



UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

UN LIBRARY

MAY 5 1982



PROVISIONAL

A/ES-7/PV.21
30 April 1982

ENGLISH

~~UN/SA COLLECTION~~

Seventh emergency special session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWENTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 28 April 1982, at 3 p.m.

President:

Mr. KITTANI

(Iraq)

- Question of Palestine /5/ (continued)
- Credentials of representatives to the seventh emergency special session of the General Assembly: second report of the Credentials Committee /3/ (continued)
- Temporary adjournment of the seventh emergency special session

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

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

82-61356/A

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 5 (continued)

QUESTION OF PALESTINE

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to explain their vote after the voting. I wish to remind the Assembly that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made from representatives' seats in the Assembly hall.

Mr. PALAZZO (Brazil): The substantive position of the Brazilian Government on the question of Palestine has often been expressed in the United Nations. It reflects our concern over the future of the Palestinian people and its right to return to Palestine and to participate, through the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), in the peace negotiations.

We have also stated our commitment to Security Council resolutions determining the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from the occupied territories.

Our abstention in the vote on the resolution adopted this morning reflects a divergence on the proceedings that could take place on the basis thereof. Such proceedings would have to be considered without the necessary legislative authority and their very implementation might fall short of the results the resolution purports to achieve. In that case, a further deterioration of negotiation possibilities would follow.

In order to clarify its abstention, the Brazilian delegation wishes to put on record our firm commitment to the cause of peace in the Middle East and our adherence to the spirit of solidarity displayed by most Member States in the search for a solution to the problem besetting the Palestinian people and other States in the Middle East.

Mr. KIRCA (Turkey) (interpretation from French): Since the adoption of resolution ES-9/1 on 8 February 1982 by the ninth emergency special session of the General Assembly, devoted to the situation in the occupied Arab territories, extremely serious developments have continued to occur in the region.

In less than three months' time the Government of Israel, in defiance of the provisions of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, has considerably stepped up its policy of repression on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights. The legitimate anger of a desperate people taken to extremes following the dismissal of elected mayors and especially after the senseless attack on the Holy Places of Islam in Jerusalem has been drowned in violence and blood. The cease-fire between the Lebanese and Israeli territories which was so painstakingly arrived at has been deliberately broken by Israeli air raids. The only glimmer of hope in the return of the Sinai to Egypt has been immediately extinguished by official statements by Israel that in future no other occupied Arab territories will be returned to the States to which they belong; at the same time, those statements do away with any likelihood for recognition of the right to self-determination of the Palestinian Arab people living in the territories occupied since 1967.

In order to show its support for the Arab countries and the Palestinian Arab people, the victims of the Israeli policy of occupation, annexation and colonization, and motivated by its desire to share in the justified outrage of the overwhelming majority of the international community at the alarmingly rapid escalation of the already intolerable conditions prevailing in the region, Turkey had no alternative but to vote in favour of the resolution adopted this morning. In keeping with the continuity of Turkey's Middle East policy, that is the political significance of my delegation's affirmative vote.

Nevertheless, the delegation of Turkey is duty bound to comment and express reservations on certain paragraphs of the resolution.

First of all, Turkey cannot in any way associate itself with the condemnation contained in operative paragraph 8. The Turkish delegation does not consider such condemnations to be likely to bring useful elements to the

(Mr. Kirca, Turkey)

search for a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the Middle East question. Also, it is obvious that in the resolution which has just been adopted the content and the constructive spirit of operative paragraph 9 render the preceding operative paragraph superfluous, and my delegation regrets its inclusion in the text.

Secondly, Turkey's traditional position, which has been expressed on many occasions, explains why my delegation cannot join in references to third States, regardless of the motive. That is why the Turkish delegation cannot support such references as are contained in the second and eighth preambular paragraphs.

Thirdly, the meaning and legal implications of operative paragraph 11 do not appear to my delegation to be sufficiently clear, and we have doubts in that respect.

Lastly, it goes without saying that the other provisions of this resolution are acceptable to Turkey in the context of its over-all policy and, in particular, in the context of its Middle East policy and the application of that policy, as expressed in statements and official acts of the competent authorities of Turkey.

Mr. DOUNTAS (Greece): My delegation's vote in favour of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.3 on the question of Palestine was determined by the consistent, unshakable and repeatedly stated dedication of my country to the principles of non-use of force and the inadmissibility of any acquisition or control over the territory of any sovereign State through military invasion and military occupation, as well as by our support of the right to self-determination for all peoples.

However, had a separate vote been taken, my delegation would have abstained on operative paragraph 8, since it believes that it is not proper to single out one specific case of the exercise of the veto.

The question of the possibility for the five permanent members of the Security Council to neutralize by a negative vote the majority of the Security Council is a matter of major importance with wide and deep implications affecting the very structure of the Organization. It is therefore my delegation's view that it is not proper to deal with the merits or non-merits of this matter in the context of a specific case.

Mr. BOLE (Fiji): In its statement on the question of Palestine my delegation reiterated its conviction that a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East was possible only through a peaceful process of constructive dialogue and accommodation of interests by the parties directly concerned. In this connexion my delegation reaffirmed the support of the Government of Fiji for Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) as the basis for peaceful coexistence in the Middle East.

However, in the resolution adopted this morning by the Assembly, there are aspects both in the preamble and in operative paragraphs which my delegation finds it difficult to accept. Hence it was obliged to abstain.

Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): The position of the delegation of Finland on the subject dealt with in the draft resolution voted upon at our morning meeting was made clear in our statement on 23 April. In that statement we dealt with Israel's settlement policies and its illegal acts both on the West Bank and in the Golan Heights. In our view these policies continue to breed frustration and violence and make the achievement of a comprehensive peace more difficult. We also made clear our position as to the basis for the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and the necessity of recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. We expressed the hope that the proceedings at this resumed seventh emergency special session would contribute to an evolving international consensus and a structure of peace in the Middle East.

We regret that the draft resolution voted upon falls short of our expectations in this regard. There are several provisions in that draft resolution that present us with serious difficulties. This applies first and foremost to operative paragraph 11, which seems to be intended to put in doubt Israel's right to belong to the United Nations. This paragraph therefore runs counter to the principle of universality, which Finland considers to be basic to this Organization.

That is why we voted against the draft resolution.

Mr. TREKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.3 this morning although convinced that it was nothing but a repetition of the kind which the General Assembly has been in the habit of adopting for 30 years and which the Zionist entity has always rejected, defied and failed to comply with as it has continued its racist policy based on expansion and the annexation of occupied Arab territories, the expulsion of the Palestinian Arab people from its territory, failure to recognize its legitimate rights, and continuation of practices of mass genocide, terror and repression against the civilian Palestinian inhabitants.

(Mr. Treki, Libyan
Arab Jamahiriya)

The resolution adopted this morning does not meet the demands of the majority of Member States expressed in the statements of delegations in the course of this session. Those delegations have condemned the aggressive actions and crimes committed by the Nazi Zionist entity against the Palestinian people and the neighbouring Arab States.

We have added another resolution to the series of resolutions already adopted in the past, without finding any true remedy for this problem and without finding any true solution. Nor has any action been taken to punish the aggressor, which has not respected this Organization and has defied its Charter and its purposes. What this Assembly should have done was adopt a resolution calling for the expulsion of the Zionist enemy from the United Nations. Indeed the membership of the Nazi Zionist enemy in the United Nations is illegal not only because Israel is not a peace-loving State but because the very existence of that entity in Palestine is no more legitimate than was the existence of the Smith régime in Zimbabwe.

We have not been able to call things by their proper names and to state the facts, however bitter they may be. To the United States we would say: You are condemned because you are protecting aggression and you are thereby violating the Charter. You are wrongly exercising against the Palestinian people a right that you enjoy in the Security Council.

Although in the final analysis, this resolution represents the collective support of the international community for the Palestinian people, as I have already stressed it is but one resolution among the many we have already adopted.

Two days ago the Zionist enemy declared with great arrogance that Sinai is the last territory that will be liberated - although we all know that the withdrawal from Sinai was purely formal and does not restore complete sovereignty over that territory. This is a case of disregard for all international customs and laws and international organizations. We say to the enemy that neither the Camp David agreements nor the American veto can in any way legitimize its existence and that the Palestinian people and the Arab nation will one day find a way to recover all their territories, and with full sovereignty.

(Mr. Treki, Libyan
Arab Jamahiriya)

The delegation of my country voted in favour of the draft resolution as the least that could be done. However, the practical measures favoured by the majority have not been adopted, perhaps out of respect for the Organization. But how long is this going to continue? Our patience has its limits.

In conclusion, my delegation, having accepted this resolution, wishes to stress that operative paragraph 15 should not be understood in any way to imply recognition of the legitimacy of the occupation or of the Nazi Zionist entity. Consequently any attempt to interpret that paragraph in that way will be the subject of a reservation by my delegation.

Mr. ROCA (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Argentina wishes to state its position on draft resolution A/ES-7/L.3, voted on at this morning's meeting.

My delegation decided to abstain in the vote because it considers that the provisions of operative paragraph 11 do not in fact contribute to the fulfilment of the purposes of this Organization.

Nevertheless it wishes to say that, in accordance with what it has already stated before this Assembly, the Republic of Argentina supports most of the elements contained in the draft resolution in document A/ES-7/L.3, in particular that concerning recognition of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to independence and the establishment of a sovereign State pursuant to the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly.

Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen)(interpretation from Arabic): The delegation of Democratic Yemen voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/ES-7/L.3, although we would have liked that draft resolution to contain an explicit condemnation of the United States for exercising the veto in the Security Council, thereby thwarting the adoption of any practical measures to punish the Israeli aggressor. The United States in that way displayed its unlimited support for the aggressor, which is contrary to the United Nations Charter.

However that may be, I should like to record the reservation of my delegation with respect to operative paragraphs 1 and 15 of that resolution since those two paragraphs contain an indirect reference to Security Council resolution 242 (1967). The position of Democratic Yemen on that resolution is well known because we have repeatedly stated it in the United Nations.

Mr. LENNUYEUX-COMNENE (France)(interpretation from French): The French delegation voted against the resolution adopted today by the General Assembly. My Government does indeed attach particular importance to the principle of the universality of the United Nations and it has therefore been opposed to any action that would be prejudicial to that principle, even if the conduct of certain countries does lend itself to criticism. The effectiveness of the United Nations makes it necessary for the Organization to remain a universal framework for dialogue.

The international community has made it clear on many occasions that the search for a solution to the Middle East conflict should be based upon the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, and hence within the framework of the Organization. It was because of this idea that some took a position against the settlement procedures which had been worked out outside the United Nations. It therefore seems illogical to us to wish to exclude one of the parties essential to the search for a settlement when the whole purpose is to preserve the necessary conditions for negotiations with a view to bringing about a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

Finally, I note that the resolution in question does not take account of the relevant provisions of the Charter which lay down the respective competencies and responsibilities of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

Mr. IBRAHIM (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): The delegation of Iraq voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/ES-7/L.3 but we believe that it merely reaffirms resolutions adopted previously by the General Assembly which the Zionist entity has refused to implement. We would have wished to see a resolution providing for measures likely to put an end to the acts of aggression committed by Israel against the Palestinian people, in particular, and against the Arab nation, in general, so as to consolidate peace and security in that region and in the world.

Similarly the delegation of my country believes that the resolution should have contained a condemnation of the policy of the United States of America not only because of its use of the veto in the Security Council but also because of its pursuit of a policy hostile to the Arab Palestinian people and to the Arab nations and for furnishing military and material support to the Israeli aggressor, which has enabled it to continue to reject the resolutions of the United Nations which support the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

The delegation of my country wishes to express its reservations with respect to operative paragraph 15 of the resolution, since it is not compatible with the position of my country.

In conclusion, we wish to state that we denounce the shameful manner in which the representative of the Zionist entity referred to the countries which sponsored the draft resolution and to the States members of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. That manner is contrary to the basic norms of international conduct.

Mr. AKAKPO (Togo) (interpretation from French): The Togolese delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/ES-7/L.3 on the question of Palestine because of its support for the struggle of the Palestinian people and its commitment to a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict.

However, certain provisions of that resolution do give rise to serious difficulties for my delegation and we would have abstained in the vote if those provisions had been voted upon separately.

I refer to the second and eighth paragraphs of the preamble which, in our view, should have been drafted differently. I refer also to the following operative paragraphs.

(Mr. Akakpo, Togo)

Paragraph 7 (d): In the Security Council Togo voted in favour of the draft resolution condemning a sacrilegious act on the part of an individual. We should have liked the sponsors of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.3 to make the distinction between the act of an individual and the act of a State.

Paragraph 10: This paragraph gives rise to problems for the Togolese delegation. We feel that its application would be prejudicial to the fundamental rights of any individual to move freely. Our vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole should therefore not be interpreted as approval of the content of operative paragraph 10.

Finally, with regard to operative paragraph 11, which is taken from the resolution adopted by the ninth emergency special session of the General Assembly, on the situation in the occupied Arab territories, we think that the situation in the region has evolved a great deal since that session, particularly with the total return of the Sinai to Egypt by Israel on 25 April. For that reason, the Togolese delegation has reservations concerning operative paragraph 11.

The vote of our delegation in favour of draft resolution A/ES-7/L.3 as a whole should in no way be interpreted as the taking of any stand on the suspension or possible exclusion of Israel from the United Nations.

Mr. PIZA ESCALANTE (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Costa Rica has frequently had occasion to recall its recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and full sovereignty, to return to their homes and to recover their property, and to all their human rights without any discrimination or conditions.

We have also supported resolutions calling upon Israel to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories as well as those calling for respect for the special status of Jerusalem as a corpus separatum under international jurisdiction.

We have, moreover, come to recognize that it is necessary and even advisable - and this applies to Israel too - for the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take part in negotiations leading to peace; thereby we accept the legitimacy which has been granted to the PLO by the United Nations, until the Palestinian people themselves, exercising their sovereignty, can democratically decide whom it wishes to represent them on a permanent basis.

(Mr. Piza Escalante, Costa Rica)

My delegation, however, abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because, although it contains some positive elements with which my delegation agrees and which are in keeping with the views I have just mentioned, it is imbalanced and contains expressions which we cannot support, since in our view such imbalance and such language, far from facilitating a just, equitable and lasting solution to the question of Palestine, seriously hinder such a solution in the broadest context of the dangerous situation in the Middle East.

Furthermore, my delegation wishes to state that it considers totally unacceptable the contents of operative paragraphs 8 and 11; had those paragraphs been put to a separate vote, we would have voted against them.

The delegation of Costa Rica cannot accept the General Assembly's adopting a resolution in which, as is the case in operative paragraph 8, there is discussion of the unconditional right of all Members of the United Nations to vote in the manner they see fit, without being required to explain their motivations. In fact, the right of veto of the five permanent members of the Security Council has hampered that body's action in maintaining international peace and security, but the right of veto does exist, and if that were not the case, the very existence of the United Nations would be at stake. I repeat, no organ of the Organization, in our view, can legitimately even discuss the exercise of that right.

My delegation considers even more serious and unacceptable the content of operative paragraph 11, in which the General Assembly, arrogating to itself a power not its own, states that a Member State is not a peace-loving State, and without expressly saying it, implies the eventual suspension or expulsion of a State which has the full right to belong to and to remain in our Organization. At a time when universality is an accepted principle, operative paragraph 11 of this resolution is an unjust and dangerous anachronism.

Mr. RAMBISSOON (Trinidad and Tobago): At the first part of this seventh emergency special session of the General Assembly, held in 1980, the Trinidad and Tobago delegation stated what it saw as the essential elements which together would constitute the basis for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

Trinidad and Tobago's affirmative vote for the draft resolution contained in document A/ES-7/L.3 must therefore be seen in that light. We wish it to be understood, however, that certain elements have been introduced into the resolution adopted by the Assembly which pose difficulties for us.

Mr. SANZ de SANTAMARIA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation regrets to note that the same arguments in favour of peace and justice in the Middle East have had to be repeated at so many meetings of the relevant United Nations bodies throughout these years. We should therefore have liked to be able to consider a more balanced resolution taking into account not only the negative aspects but also the positive advances which have been registered in the field, such as the action last week with regard to the return of the Sinai.

My delegation therefore deplores the fact that the resolution adopted by the General Assembly a few hours ago lacks the desirable balance. The primordial objective of the United Nations is the consolidation of peace and the promotion of harmony among all peoples through acts inspired by good judgement and balance.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations, by his culture, temperament and rectitude, has a great interest in acting in favour of peace. My delegation feels that in draft resolutions like the one on which we voted today, there should be positive elements which would provide him with a basis for acting successfully in bringing about peace settlements on a stable and just basis for the region in question.

The draft resolution presented by a large group of countries contained paragraphs which many Members of this Assembly accepted; however, there were others which we could not support because they contradict the principles which our country has always traditionally maintained, based in this case on the right of both the Jewish people and the Palestinian people to live in peace.

My delegation repeats its attachment to the use of procedures governing international law and we are against the use or the threat of the use of force to resolve conflicts between countries.

For those reasons, my delegation abstained in the vote.

Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic, in explaining its vote, wishes to say that the resolution adopted this morning meets some of the requirements of the international community, which is opposed to the Zionist aggression - supported by the United States - against the people of Palestine and the Arab countries. But there are three points which we should like to emphasize.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

First, the resolution should contain a special operative paragraph condemning the United States of America explicitly for its diplomatic, military, economic and financial support - as well as support in other areas - of the Zionist occupiers of all of Palestine and a part of my country.

Secondly, the General Assembly, in the resolution adopted today, should have imposed sanctions against Israel and the United States.

Thirdly, operative paragraph 5 of the resolution is not clear. Those of ill will - those whose distortion of the facts is well known: that is, Washington, Tel Aviv and Cairo - could interpret it outside of its true context, namely, the rights of the Palestinian people.

The PRESIDENT: The Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization has asked to be given the opportunity to make a statement. Members will recall that on several occasions in the past the Assembly has deemed it appropriate to allow the Observer to speak on this item after all delegations wishing to do so had spoken in explanation of vote.

In line with those precedents, I now call on the Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization for a brief statement.

Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): The General Assembly has just pronounced judgement, almost by unanimity. Only 20 members chose to cast a negative vote, and for reasons not related to the condemnation of Israel, the occupying Power, for the criminal acts that it perpetrates against my people. Actually, the international community has adopted the resolution by a margin of more than 4 to 1.

I wish to express the deep appreciation, high esteem and thanks of the Palestine Liberation Organization to those members that did not hesitate to uphold the lofty principles of the United Nations Charter. The Palestinian people knows who are its friends.

Today marks yet another day of atrocities and crimes against my people, the Palestinian people under occupation: 14 more Palestinians in occupied Nablus, five others in the Jabalyah refugee camp in the occupied Palestinian territory of Gaza, and several other Palestinian human beings under foreign occupation have been injured as a result of criminal acts of State terrorism committed by the neo-Fascists. Yesterday 600 Israeli armed troops crossed into Lebanon while contingents of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) were there. Nothing was done to prevent the Israeli incursion; nor did we hear from the Force Commander, the Secretary-General or the Security Council about this most recent Israeli act of aggression and violation of Security Council resolutions.

Article 1 (1) of the Charter stresses that the first purpose of the United Nations is, among other things, the suppression of acts of aggression. Thus to condemn or to pronounce judgement is only the first prerequisite. But the aim is clear; it is stated in the Charter: it is the suppression of acts of aggression. And my question to the General Assembly is: How do the General Assembly and the various other United Nations organs hope to discharge this noble task of suppression of aggression? Is it by encouraging the condemned criminal and permitting it to pursue its acts of aggression? Is it by supplying it with the latest models of lethal weapons, armaments and bombs, to kill refugees and children in camps? How do we suppress acts of aggression? That is the question. Many people apparently forget what the Charter mentions as the first purpose.

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine
Liberation Organization)

Article 1 (2) states that the second purpose is "To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples...". We have heard a lot about Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and Camp David. Where in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), where in the Camp David accords and process, is the principle of equal rights and self-determination of the Palestinian people respected? How can we achieve peace if we do not respect that?

How do Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and the Camp David accords provide for a comprehensive, just and lasting peace when the right of self-determination of the Palestinian people is nowhere taken into consideration?

Four million of us Palestinians, by the mere stroke of a pen and under the provisions of the so-called Camp David accords, find ourselves denied even a mere reference to our right to self-determination; and we find the United Nations approach for a comprehensive peace torpedoed.

There are those who speak about the United Nations being pushed one step closer to a precipice beyond which looms a political and moral abyss -- those were the words used by the representative of the Government of the United States. That representative seems to forget, or rather he ignores, the fact that the first words of the Charter are "We the peoples". To us, the Palestinian people, the United Nations is here to save the peoples from the scourge of war and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom. Nowhere does the Charter say that people must live for ever under the boots and bayonets of the forces of occupation.

I wish to state here, with regret, that today the General Assembly failed to discharge its task and failed to honour its first purpose, namely, the suppression of acts of aggression. No matter how constructive the resolution that has been adopted, it fails to deal with ways and means to suppress these acts of aggression, which have been condemned by almost everybody in this Assembly.

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine
Liberation Organization)

The exercise of the veto by a permanent member of the Security Council is nowhere challenged in the resolution - and the question of the veto is another matter for discussion. The resolution does condemn the misuse of the veto. Is it not correct that the Government of the United States resorted to that misuse to deny a people - the Palestinian people - its right to self-determination and to return to its homes in its beautiful country, Palestine? Is it not correct that the Government of the United States misused the veto in connexion even with a request that Israel, the occupying Power, should respect international law and the provisions of the Geneva Convention? That happened on 20 April in the Security Council. Is it not correct that the Government of the United States misused the veto to obstruct the process for a comprehensive peace in the Middle East? It is the misuse that is condemned, and I would suggest to the representative of the Government of the United States that he read the text closely and attentively, and not misquote or maliciously interpret it.

If the United States Secretary of State justifies Israeli acts of aggression against the integrity of Lebanon and my people who are now temporarily in the refugee camps in Lebanon, if he justifies the criminal campaign of physical elimination of the Palestinian people perpetrated against that people - my people - the Secretary of State is only identifying with his strategic ally, and I am sure that he is aware of the consequences of such an identification.

The crimes committed by Israel cannot remain unpunished, especially as today the international community has pronounced its verdict and condemned Israel for those acts of aggression.

The policy of threats and intimidation is not exercised by those who sponsored or voted in favour of the resolution. It is exercised only by those who massacre our people, who violate and desecrate our religions, who supply the forces of occupation and encourage them to persist in committing acts of aggression and crimes; by those who turn over their noble soil and territory to become a base of aggression against the peace, stability and development of the peoples and States in the Middle East. The policy of usurping

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine
Liberation Organization)

rights and arrogating to oneself the authority to speak on behalf of other peoples - in this case the Palestinian people - leads only to the exacerbation of the situation, not to its improvement.

What has been so jubilantly referred to as "a sacrifice for peace" - withdrawal of Israeli troops - to our mind is only twisted logic and terminology. What really happened was the termination of illegal occupation, and that, to say the least, is a matter of justice. The occupier should seek neither reward nor gratitude, but should have been castigated in the first place.

It is no longer a matter of khutzpah: I kill my parents; please have pity on me, I am an orphan. No, it has gone beyond that. The killer is now demanding more than pity; he is demanding rewards - and, to our regret, he is getting the rewards, in particular from one of the victims.

(Mr. Terzi, Palestine Liberation
Organization)

In our opinion, the Secretary-General does need the support and concurrence of the Security Council for any endeavours he may undertake, and we call on the members of the Security Council - particularly the permanent members, and more precisely the Government of the United States - to assist the Secretary-General in those endeavours. It would not be fair to demand of the Secretary-General that he undertake any task without the support of the Security Council, especially when that task is aimed at achieving peace and security in a region which is already exploding.

Finally, we the Palestinian people, under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, our sole, legitimate representative - that is what the General Assembly has said it is - will still maintain our confidence in the efficacy of the United Nations as a vehicle for justice, peace and the attainment of our rights. But, meanwhile, we shall maintain our determination to continue our struggle by all means to liberate our country, to return to our homes, to exercise our right to self-determination in our beautiful Palestine and to establish our own sovereign and independent State there.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

Mr. FILEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): Since the name of the delegation of the Central African Republic was not called out during the roll-call vote on the draft resolution adopted at this morning's meeting, the Soviet delegation would like to make the following statement.

The Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Buffum, had no basis for proceeding in such an arbitrary fashion. In accordance with the United Nations Charter, only the General Assembly is competent to settle questions connected with the right of a Member State of the Organization to participate in the voting in the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT: I notice that this is the second time a representative of the Soviet Union has mentioned the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Buffum, by name. I am obliged to say, in this connexion, that the procedure followed by the Under-Secretary-General represents the concerted view of the United Nations Secretariat, and not that of an individual.

AGENDA ITEM 3 (continued)

CREDENTIALS OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE SEVENTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY: SECOND REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE (A/ES-7/13/Add.1)

The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Credentials Committee in paragraph 12 of its report (A/ES-7/13/Add.1). May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to adopt that draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution ES-7/1 B).

TEMPORARY ADJOURNMENT OF THE SEVENTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

The PRESIDENT: The seventh emergency special session of the General Assembly is now adjourned in accordance with the terms of paragraph 17 of resolution ES-7/4, adopted at this morning's meeting.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.