal to recognize the right of the Jewish nation to self-determination and national sovereignty in at least a part of its ancient homeland, a homeland that was never in history considered a homeland by any other people, a homeland that the Jewish people has inhabited continuously and without interruption for the last four millennia.

100. Unless and until the Arabs recognize Israel's right—I repeat, right—to exist, rather than, as we hear one Arab leader declaring, recognize Israel as a fact because it is not in their reach to destroy Israel militarily, durable peace will not come to the Middle East.

101. This is not our opinion only; some learned Arabs have come to recognize this to be the underlying problem in our conflict. One such Arab leader is the internationally respected former President of this Assembly, Mr. Charles Malik, who said in an interview which appeared in the 22 March 1975 issue of the *Saturday Review* that in his opinion:

“The main essential for peace—indeed the quintessential—is the need for the Arab world to accept Israel's existence. He [Malik] felt that this is the ultimate issue. Unless and until the Arab peoples have a genuine change of heart on this question, the Middle East will be vibrated from one crisis to the next. He [Malik] repeated ‘change of heart’ in order to emphasize his belief that what is required is not just a temporary accommodation or an expedient political manoeuvre, but a genuine acceptance of Israel as a State.”

102. If there is anyone in this Hall who may still harbour some doubts with respect to the true core of the Middle East conflict, a very succinct definition was given by none other than Yasser Arafat himself. In the opening address at a symposium on Palestine in Tripoli, Libya, he stated:

“There will be no presence in the region except for the Arab presence.”

103. In other words, in the Middle East, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Persian Gulf, only one presence is allowed, and that is the Arab presence. No other people, regardless of how deep are its roots in the region, is permitted to enjoy its right to self-determination.

104. This is the real racism in our region; this is the real exclusivism in the Middle East.

105. A mechanism has been established in the Middle East by the United Nations, within the framework of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), in order to achieve a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. That mechanism includes the Geneva Peace Conference. It has already brought about two

disengagement agreements, one with Egypt⁵ and one with Syria,⁶ and now the first interim agreement with Egypt, within the framework of the Sinai Agreement.²

106. The various draft resolutions which have been and are being mooted have one purpose and one purpose only: to sabotage the existing mechanism, which is working and the results of which we see every day, and to neutralize all further efforts to move towards peace.

107. Why destroy the mechanism that has been created and works? Why let extremism take control and introduce conflict instead of negotiations, and encourage irreconcilable differences instead of accommodation? Why should this Organization, by accepting any of these draft resolutions, lend a hand in defeating its own purpose? Why should political expediency be allowed to darken the prospects for peace?

108. Many of the delegations blithely express themselves on the question of the representation of the PLO at Geneva. The PLO has made it quite clear that it does not accept resolution 242 (1967), that it does not accept the basis of the Geneva Conference, which after all is based on recognition of Israel, compromise with Israel, secure and recognized borders, and so on. Why force them into a situation which they are not willing to accept?

109. The Security Council of this Organization created the Geneva Conference on the basis of resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). I ask you, if the PLO wants to go to Geneva, is it not logical for the United Nations to ask it to declare, in advance, that it accepts the basis of the resolutions which the Security Council has laid down as a framework? Many of the delegations talked about the right of Israel to exist, or the right of all States in the area to exist. I ask representatives, how do you reconcile this with Yasser Arafat's statement in Tripoli in May of this year that "there will be no presence in the region except for the Arab presence"? Or how do you reconcile your statements with that of the representative of the PLO to the effect that the "principles of Palestinian diplomacy are non-recognition, no peace . . . no right of passage through the Suez Canal . . . a political settlement is doomed to failure . . ."?

110. Resolution 3236 (XXIX) is cited. I repeat, how do you reconcile Yasser Arafat's statement, "Resolution 3236 (XXIX) comprises the liquidation of Zionist existence", with the statement that you recognize the right of Israel to exist?

111. If you are honest with yourselves, how do you reconcile your declarations with article 21 of the Palestine National Covenant which "rejects all plans that aim at the settlement of the Palestine issue"?

112. I listened to the representative of the Soviet Union reaffirming his Government's oft-repeated policy supporting the rights of all States in the area to exist, including, of course, Israel. I would be most intrigued to know how the representative of the Soviet Union or for that matter the representatives of all the other countries which supported that view, reconcile this statement, doubtless made in good faith, with their support for the PLO, in the light of the statement by the representative of the PLO to a press conference

in this building the day before yesterday to the effect that he regards Tel Aviv as occupied territory.

113. You surely do not expect us to sit down with people who make such statements. That being the case, would not the General Assembly be wiser to avoid voting for resolutions which have not the slightest chance of ever being translated into reality?

114. To sum up, I can only repeat what I said some days ago. Every extreme draft resolution introduced here is self-defeating as far as moving towards accommodation in the area is concerned. If representatives want the process of peace to move forward, let them support the existing machinery which has been set up by the Security Council, encourage it and help it along. To support today any draft resolution of the type presented to us, or which will be presented to us, will be to support the policy of those who, under article 21 of the Palestine covenant, reject "all plans that aim at the settlement of the Palestine issue".

115. The choice is clear and unequivocal. Each delegation, in making its decision, will bear a very heavy responsibility for the future course of events in the Middle East.

116. Mr. ALLAF (Syrian Arab Republic): Mr. President, I really admire your patience and the patience of the representatives at this meeting. We have heard today for the second time from the representative of the Zionist régime the same utter lies and fabrications we listened to on the first day of the discussion of the Palestine question. I do not know if the representative of the racist régime was speaking in exercise of the right of reply; he referred to various statements by representatives who have spoken since the beginning of the discussion. But, since his statement was distributed some time ago as a prepared statement, and since even the passages quoted were the very ones he quoted in his first statement on the first day of the debate, I wonder why he has taxed the patience and courtesy of the members of the Assembly by repeating the same lies and the same fabrications.

117. I reserve my delegation's right to answer at the appropriate time those lies which we are so used to hearing from all colonialists and all racists.

[The speaker continued in Arabic.]

118. Since the end of the Second World War no other such tragedy as the Palestinian tragedy has befallen a people, and no other aggression has continued and been protracted, with hearts and consciences hardening to it, as has the Zionist aggression against the Arab States. The life span of this tragedy is the life span of the United Nations. While the United Nations blows out 30 candles, there have been a little fewer than 30 years of crisis, torture, oppression and murder, and the dispersal of 3 million Palestinians and Arabs suffering under the yoke of the invading occupiers or living in refugee camps not far distant from their usurped land and territory.

119. The root of the tragedy stretches back much further than that, to 1898, when a number of Zionist leaders in the Swiss city of Basle studied a large map of the Palestinian territory with greedy eyes. They decided that that land, a distance of thousands of miles from the first Zionist Congress, a land upon which most of them had never even set foot, was the

candidate for usurpation. Twenty years later, in 1917, another alien whose eyes had never before seen the land of Palestine decided that His Majesty's Government looked sympathetically upon the establishment of a national home for the Jews in Palestine, provided that did not infringe the rights of the other populations in the country. That statement by Lord Balfour was the price of Zionist financing of British expenditures during the First World War. It was the promise of one who did not own what was promised to one who did not deserve it. Thus Britain deliberately and with premeditation violated the conditions of the Mandate whereby Palestine and eastern Jordan were later put under its administration, in the absence of the innocent people of Palestine, the overwhelming majority of whom at that time were Arab Muslims, with a minority of Christian and Jewish Arabs.

120. The total population of Palestine in 1914 was 689,000. Of those, only 48,660 were Jewish. In the first census carried out in Palestine in October 1922 the total population was 757,182 people. Of those, 78 per cent were Muslims and only 11 per cent were Jews, while 10 per cent were Christians. After that we saw the beginning of the organized racist imperialist occupation under the very eyes of the British Mandate in the form of successive waves of illegal immigration. Ten years later, in 1931, when the second official census was taken by the Mandatory it was found that the population of Palestine had increased to 1,033,314. Of those, 693,147 were Muslims, 174,606 were Jews and 88,907 were Christians. That meant that, in the decisive 10 years between the two censuses, Arab Muslims and Christians increased by a normal population rate of increase of 29 per cent, while the number of Jews increased, through illegal immigration, by 108 per cent.

121. In the period between 1931 and the end of 1944, according to the statistics of the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry of 1946,⁷ the Jewish population in Palestine increased, through feverish immigration, from 174,606 in 1931 to 528,702 in 1944, in other words by 300 per cent, while the Arab Muslims increased from 693,147 in 1931 to 994,724 in 1944, or by 40 per cent.

122. The heroic uprisings of the Palestinian people and their revolutions in the 1930s and later were not able seriously to affect this wave of alien immigrants who had come to usurp the land and expel its original population by various means of terrorism, coercion and inducement. Then came the Second World War; the Zionists used the Nazi crimes against the Jews to arouse the sympathy of world public opinion. The Zionist settler colonialist invasion of Arab Palestine was stepped up with the encouragement of the United States and European countries which, by responding to the ambitions of world Zionism, considered that they would alleviate their guilt for what had happened in the critical situation with regard to the Jews in Europe, thus burdening the Arab Palestinian people, which was innocent of those crimes, and making it pay for and redress the crimes Europeans had committed against the Jews, crimes and mistakes as unjust and as bitter as those perpetrated against the innocent Arabs.

123. With the birth of the United Nations and the awakening by the Charter of the aspirations of the

small peoples in regard to justice, peace and freedom, the Arabs looked with confidence and hope to the nascent international Organization and placed in the San Francisco Charter all their hopes with regard to man's basic freedoms, equality of rights of peoples and their right to sovereignty, independence and self-determination. Nevertheless the new international Organization soon forgot its principles and objectives, even before the ink had dried on the San Francisco Charter.

124. In contradiction of all the principles of human rights, self-determination, national integrity and unity on the national soil, the General Assembly on 29 November 1947 at its second session adopted its resolution 181 (II) calling for the dismemberment of Palestine and its division into two separate States, Arab and Israeli, and placing Jerusalem under a special international régime.

125. This Plan of Partition was adopted by 33 votes to 13, with the abstention of 10 States. In other words, it was adopted by a number of votes that today could not ensure adoption of even the simplest procedural matter, such as the closure of a debate, the suspension of a meeting or the inclusion of an item on the agenda. Even more important than that, among the 33 countries that adopted the Plan of Partition there were only one Asian country and two African States, one of those being the racist Union of South Africa. The other 31 countries which created the Palestinian tragedy were all European and American States—North or South American since at that time most of the countries of Latin America had not yet freed themselves from the American imperialist influence. It is unfortunate for the people of Palestine that the Zionist racist invasion befell them before the continents of Africa and Asia had rid themselves of the bonds of colonialism and before the peoples of Latin America had freed themselves of American influence and domination. Had the Plan of Partition been put before the General Assembly today, now that that body represents the real determination and will of the majority of the peoples of the world, it would not receive 10 per cent of the votes of the Member States represented in the Organization.

126. The Arabs refused the Plan of Partition, as has been said by the representative of the Zionist régime, they refused it just as the real mother rejected the dividing of her child proposed by Solomon in the old story, whereas world Zionism, or the false mother, if you will, welcomed it because by usurping half the body of the land of Palestine it received something it did not deserve and had not hoped to get, at least not so easily. Nevertheless, the greedy false mother was not satisfied with the portion she received from the Plan of Partition. Israel from its very establishment embarked on aggression and expansion and it now has become a cancer that is spreading throughout the body of the Arab nation, each day swallowing up other parts of that area.

127. Once the General Assembly had adopted the Plan of Partition, we witnessed butchery, slaughter and the practice of terrorism against the Arab population. After a series of massacres, such as that of Deir Yassin, in which the Haganah troops on 9 April 1948 massacred the entire population of a peaceful Palestinian village—250 people, men, women and children

who were butchered like sheep—the Zionists, at the end of the first Arab-Israeli war in 1948, usurped 18 per cent of the land of Palestine in addition to what was given under the Plan of Partition to the Jewish State. After an abortive attempt in 1956 to swallow the rest of the Palestinian land in addition to the Sinai Peninsula during the tripartite aggression against Egypt, Israel repeated its attempt in its perfidious aggression of June 1967 and this time, with the backing of Western and American imperialism and colonialism, it was able to occupy not only all the land of Palestine but also other parts of the territory of Egypt and the Syrian Arab Republic.

128. Eight years have passed now, and the Israeli aggressor continues its occupation of the Arab territories and its violation of the rights of the Arab people of Palestine, after having dispersed that people and usurping its original homeland since its own establishment 27 years ago.

129. The Palestine question and the Middle East question have been of great concern to the United Nations since its establishment. The Organization has not adopted so many resolutions concerning any other matter of international interest. Has Israel implemented one of those resolutions? On the contrary, since its creation, it has violated the Charter of the United Nations and refused to implement any resolution connected in any way with the rights of the Palestinian Arab people or of the other Arab States which have been suffering from racist Zionist aggression since 1947. Israel holds the record as the country that has had the largest number of condemnations and denunciations issued against it of any Member State in the history of the United Nations. Israel has been condemned to date more than 110 times by the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Commission on Human Rights and a number of specialized agencies, particularly the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization, the International Labour Organisation and the International Civil Aviation Organization as well as being denounced dozens of times by conferences and international organizations, governmental and non-governmental, regional or otherwise. However, the Zionist entity has become used to these denunciations and has grown familiar with them until it has become thick-skinned. Zionist representatives, as we have seen here recently, have no compunction about coming up to the rostrum after each denunciation in order to insult and slander the international Organization that condemned them and to announce with all arrogance and impudence that they will not implement any part of the resolutions adopted by halting their aggression, withdrawing from the lands they have occupied by force or recognizing the rights of the Palestinian people which they have trampled under foot.

130. The representative of the Zionist entity is not satisfied with rejecting the resolutions of the Organization. He also objects to the very idea of discussing the Palestine question, and I think he might even reject tomorrow the discussion of the Middle East question in the United Nations, because the Zionist representative thinks that the United Nations should not be concerned in Palestine or in the Middle East. As we understand it, the reason for his fear lies in the

fact that an international Organization which now represents the aspirations of the peoples of the world and their hopes for peace and justice and freedom must cause a certain embarrassment to every aggressor and usurper and must unmask every misanthropic racist whenever the crimes and violations of such aggressors are discussed.

131. The representative of the Zionist entity, the previous military governor of the West Bank, at whose hands tens of thousands of the population of the occupied Arab areas have suffered death, dispersal and torture, stood here and wondered how the General Assembly could devote 30 per cent of its time to what he called "our small Jewish State with a population of 3 million". Perhaps he may be right and his small racist entity does not deserve this large percentage of the time spent by the General Assembly, but the crimes of that entity and its violations are not, unfortunately, compatible with its size. That small entity disperses and oppresses a population of 3 million by the practice of the worst human injustice witnessed in the twentieth century; through aggression it occupies land belonging to other countries and peoples that covers an area three times as great as that allotted to it by the United Nations. That small entity acts politically, militarily and economically as an outpost of neo-colonialism and imperialism. It is a bridgehead that threatens the security and independence of small nations. It is not we who assign to Israel the role of imperialist agent. The representative of the Zionist régime himself, Mr. Herzog, is proud of it, as is clear from what he said to Mr. Edwin Newman in a television interview on 21 October 1975 at 7 p.m. during a programme called "Speaking Freely" on NBC. He stated—and I am summarizing—that, after the fall of the former régime in Portugal, after the events in Greece and what is about to happen to American military bases in Turkey, if people look around them, they will see that Israel is the only country capable of ensuring and guaranteeing the interests and objectives of American strategy in the area.

132. That is why the United Nations devotes more than a third of its deliberations to the discussion of the situation resulting from Israeli aggression against the Arab people in Palestine and against other Arab States and it is for that reason also that Israel can boast the highest number of resolutions of condemnation and denunciation issued against any State or régime in history.

133. The Zionist representative, as usual, claims that the only reason for the denunciations of and attacks on his régime is that the régime is Jewish. He knows very well that the only true reason for the denunciation of his entity is that it is racist and imperialist and aggressively attacks the rights of peoples and their territories. The condemnations would not be different were Israel a Christian, Islamic or secular State, as long as it violated rights, dispersed people and usurped land. We hold the great Jewish religion innocent and we cannot consider it synonymous with racism, aggression or violence. We also reject the use of that religion—which is recognized by Islam, as are its prophets—as a cloak for the crimes committed by Israel, or as a shield of immunity, allowing its adherents to indulge in acts of murder, usurpation, dispersion

and tyranny against peoples without objection, sanction or punishment.

134. The racist Zionist representative, in his speech at the beginning of the discussion of the question of Palestine, repeated the allegations and the lies about what he described and bid us

“... look at the more than 800,000 Jews that have left or have been driven out of the Arab countries of the Middle East and North Africa since 1948. Look at the tortured existence of the 4,000 odd hostages left in Syria today . . .” [2390th meeting, para. 97.]

He said that to show the destiny that awaits Jews, as he alleges, if the PLO dream of setting up a democratic secular State in Palestine is realized.

135. Israel has been blinded by religious racism to the extent that it arrogates to itself the right to intervene in the internal affairs of other countries and the relations of those countries with their own nationals in the name of and in the guise of religion. If religion is the origin of race or of national identity, why does not Italy, for instance, intervene in the affairs of Christians throughout the world and consider that it should provide them with security? Why does not Pakistan intervene in the affairs of Muslims throughout the world and pretend that it represents them and secures their rights?

136. One is confused by Israel's lies and its racist logic. On the one hand it accuses the Arab States of expelling the Arab Jews and dispersing them; but on the other hand it accuses those countries of holding the Jews as hostages and not permitting them to leave the lands in which they were born and in which they live in order to emigrate to Israel. If the Arab Jews leave their original homelands, then they have been expelled and dispersed; if they do not leave them, they are being held as hostages. Whatever happens, whether they leave or do not leave, the Arabs are criminals and in the wrong.

137. In fact, what Israel cannot understand with its narrow racist mentality is that the Arabs do not differentiate between or break down their nationals according to their religion as Israel does. The Jewish Syrian is like the Christian Syrian and the Muslim Syrian: they are all Syrian nationals, one nationality with the same traditions, the same colour, and even sometimes the same names. My own father was called Selim and my youngest son is called Selim; and the head of the Jewish community in Damascus is called Selim. His colour, his characteristic features, his language, are 1,000 times closer to mine than are the characteristic features, colour and look of the representatives of the Zionist entity in this Hall.

138. The Arabs do not set religious isolationist boundaries around them, or boundaries of racist superiority, as the Zionists do. The millions of Arab people, Muslims and Christians, living in every part of the world, in the East and in the West, who have emigrated and settled down for many years now in other countries in North and South America, Africa, Asia and Europe do not constitute a racist minority or an isolated religious minority. They do not fear to be merged with the other nationalities and new societies in what has become their homeland. They have all without exception become assimilated in their new

countries, serving them, thinking of their interests and fighting under their flags, without links with their original lands except the links of sentiment, memory and sympathy. However, they sleep peacefully at night, not fearing fusion or assimilation with other nationalists, and their conscience is free of dual loyalty.

139. The expansionist Zionist régime is not only troubled by the discussion of the question of Palestine and the related resolutions of the United Nations; it fears the very name or mention of the Palestinian Arab people. The speech which the representative of the Zionist régime made here on the first day of the discussion covers 23 large pages; I tried to find in them one mention of the Palestinian people, but I was not successful. To the representative of the Zionist entity, the Palestinians are no more than a “problem”. That is how he referred to them every time he was obliged to: it was the Palestinian Arab “problem”. The solution thought of by Zionist genius for this Palestinian Arab problem is to put the Palestinians in the part of historic Palestine which is today called the Kingdom of Jordan through a peace agreement between Israel and Jordan. The expression “historic Palestine on both banks of the Jordan”, which was repeated by the Zionist representative today and which he quotes from a statement by his Minister for Foreign Affairs, is really worthy of attention because it is a Zionist formula with regard to Israel's expansionist dreams and aspirations to dominate historic Palestine on both banks of the river which has begun to infiltrate even international forums.

140. Israel recognizes the presence of a Palestinian Arab problem but it does not recognize the presence of the Palestinian people. But, even if it rejects the presence of one and a half million Palestinians living in exile in refugee camps throughout the Arab States, it cannot deny the presence of a million Palestinians still suffering under racist occupation in their own land and homes. Even if Israel recognizes the presence of the Palestinians, it does not recognize the PLO, which is recognized by more than 100 States as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

141. But what is Israel that it can decide who does and who does not represent the Palestinians? Have the Zionist forces occupied the souls of the Palestinian people within and outside the occupied Arab lands, just as they have occupied their lands and homes, to decide for them who should speak in their name? No: the greatest failure suffered by Zionism in its continued aggression against the Arab people in Palestine and outside is that it has not been able to subjugate these people or to break their will in spite of the occupation, coercion and oppression which has continued for over 28 years. One of the greatest victories of the heroic people of Palestine is that aggression, occupation, exile and dispersion have not been able to extinguish the flame of the struggle of these people or to break the spirit of resistance within them. What happens is the precise opposite. Whenever the Zionist enemy increases its aggression and coercion, Palestinian Arab resistance increases within and outside the occupied territories. As long as occupation continues, the determination of the Arab people will continue and increase in the struggle for liberation.

142. It is indeed ironical that the representative of the entity which was established, grew and still lives

on terrorism should call the PLO a coalition or grouping of terrorist organizations, as though he had forgotten the history of the Haganah—I think he served in it himself—the Stern Gang, the Irgun and the Tzeva'i Leumi; as though his hands and the hands of his group of racists were free of the blood of the victims of the massacres at Deir Yassin, Kobieh, Kafr Kassem, Kalkilieh, Al Karamah and the King David Hotel, and the thousands of martyrs, women, children and the elderly, in refugee camps, in schools and in populated areas of Arab cities and villages.

143. The imperialists and racists have always called those who have fought against aggression, occupation and injustice terrorists. The European resistance against Nazi occupation throughout the Second World War was also described by the Nazis as terrorism. But if terrorism is terrorism against your enemy, who occupies your land, expels your people, burns down your cities with napalm and kills your women, children and old people, that is a great heroic act. It is an honour for the PLO to bear the same name that was borne by all other liberation organizations and fronts in Algeria, South Viet Nam, Cambodia, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Angola and other territories and countries, which would not have tasted freedom and enjoyed independence had it not been for the heroic struggle which terrorized the enemy and broke the imperialist yoke under which they had suffered. There is a difference between Zionist terrorism as practised by the Haganah, the Stern Gang and the Irgun, and as Israel practises it today, and the terrorism that is practised by the national liberation movements in every part of the world. Zionist terrorism is usurpation of the land from its original and legitimate owners who have lived on it for thousands of years without interruption. But the "terrorism" of the national liberation movements is intended to restore the land, to take it from its imperialist invaders, who are foreigners, and to break the chains of enslavement weighing down the original population of the land.

144. Israel's determination to ignore the presence of the Palestinian Arab people and their right to establish their State in their own territory and its refusal to recognize the sole legitimate representative of those people, chosen by the struggling Palestinian people and recognized without reservation by the Arab Summit Conference⁴ and by most countries of the world constitutes a violation by Israel of the instrument which established and created it. Israel is the only State in the world which was created by a resolution of the General Assembly, but resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947 did not create Israel alone; the same resolution created the Arab State of Palestine, with a map defining the frontiers of the two countries. If Israel denies the right of the Palestinian people to set up its State in the form stipulated in that resolution, then at the same time it denies the resolution which, at least in the eyes of the United Nations, is its own birth certificate.

145. If Israel does not withdraw from all the Arab territories it occupied and usurped by aggression in violation of that resolution and other resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and if it does not recognize the full national rights of the Palestinian people, allegations and statements about peace or steps towards peace all become mere smoke-

screens with which Israel is trying to fool the international community and world public opinion and to divert their attention from its racist and expansionist policy and the occupation of Arab territories, which has lasted so long.

146. The Zionist régime attempts to make partial steps taken at a snail's pace and individual peripheral measures, which do not change the very core and dimensions of the problem, pretexts for objecting to the draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly on the question of Palestine, which recommends establishing a United Nations committee to assist the Palestinian people in achieving its inalienable national rights.

147. Where is peace and what are the alleged negotiations for peace to which the Zionist representative refers? More than 95 per cent of the usurped Arab territory is still under occupation and, eight years after the Israeli aggression of June 1967, we find that the Zionist entity continues to reject United Nations resolutions and to violate the Charter, the rights and the sovereignty of the Arab people. The withdrawal of the aggressor a few kilometres, after all these years of occupation and at the very great price which that unimportant withdrawal cost, does not constitute a real movement towards peace. On the contrary, it freezes the Arab capacity for pressure and enables the aggressor to catch his breath and to divert his victim with a few crumbs while it continues to stabilize its occupation of other territories. With the time that it has thus gained it strengthens its settler imperialism in the Golan, Sinai and the West Bank. Israel speaks of peace, but in the context of its imperialist and expansionist concept, peace is submission. With that concept in mind the Zionist representative at the 2390th meeting, read out the following text from the recent Sinai Disengagement Agreement:

"The conflict between them and in the Middle East shall not be resolved by military force but by peaceful means . . . The parties hereby undertake not to resort to the threat or use of force or military blockade against each other."²

148. The representative of Israel gave this example as the only basis, in principle, on which an independent sovereign State can negotiate. But he forgot to say that these commitments by the two parties not to use force or the threat of force are commitments which are violated *a priori* by the aggressive Israeli party, because when it signed that Agreement it was still using force and threatening to use force in the form of military forces that were occupying more than 90 per cent of the land of Sinai.

149. After 20 years of legal discussion and research on a definition of aggression, the United Nations stated that the occupation of a territory, however temporary, was continuous aggression. Article 3 (a) of the Definition of Aggression [resolution 3314 (XXIX), annex] states that an act of aggression is:

"The invasion or attack by the armed forces of a State of the territory of another State, or any military occupation, however temporary, resulting from such invasion or attack, or any annexation by the use of force of the territory of another State or a part thereof."

150. The Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, also adopted during the twenty-ninth session [resolution 3281 (XXIX)] states that the principle of non-aggression is a basic one and acknowledges that States have the right and even the duty to eliminate all forms of foreign aggression, occupation and domination as a basic condition of development and progress.

151. How can Israel reconcile its commitment under the Sinai Agreement not to use force and its actual use of force in continuing to occupy Egyptian territory, thus committing continued aggression as defined by the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations?

152. The agreement of one sovereign State not to use force in the solution of disputes between it and another State at a time when the military forces of the latter continue to occupy its territory is submission to the force of aggression and surrender of the sacred right of self-defence, the right to liberate its territory and the right to expel the aggressor by all necessary and available means.

153. The international community has confirmed the right of peoples to use all means available to liberate their lands and to achieve independence and self-determination. Therefore no sovereign State can forgo the alternatives whereby it might, in harmony with the principles of the United Nations Charter and the principles of international law, liberate its territory from aggression and occupation.

154. The aggressor Zionist entity must understand that peace is not submission; that the road to peace cannot be that of intransigent violation of rights and insistence on expansion and the occupation of the territory of others by force. The Zionist entity must also understand that the cause of the Arab people of Palestine is the crux, the very substance, of the dispute and that, unless the full inalienable, national rights of the Palestinian people are implemented and respected, there can be no hope of peace.

155. However, since the Zionist entity was placed in the Arab area it has always carried out manoeuvres to gain time, falsified matters before world public opinion and upheld and entrenched its aggression and expansion.

156. The Zionist entity, in addition to insisting on occupying the lands of others by force and despite United Nations resolutions and condemnation, continues to violate human rights in the occupied Arab territories, to throw Arab citizens into prison without trial, and to destroy their homes and subject them to the worst kinds of mass punishment and oppression. All this is explained in the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories [A/10272].

157. The Zionist racist entity continues to ignore the existence of the Arab people of Palestine. It no longer hides this violation or denial; the Zionist representative speaks of it with arrogance in the General Assembly. Thus we find that half the speech of the representative of the Zionist entity was composed of attacks on the PLO and a denial of the rights of the Palestinian people and its very existence, while the other half was composed of insults to and criticism of the actions of the

General Assembly because it has "intervened" in the discussion of Israeli attacks on and crimes against the Arab people of Palestine and neighbouring Arab countries.

158. Such actions by an entity which has become synonymous with racism and aggression, and such continued violations and challenges to the United Nations Charter and resolutions and the will of the overwhelming majority of the peoples, would not have been possible had not that racist Zionist régime received the blind support of a number of countries—which can be counted on the fingers of one hand—and in particular the United States.

159. The United States, ever since the establishment of Israel, has always supported the Zionist aggression against the Arab nation. It is indeed shameful to see that the United States, one of the two super-Powers in the world, often votes with Israel and its aggression when most of the other countries of the world stand by the other party, on the side of right and logic and in support of the victim of aggression.

160. The United States support of Israel in the form of aid and complex destructive weapons no longer surprises Arab and other peoples alone; in fact, many Americans are surprised and annoyed by this, including many representatives and senators in Congress whose consciences Zionism has not been able to buy. The American people have not forgotten how during the October 1973 war all the depôts of the United States army were depleted to the extent that the security of the United States was threatened. The world has not forgotten how the United States threatened to unleash an atomic war in support of the Israeli aggression during that war.

161. Although the United States pretends it is attempting to consolidate the policy of détente and disarmament, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the limitation of strategic weapons, it has not stopped giving the most modern and complex types of missiles, planes and electronic weaponry, including weapons capable of carrying nuclear warheads, to a small racist State which flouts the entire world community. This is happening at the very time when that racist State is refusing to end its occupation of Arab territories and continues obstinately to deny the rights of the Palestinian people and to violate basic human rights in the territories it occupies.

162. It is indeed strange to see the United States increasing its arming of Israel at this particular time following the last Sinai Agreement,² which the United States pretends is a step towards peace. If one step towards peace requires this large amount of weapons and means of destruction, unequalled in history, what will come to the area as a result of total peace—which God forbid?

163. The United States, by its blind bias in favour of Israel and the fact that it provides the racist Zionist system with the most modern means of destruction and complicated weapons, deprives itself of the ability to act as an acceptable mediator between the two parties. Also, the imposition of its military elements for the first time in the history of the conflict in the area in the guise of "technicians" can be considered direct interference in this dispute by one of the super-Powers, a serious infringement of the role and com-

petence of the United Nations as an instrument of peace in the world, which threatens to decrease the importance of the international Organization in solving disputes and supervising peace-keeping operations.

164. It is interesting to compare this biased American attitude in favour of the Israeli aggressor with the attitude of the Soviet Union, which supports right and justice, in keeping with its responsibilities as a super-Power; that great State which defends the causes of oppressed and colonized peoples and supports the right of the victims of aggression in confronting and liquidating the consequences of aggression.

165. At its twenty-ninth session, the General Assembly adopted its great resolution 3236 (XXIX), which recognizes the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, foremost among them those of self-determination, national independence and sovereignty and the right to return to their homes. The United Nations is now asked to adopt methods and means to implement that resolution. The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic has therefore sponsored the draft resolution which was formally submitted to the General Assembly today [A/L.770] and which sets out the ways and means which most Member States consider appropriate to ensure the implementation of resolution 3236 (XXIX), the most important among them being the establishment of a committee to ensure the exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable national rights and to provide a programme for the implementation of those rights, and requests the Security Council to consider the question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of their rights in implementation of resolution 3236 (XXIX).

166. The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic has sponsored another draft resolution [A/L.768/Rev.1], inviting the PLO, the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, to participate in all the efforts and deliberations concerning peace carried out under the auspices of the United Nations on the basis of General Assembly resolution 3236 (XXIX). The Syrian Arab delegation affirms that operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution cannot be understood except on the basis of operative paragraphs 1 and 2, and it is on this basis that the Syrian Arab delegation has sponsored the draft resolution.

167. It will be impossible to achieve peace in the Middle East without the recognition of the national rights of the Palestinian people. The road to peace in the Middle East is clear and simple. The resolutions of the United Nations must be put into effect immediately, within the framework of the principles of the Charter, the rules and provisions of international law, and the provisions of international declarations concerning human rights and the principles of friendly relations among States, the Definition of Aggression [resolution 3314 (XXIX)] and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States [resolution 3281 (XXIX)] as well as the 10 principles adopted at the Helsinki Conference.⁸

168. Occupation of land by force, even temporarily, constitutes constant aggression, under the foregoing international documents, and any serious step towards peace must take that fact into consideration. No stable or lasting peace can be imposed under the force of occupation and aggression.

169. The Arab countries desire lasting peace based on justice and right. But after 27 years of Israeli aggression and violation of their territory, their patience is running out. If the situation in the Middle East, including Palestine, is allowed to continue to deteriorate and if Israel and those who support it continue to play for time and to manoeuvre for partial or peripheral agreements, there is a real danger that the situation will explode. This will threaten peace and security and economic prosperity not only in the Middle East but everywhere else in the world. That would be a tragedy, a tragedy that our international Organization and all peace-loving peoples and States must strive to avoid.

Organization of work

170. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): There are still nine names on the list of speakers on the present item. One representative has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. As members know, a revised draft resolution [A/L.768/Rev.1] and a second draft resolution [A/L.770] have just been submitted; they will be distributed this afternoon.

171. The General Assembly of course wishes to complete its agenda in the allotted time. On the other hand, rule 78 of our rules of procedure provides in principle that:

“... no proposal shall be discussed or put to the vote at any meeting of the General Assembly unless copies of it have been circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting.”

Moreover, some delegations wish to state their positions on the two draft resolutions before the Assembly. It is possible that amendments to those draft resolutions may be introduced.

172. In view of all those considerations, I think that it is only fair to propose to the Assembly that we conclude the general debate this afternoon but postpone the voting on the draft resolutions until the meeting on the morning of Monday, 10 November. That will give members of the Assembly some time for reflection. From my consultations it is obvious that a large number of delegations would like to have some time to study the draft resolutions before voting on them. That seems to me quite normal and in conformity with the rules.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2282nd meeting, paras. 3-83.

² Agreement between Egypt and Israel, signed at Geneva on 4 September 1975. See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirtieth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1975*, document S/11818/Add.1.

³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, No. 71*, 299th meeting.

⁴ Seventh Conference of Arab Heads of State, held at Rabat from 26 to 29 October 1974.

⁵ *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-ninth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1974*, document S/11198, annex.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Supplement for April, May and June 1974, document S/11302/Add.1, annex I.

⁷ See *Report of the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry*, Cmd. 6808 (London, HM Stationery Office, 1946).

⁸ The Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe was signed at Helsinki on 1 August 1975.