

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1882nd
MEETING**

Wednesday, 24 November 1971,
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mrs. Helvi SIPILÄ (Finland).

AGENDA ITEM 55

Importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights (*continued*) (A/8331, A/8403, chap. XVII, sect. D; A/C.3/L.1877/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1878 to 1880, A/C.3/L.1881/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1882, A/C.3/L.1886/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1888, A/C.3/L.1889, A/C.3/L.1893)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS
(*continued*)

1. Mr. FASSOU (Guinea) said that the amendments proposed in documents A/C.3/L.1879 and A/C.3/L.1882 were very similar. The latter document, of which he was a sponsor, proposed what he considered to be a positive amendment to the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1592 (L). With regard to the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1881/Rev.1, he said that the time had passed for expressing concern at the use of violence. It was time to take action and to assume historic responsibilities. The progress of the United Nations depended on its sense of historic responsibility and its documents would be part of history rather than useless pieces of paper only if the Organization understood its great mission. That fact had been taken into account in the text proposed by Guinea.

2. The first amendment in document A/C.3/L.1881/Rev.1 proposed the replacement of the third preambular paragraph by another text. Comparing the new text with the original, it could be seen that the purpose of the amendment was to remove any condemnation of violence. The United States, which claimed to be a country with a tradition of non-violence, should explicitly condemn violence. Portugal was using violence to deny independence to the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), which obliged the African peoples to resort to force to achieve self-determination. His delegation therefore rejected that amendment to the third preambular paragraph. With regard to the proposed amendment to the fourth preambular paragraph, the formula "constitutes a threat" was no longer valid since colonialism was by now not merely a threat to basic human rights and freedoms but a direct attack on them. With regard to the amendment to operative paragraph 4, it called upon colonial Powers to permit the full exercise of self-determination by peoples under colonial domination. That was not a realistic position; colonial

Powers should no longer be requested to grant independence but should be compelled to do so since their attitude was contrary to history. The amendment to operative paragraph 5 called upon all States to do what had been requested a thousand times since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) in 1960; it was time to go beyond making appeals and to condemn those countries which, like the United States, bought chrome from Southern Rhodesia and those which sold arms and aircraft to the colonial Powers. Their attitude amounted to defiance of the United Nations and disregard of the undertakings which they had assumed.

3. With regard to amendment A/C.3/L.1889, he said that by arguing for the inclusion of the words "and elsewhere" the representative of Barbados was confusing matters. Although the item under consideration was the importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, the representative of Barbados did not consider it appropriate to mention Palestine. Human rights were not being respected in Palestine and he wondered whether the representative of Barbados knew the history of Palestine, for if, as he had said, Palestine had never existed as a geographical entity, it would have to be acknowledged that neither had Israel. The inclusion of Palestine was not intended to represent explicit support for its position but was a question of justice. The situation of the Palestinians was comparable to that of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau); they were living in deplorable conditions because they had been expelled from their territory. It was not a case of secession—Guinea would never support any kind of secession—and it was totally different from the cases of Formosa, Biafra and Bangla Desh. The problems of secession and that of peoples who had been expelled from their territory should not be confused.

4. He requested the representatives of the United States and Barbados to withdraw their amendments.

5. Mr. BAL (Mauritania) thanked the representative of Uganda for having withdrawn its sponsorship of amendments A/C.3/L.1888 and A/C.3/L.1889. In a long statement at the previous meeting the representative of Barbados had said that he had searched in vain for a document referring to the inalienable right of Palestine. It should be pointed out that at its twenty-fourth session the General Assembly had adopted resolution 2535 B (XXIV) which recognized that the problem of the Palestine Arab refugees had arisen from the denial of their inalienable rights under the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. He quoted pertinent passages from the resolutions referred to in the amendment pro-

posed by the Syrian Arab Republic (A/C.3/L.1878), which confirmed the validity of amendment A/C.3/L.1882 co-sponsored by his delegation.

6. He was surprised that the first of the amendments proposed by the United States in document A/C.3/L.1881/Rev.1 should call for the deletion of the reference to Portugal and NATO in the third preambular paragraph. Portugal was violating the most fundamental rights of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) and was attacking all the independent peoples of Africa. A country like Portugal would not be able to wage such a costly war against African countries without the support of countries which were members of NATO. The amendment was not subtle enough to conceal the fact that the United States was endeavouring to cover up crimes committed by the fascist régimes of Portugal, Pretoria and Southern Rhodesia.

7. The United Nations had adopted various resolutions designed to ensure the effective guarantee and observance of human rights and the right of peoples to self-determination. Unfortunately, and to the indignation of the international community, they remained a dead letter. It was not the fault of the Africans. The countries of the third world respected General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and later relevant provisions such as the arms embargo against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, although such a course of action could affect their rate of development.

8. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait) said that the differences between subamendments A/C.3/L.1888 and A/C.3/L.1889 on the one hand, and the amendments which they sought to change on the other, were obvious. The subamendments were not intended to make a restrictive list more general. On the contrary, the use of the words "and elsewhere", far from broadening the list, in reality eliminated the word "Palestine". That was the conclusion to be drawn from the explanation given at the previous meeting by the representative of Barbados, who had said, *inter alia*, that Palestine did not exist and that the Palestinian people were not entitled to self-determination.

9. The representative of Barbados had rightly pointed out that the Committee was not considering the item on the Middle East. Following that line of thought, it was also true that it was not considering the situation in South Africa. There was in both those regions a *sui generis* situation which was being considered in other United Nations bodies. The Third Committee was discussing an item of a general nature which transcended specific and regional considerations. It related not only to the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples but also to universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination. Hence it could not be confined to one region alone. It had to cover all peoples, wherever they were, who were entitled to self-determination but were not enjoying it at the present time.

10. The representative of Barbados had said that Palestine did not exist at the geographical or political level. It was, however, precisely because such a State did not exist that the Palestinian people wanted their right to self-determination to be recognized. Furthermore, the represen-

tative of Barbados had spoken of his affection for the Palestine refugees. What did that mean to him? It could not be a question of a group whose identity was based on language, for the Palestinians did not have a special language—they spoke Arabic, like many others. Nor could it be a group united by religion. Analysing the problem, one had to acknowledge that what was at issue was the relationship of a particular people to its homeland.

11. The representative of Barbados had said that he had tried to obtain documentation on the Palestine problem and had mentioned the list of Territories annexed to the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to the eighteenth session of the General Assembly.¹ He had concluded that Palestine did not exist since it was not included in the list. Unfortunately, he had not read the full title, which stated explicitly that it was a "preliminary list". Not only did the Palestinian people exist, but the international community had acknowledged it in Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, which had provided that certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire had reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations could be provisionally recognized. Article 80 of the Charter of the United Nations, which referred to the Covenant and other international instruments, stated that nothing in Chapter XII of the Charter should be construed to alter in any manner the rights of any States or peoples. In resolution 2672 (XXV), the General Assembly had again recognized the existence of Palestine and its right to self-determination in accordance with the Charter.

12. It should also be recalled that the Palestinians had fought to win that right. Again and again they had risen up against the British Mandate. In 1937 the Peel Commission, a royal commission sent to investigate the causes of the "disturbances" in Palestine, had recognized the serious nature of the disturbances and had established that there were two causes for them: the desire for national independence and fear of and opposition to the establishment of a national Jewish State.

13. In Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations, universal peace was linked with the development of friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples. Article 55 of the Charter was couched in the same terms. The wording was important: reference was made to respect for the principle (in the singular) of equal rights and self-determination of peoples. That was not a random wording, but the expression of a profound metaphysical concept. The explanation for it was to be found in the background to the Article. The San Francisco Conference had deliberately adopted those words in its desire to make it clear that equal rights and the self-determination of peoples were two aspects of a single principle and not two different principles. If Palestine was denied the right to self-determination, that was tantamount to saying that its people were less equal than others. It should be borne in mind, moreover, that the General Assembly in resolution

¹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighteenth Session, Annexes, addendum to agenda item 23, document A/5446/Rev.1.

2672 C (XXV) had clearly established that there was a link between peace in the Middle East and the right of the Palestine people to self-determination. Consequently, Security Council resolution 242 (1967) should not be invoked to evade the issue. If the purpose of that resolution was to reach peace, it could not be incompatible with the right of the Palestinian people.

14. At the previous meeting Nigeria had appealed to the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1882 to defer the inclusion of the paragraph mentioning Palestine until the outcome of the peace mission of OAU was known. The Nigerian representative could rest assured that there was no contradiction whatsoever between the purposes of that mission and the recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. The sole purpose of the OAU mission was to try to settle an inter-State conflict, as was indicated in the title of the resolution establishing the mission. He therefore urged the Nigerian representative to reflect again on the nature of the mission in the light of the resolution by which it had been set up. In conclusion, he thanked the Ugandan representative for the wisdom he had displayed, and expressed the hope that the representative of Barbados would withdraw his amendment, in response to the many requests by representatives.

15. Mrs. STEVENSON (Liberia) said that Liberia had always maintained that mere condemnation of the atrocities committed by the Governments of South Africa, Portugal and Southern Rhodesia only tended to enable those Governments to persist in their repressive policies. It was obvious that condemnation resulted in nothing if more energetic measures were not taken at the same time. In spite of the many resolutions adopted by the United Nations relating to the right of peoples to self-determination, the activities of foreign monopolies made it impossible for the colonial territories to accede to independence, and it was clear that as long as there were colonial territories there would be violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

16. In his report, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees had said that the problem of the increased numbers of refugees in Africa could not be alleviated until the pertinent General Assembly resolutions were applied. It was essential, therefore, that the obstructive régimes should be extirpated, and the General Assembly had a duty to reaffirm the rights of the peoples concerned to self-determination and independence. The draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1592 (L) called for the implementation of the various instruments relating to the right of all peoples to self-determination and condemned colonialism in all its forms. She therefore fully endorsed the draft resolution in its present form, but was prepared to vote for any amendment which would enhance it.

17. She supported amendment A/C.3/L.1880 because it was vital for majority rule to obtain before independence if the consequences were not to be calamitous for the people of Zimbabwe. She agreed with previous speakers that the United States amendments in document A/C.3/L.1881/Rev.1 clarified and improved the text of the draft resolution and she would therefore support them. With respect to the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1882, she had no

difficulty in supporting the first three. In conclusion, she reiterated that the international community must make more concerted efforts to ensure the implementation of the United Nations resolutions relating to the right of peoples to self-determination.

18. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic), after thanking the Ugandan representative for his wise decision, said that the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1881/Rev.1 could be dismissed outright as propaganda aimed at diverting the Committee's attention from the recent decision of the United States Congress to violate the sanctions against the racist minority régime of Southern Rhodesia. The sole purpose behind the amendments was to distract attention from the legal and political consequences of the United States violation of Article 25 of the Charter, and therefore they could not be taken seriously. He hoped that the progressive countries would vote against them. The other amendments seemed acceptable and his delegation's positive vote would reflect its position. It completely rejected, however, the subamendments submitted by the representative of Barbados (A/C.3/L.1888 and A/C.3/L.1889) because of the manner of their presentation and the bulldozer tactics used. While Israel was bulldozing Arab territory in Palestine, Barbados was trying to bulldoze the minds of representatives and confuse the issue; it was trying to send the Palestinians to the gas-chambers of the history of the United Nations. It was true that the Palestinian question was currently on the agenda of the Security Council. The Third Committee, however, was not discussing the conflict between the Arab States and Israel but the question of the rights of the Palestinian people. It was one thing to say that a State did not exist today as such and an entirely different thing to say that the rights of the Palestinian people did not exist. If that logic were acceptable, one would also have had to accept Hitler's logic when he had said that Czechoslovakia, Austria and Poland did not exist because their peoples had lost their national sovereignty at a given moment in history. Such logic would allow the repudiation of all United Nations resolutions, and make of Barbados a potential non-State, given the character of its neighbour to the north. Barbados contended that the problems applied only to colonial countries and peoples; he was in agreement with that view, although Barbados was not in agreement with Israel, nor Israel with Barbados, because Israel was a "colonial creation".

19. As Herzl, the father of Zionism, had said in 1902, Jews would buy and distribute products from a country where Jews were well-treated much more readily than from a country where they were not. The first draft of the Balfour Declaration in 1917 had stated that His Majesty's Government considered it essential to allow internal autonomy for people of Jewish nationality in Palestine and freedom and emigration for the Jews, and to create a Jewish national colonizing corporation for the resettlement and economic development of the country. The machinery used to establish such a colony did not differ from that used by Dutch and British companies to colonize Africa and Asia. The Jewish agency, i.e. the national colonizing corporation, had been defined in articles 3 and 4 of the 1952 Act, which stated that the World Zionist Organization was supervising the immigration as before and was overseeing the projects to absorb and settle Jews in the State. It also said that the State of Israel designated the World Zionist Organization as

the organization with a continuing responsibility to bring about development and settlement and the absorption of immigrants. One had only to recall that Chamberlain had proposed to Herzl that the Jews should settle in Uganda, to which Herzl had replied that the Jews should first go to Palestine, and might later go to Uganda. In conclusion, he recalled the two principles on which Syrian foreign policy was based: first, the struggle of the third world was one and indivisible, and secondly, the character of the Syrian Arab Republic's relations with other States depended on their stand vis-à-vis the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

20. Mr. ČALOVSKI (Yugoslavia) said that in its capacity as a member of the Economic and Social Council Yugoslavia had already voted in favour of the draft resolution under consideration, but that it would welcome any proposal that would enhance the text. It had reiterated on many occasions its belief in the universality of the right of peoples to self-determination, yet many peoples were still under colonial domination. That was why the item was important. Many amendments had been submitted for various specific reasons. The first was whether or not the names of the peoples referred to in the draft, i.e. the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia, Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and Palestine, should be spelled out. In his opinion that was essential. The second reason, as indicated in amendment A/C.3/L.1880, which deserved unanimous approval, was the need to bring to the attention of world opinion and Member States that the future of Zimbabwe could not be negotiated with an illegal régime or before majority rule had been established. The third point was to decide whether the text of the draft resolution should be weakened; he believed that it should not; indeed, he felt that if the Committee had more time the text could be still further improved. The final decision to be made was whether the text should include such important and far-reaching questions as that of the principles of peaceful co-existence, together with some opinions on those questions. Like the Austrian representative, he hoped that the sponsors of those amendments would reconsider their position. In his opinion, it was vital for the draft resolution to reaffirm the inalienable rights of peoples.

21. Mr. FOUNGUI (Congo) said that his delegation would join in sponsoring the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1880 and that it supported those appearing in documents A/C.3/L.1882, A/C.3/L.1877/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1878 and A/C.3/L.1893, for which it would accordingly vote.

22. It considered that the United States amendments (A/C.3/L.1881/Rev.1) were a clear provocation to freedom-loving peoples and the entire international community, but did not find that surprising, since it was in accordance with the position of reactionary United States capitalism. The first amendment was aimed solely at eliminating from the draft resolution any reflection of the idea that NATO was giving aid to Portugal in its struggle against the national liberation movements and the ruthless war it was waging to delay the independence of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). The amendment to the fourth preambular paragraph of the original text was aimed at demonstrating that colonialism was a threat only to the fundamental rights of peoples, whereas in the speaker's opinion colonialism in all its forms constituted an open

assault on human rights. The amendments to operative paragraphs 4 and 5 simply reflected United States hypocrisy and the influence of NATO. On the whole he felt that the amendments would not improve the text but would only weaken it.

23. The struggle against the liberation movements was headed by United States imperialism, which was trying not only in Africa but also in Asia and Latin America to unleash wars from which it would be the first to benefit and was encouraging colonialism with its support of Portugal and its purchases of chrome from Rhodesia. He called on all delegations of exploited countries to reject the amendments, for since that was the majority position there was no need to join with the United States in order to reach a consensus.

24. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Cyprus), noting that he had set forth his position on the subject under consideration in the course of the general debate (1873rd meeting), said that he supported all the amendments which would add to the draft resolution submitted by the Economic and Social Council on the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination, including Palestine. With reference to the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1886/Rev.1, he felt that they would be a positive contribution to the draft resolution and he was in agreement with them but he thought it would be preferable if the words "established in accordance with the right of the self-determination of its peoples" in the second of the proposed new preambular paragraphs were deleted. The same applied to the corresponding phrase in the proposed new operative paragraph 9, since that phrase would exclude countries which had attained their independence without their people's having exercised the right of self-determination. He suggested that Pakistan should delete that phrase unless an effort was made to reconcile the amendment with the subamendment proposed by India (A/C.3/L.1893), which referred to the same principles of the Charter—if that could be done, it would be a promising development. If Pakistan agreed to delete the phrase in question, he would vote for the amendment.

25. Mr. SABIK (Poland) said that he wished to address himself to those amendments which he deemed unacceptable because they were not in accordance with principles of freedom and justice. Referring to the amendments in document A/C.3/L.1881/Rev.1, he said that operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of the draft resolution under consideration should not be replaced because he felt that they constituted the essential part of the draft. The fact was that the amendments proposed by the United States were in opposition to the right of self-determination of peoples such as those of Zimbabwe, Namibia, Angola, Guinea (Bissau) and Palestine because that Power favoured the *status quo*. It likewise openly defended the policy of establishing an economic and military bastion in Africa which would enable the racist régimes and foreign monopolies to hold sway in the area.

26. He could not accept the amendments proposed in documents A/C.3/L.1888 and A/C.3/L.1889 because he felt that the people of Palestine were as much entitled as any other people to exercise all of their inalienable rights. That was a matter of special interest to the Committee,

which should adopt a draft resolution reflecting its desire to see the people of Palestine win their inalienable rights.

27. Mrs. ESHEL-SHOHAM (Israel) said that the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic had described a situation which had nothing to do with reality. He seemed to forget that Palestine as such had been a separate entity only in Jewish history. It had been known for hundreds of years in the history of the Arab peoples as southern Syria, and many of his countrymen still regarded it as such. His words about colonialism rang hollow in her ears, for her own grandparents had settled nearly 90 years before in the swamps of Hadera, a neglected area, and had exploited no one but had made it habitable for themselves and for the Arabs who came there from various parts of the Ottoman Empire. The Jewish people had had to wage a long and cruel struggle to realize their inalienable right of self-determination.

28. The representative of Kuwait had said that the League of Nations had recognized the right of self-determination of the Palestinians and all the peoples liberated from the Ottoman Empire. As far as the Arab nation was concerned, 17 Arab countries had attained independence and realized the right of self-determination and were all Members of the United Nations, yet they denied the same right to Israel, the only non-Arab State in the Middle East. However, the delegation of Kuwait had conveniently forgotten to mention the special decision of the League of Nations to establish a Jewish national home in Palestine under a British Mandate. That right had been sanctioned anew by the international community when, in 1947, the United Nations had adopted resolution 181 (II) on the partition of Palestine, rejected by the Arab countries.

29. What lay behind all the talk about the rights of the Palestinians? When the United Nations had adopted the 1947 resolution, who was it that had gone to war to destroy that resolution? Not Israel, but the Arabs. For 20 years a million Palestinians had been subjected to the rule of Egypt and Jordan. Had those countries recognized their right to self-determination?

30. Unfortunately, the apparently disinterested exhortations of the Arabs concealed their intention of destroying the sovereign State of Israel and setting themselves up on its ruins. How could they fail to see the absurdity of defending the universal right to self-determination and at the same time denying that right to the people of Israel?

31. Mr. MKONA (Malawi) said that he had heard the various statements on the universality of the right to self-determination, as also the reasons for which the representative of Barbados had put forward his amendment (A/C.3/L.1889). Malawi considered that amendment a reasonable one and would like to join in sponsoring it if it was maintained by Barbados.

32. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said he wished to make it clear to the representative of Israel, who had referred to the Ottoman Empire, that the latter had been the precursor of what was nowadays known as the Commonwealth, or of States like the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in which 15 nationalities lived together. The Ottoman Empire had included many nationalities: Kurds, Armenians, Syrians,

Iraqis, Palestinians, and so forth, all of which had had the right to send their representatives to the Parliament. The Europeans had sought its dismemberment for reasons of geopolitical expediency. The British had looked on Islam with contempt and had considered that its religious practices were an obstacle to the development of the area. In what was now Israel, the Palestinians had constituted 94 per cent of the population, while the remaining 6 per cent had been Jews, most of them Sephardic Jews, who also looked on Zionism as an alien ideology. The Balfour Declaration had been a manoeuvre of the British, who wanted the Jews to settle in the area in order to defend British interests in the event that the Arabs should wish to ally themselves with other Powers to put an end to the British Mandate. The British had fought in the Second World War to preserve their empire. They had not succeeded in doing so, and they had not had the right to dispose of the territories under their mandate as they had done. The United States, emerging as a great Power after that war, had contributed to the establishment of the usurper State of Israel.

33. In the play of United States politics, with which he was familiar, the Arabs had been sacrificed to expediency. During the Second World War the then President Truman had deemed it expedient to disregard the arguments of the Department of State in order not to lose the support of United States Jews, whose votes he needed. He also recalled that a United States Senator, whose name he preferred not to mention, had asked him why the Arabs were not prepared to pay for the defence of their cause, as the Jews had done and continued to do.

34. Israel said that Palestine did not exist, but it had existed before the war; it was true that it had been a mandated territory, but that had also been true of Lebanon, Iraq and Syria. It must be reiterated that neither the United States nor the United Kingdom were arbiters of the destiny of the Arabs; they must be reminded that the future of the Palestinians, who were human beings, was at stake.

35. It was encouraging, in contrast, to note that the People's Republic of China did not wish to associate itself with those great Powers and recognized the rights of the Palestinians; thus all Asia was now calling for the realization of the rights of that oppressed people. If it was religion that concerned the Jews, nothing and no one was preventing them from going to Israel and living in peace with the inhabitants of that area, for history showed that persecuted people who had gone to Palestine had always been well received. What was inadmissible was that they should use religion as a pretext for fomenting nationalism for economic reasons.

36. With regard to the statement made by the representative of Malawi, he said that Malawi, a small country which apparently was going to be allowed to continue existing in Africa, had surely supported the Barbados amendment because of ignorance of the problem under discussion and because, owing to lack of information, it might have yielded to certain pressures. The people of Palestine, which constituted an entity, had the right to independence regardless of how many Arab States there might be. The Palestine people had existed as such since thousands of

years before Christ, as had the Samaritans, the Jews, the Philistines and many others. One of those peoples, the Jews, had been persecuted and for that reason—and because of ulterior motives—it had been given the land of the Palestinians. Some new States such as Malawi supported those who were attacking Palestine because they were benefiting from the play of power politics.

37. In reply to the representative of Israel, he pointed out that it was not possible to set up a State based on religion, as had been done in the Middle Ages. That was an anachronism which could not survive. A common culture, religion, history and tradition were the characteristic features of a people and Palestine fulfilled all those conditions. The Palestinians were the true owners of a land which the Zionists, who had come from northern Asia, had colonized. Mr. Balfour, a rogue, and Mr. Truman, a common politician, had not had any right to decide the fate of the Arabs. If the Jews wanted to live in Palestine, as brothers, they would be received with open arms but never as domineering colonialists. Peace would be attained only after the destruction of a people's illusion that in the modern world a country could be built on religious foundations.

38. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, told the representative of Israel that, when he had quoted Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, it was not through an oversight that he had omitted to mention the Balfour Declaration. It would have been impossible for him to do so because the United Kingdom, when it had accepted the Mandate, had undertaken to respect the rights and the position of the people of Palestine.

39. Toynbee had referred to Israeli colonialism as one of the blackest cases of colonialism in history, since it was not only a crime but also an anachronism. Gandhi had said that Zionism in Palestine was an artificial injection into the Middle Eastern body. Although there were many Arab States, they had all been established in lands which belonged to their people. The Palestinians could not be denied the same right. Israel had given a strong argument to the Rhodesian régime, which could now claim that as there were more than 40 African States it saw no reason not to take over one of them.

40. Mr. MKONA (Malawi) described the features and geographical position of his country, for the benefit of the representative of Saudi Arabia. Malawi was a very small country, but at no time during the debate had it permitted Barbados to influence its decision. Indeed, if Barbados had not proposed the subamendment, Malawi would have done so. The small, poor and underdeveloped peoples considered the representative of Saudi Arabia as their guide in the exercise of their rights.

41. Mr. DERWINSKI (United States of America), replying to the remarks of the representative of Saudi Arabia, said that President Truman was an honourable man who had happened to be President of the United States during one of the most difficult times in the history of the world and that if he had made any mistakes they were honest ones. He also said that the allegation that a member of the United States Senate had switched his support for the Arabs to

Israel for reasons of personal political and financial gain was a serious charge. The people of the United States respected the integrity of their legislative bodies and if the representative of Saudi Arabia knew of such a senator he could help protect that integrity by naming the senator publicly.

42. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, stated that when he had referred to the small size of Malawi he had in no way intended his remark to be pejorative. He had simply wished to imply that perhaps Malawi might not be qualified to understand such a complicated problem. It was a new State which, because of its closeness to South Africa, had problems of a special kind. He had merely been expressing surprise at the fact that a representative of a small State should have become an expert on the matter.

43. The United States of America had welcomed the creation of Israel because it had thought that culture and technology would thus be introduced into the area. It had forgotten that the Arabs had a civilization which went back more than 5,000 years. The philosophy of the usurper State of Israel was that Jews owed their first loyalty to that country. They were endeavouring to create a problem of double allegiance for the Jews of the world. In the United States, the Jews controlled the mass information media and distorted, censored and sometimes suppressed the news. Under the cloak of Canadian interests, they owned various newspapers throughout the country and used them to slander the Arabs and their history. It was very easy to drain swamps if one had enough money.

44. He wondered what right the United Kingdom and the United States had to impose their policy on the Arabs.

45. He recalled that President Truman himself had said, in his memoirs, that he had asked the State Department how many Arabs there were among his voters. That had been a grave mistake, because he had been guided by an ulterior motive and he had not had the right to play with the interests of a people more than 6,000 miles away from the United States.

46. Regarding the United States Senator to whom he had referred, he would decide later whether to give the name to the representative of the United States; it was understandable that the Arabs were not prepared to act like the Zionists and did not seek to interfere in the domestic affairs of the United States. In that connexion, it should be noted that the United States Senators had recently voted a grant of \$500 million in aid to Israel. They were saying that their decision had been motivated by the fact that the Soviet Union was selling large quantities of arms to Egypt; but the fact was that the Soviet Union had not created the problem, which had arisen through the machinations of the United States and the United Kingdom.

47. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan), speaking on a point of order, stated that in view of the subamendments submitted by India (A/C.3/L.1893) and following various consultations, he had decided to revise his amendments (A/C.3/L.1886/Rev.1). He therefore proposed that the text of the first Indian subamendment should be accepted not as a replacement for the three new preambular paragraphs suggested in

the Pakistan amendment, but as an additional paragraph after the three paragraphs proposed by Pakistan, so that the first Indian subamendment would read "add the following paragraph, to be inserted after the three new preambular paragraphs". He also wished to make some changes in the three preambular paragraphs which he had proposed in document A/C.3/L.1886/Rev.1. In the first paragraph, the words "all its people entitled to the right of self-determination" should be replaced by "the whole people belonging to that territory". At the end of the paragraph, the words "this right" should be replaced by "the right of self-determination". In the second proposed paragraph, the words "the practices and purposes of the Charter" should be replaced by "the purposes and principles of the Charter". In the third proposed paragraph, the words "such States" should be replaced by "States".

48. In view of the position of the representative of India regarding the new operative paragraph 9 proposed in document A/C.3/L.1886/Rev.1 and of the opinion expressed by the representative of Cyprus and by others, he would withdraw that paragraph and thus forestall a subamendment. Only operative paragraph 10, to which he understood that the representative of India had no objection, would remain.

49. Mrs. DAES (Greece) asked the representative of Pakistan to clarify his position regarding the suggestion by the representative of Cyprus, particularly the deletion of the phrase "in accordance with the right of the self-determination of its people" in the second paragraph proposed in document A/C.3/L.1886/Rev.1.

50. Mr. MANI (India) pointed out that he had not said that he had no objection to operative paragraph 10 but that, if his amendments to operative paragraph 9 were accepted, operative paragraph 10 would have no meaning. At no time had he stated that he would accept that paragraph without reservations.

51. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Cyprus) said that the representative of Pakistan had announced changes in the paragraphs proposed in document A/C.3/L.1886/Rev.1, but had not said whether he accepted the suggestion made by the Cypriot delegation regarding the deletion of the phrase "established in accordance with the right of the self-

determination of its people" in the second paragraph. He formally proposed the deletion of that phrase, since it limited the scope of the paragraph, which should cover all peoples.

52. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that the phrase had been inserted because the subject dealt with was self-determination. The comment made by the representative of Cyprus was a valid one and should be studied; he would consult the delegations concerned so as to produce a formula which would be more acceptable to the representative of Cyprus.

53. He had misunderstood the representative of India and thought that he had accepted the new operative paragraph 10 proposed in document A/C.3/L.1886/Rev.1. He himself had found that quite natural, since the wording was one used in almost all documents on the subject.

54. Mr. MANI (India) stressed that the subamendments proposed by his country (A/C.3/L.1893) were based on all the debates in the General Assembly and the Third Committee during the past three years. He wondered whether it was not redundant always to insist on the same point, if the words used in the new operative paragraph 10, proposed by the representative of Pakistan, appeared in the Charter. Like the representative of Austria, he thought that no purpose would be served by quoting passages out of context for predetermined purposes. Mr. Mani added that operative paragraph 10 depended upon the acceptance of the sequence of the subamendments submitted by India.

55. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) stated that he understood the objections raised by the representatives of India and Austria to the terms of the new operative paragraph 9 which his country had proposed. He found it difficult, however, to understand the objections to operative paragraph 10, which was practically copied from the Charter.

Organization of work

56. The CHAIRMAN announced that the dead-line for the submission of amendments to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1894, concerning agenda item 63, would be Thursday, 25 November, at 11 a.m.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.