

which, moreover, was not directed at countries whose territories were not occupied.

61. Mr. DORON (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, reiterated that he had no intention of repeating the reply he had already given.

62. The CHAIRMAN announced that Trinidad and Tobago had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/L.334.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.

981st meeting

Thursday, 20 November 1975, at 10.55 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Roberto MARTINEZ ORDOÑEZ (Honduras).

A/SPC/SR.981

Tribute to the memory of H.E. Generalissimo Francisco Franco Bahamonde, Head of the Spanish State

1. The CHAIRMAN, speaking on behalf of the Committee and of his country, and on his own behalf, expressed condolences to the delegation of Spain on the death of the Head of the Spanish State, Generalissimo Francisco Franco.

2. Mr. LOPEZ HERCE (Spain), on behalf of the Permanent Mission of Spain to the United Nations and of the people and Government of Spain, acknowledged the expression of condolences on the death of the Head of the Spanish State.

AGENDA ITEM 54

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (*continued*) (A/10114, A/10115, A/10268, A/SPC/L.334-336):

- (a) Report of the Commissioner-General (A/10013 and Corr.1);
- (b) Report of the Working Group on the Financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (A/10334);
- (c) Report of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine (A/10271);
- (d) Report of the Secretary-General (A/10253)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/SPC/L.334-336)

3. The CHAIRMAN noted that the Committee had before it draft resolutions A/SPC/L.334 and A/SPC/L.335 which he intended to put to the vote forthwith. He would suspend the meeting briefly to enable delegations to place their names on the list of speakers, with a view to explaining their votes either before or after the voting.

The meeting was suspended at 11 a.m. and resumed at 11.05 a.m.

4. The CHAIRMAN, referring to draft resolution A/SPC/L.334, recalled that in previous years the Committee had adopted similar draft resolutions by consensus. If there was

no objection he would take it that the Committee agreed to adopt draft resolution A/SPC/L.334 in the same way.

The draft resolution was adopted by consensus.

5. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Israel had requested that draft resolution A/SPC/L.335 be put to the vote.

The draft resolution was adopted by 79 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

6. Mr. SHARAF (Jordan) expressed his delegation's condolences to the Spanish delegation on the death of the Head of the Spanish State.

7. He introduced draft resolution A/SPC/L.336, of which his delegation was a sponsor, concerning the refugees displaced as a result of the Israeli attack on three Arab States. Operative paragraph 1, which reaffirmed the right of the displaced inhabitants to return to their homes and camps in the territories occupied by Israel since 1967, used the word "camps" because the inhabitants who had been displaced from those territories had already been refugees when they were again driven out by the Israelis; they were now refugees twice over. The other operative paragraphs deplored Israel's refusal to take steps for the return of the displaced inhabitants and called upon Israel to take such action and to desist from all measures that obstructed the return; Israel was called upon once again to take steps immediately for the return of the refugees to the camps in the Gaza Strip and to desist from removal of refugees and destruction of their shelters; Israeli military attacks on refugee camps were condemned and Israel was called upon to desist from such attacks.

8. He announced that the United Republic of Tanzania had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

9. Mr. PETNIČKI (Yugoslavia) introduced a draft resolution¹ concerning the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA and announced that Austria, Belgium, Colombia,

¹ Subsequently circulated as document A/SPC/L.337.

Finland, the Federal Republic of Germany, Indonesia, Iran, Malaysia and Yugoslavia were sponsors of the draft resolution.

10. The CHAIRMAN said that the text of the draft resolution which Yugoslavia and just introduced was based on the draft resolution adopted by the Committee at the twenty-ninth session by consensus² and he hoped therefore that the draft resolution in question would be adopted in the same manner.

11. Mr. VALDERRAMA (Philippines) said that if his delegation had been present it would have joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/SPC/L.334 and would have voted for draft resolution A/SPC/L.335.

12. Mr. OULD SIDI (Mauritania) said that if his delegation had been present it would have voted for draft resolution A/SPC/L.335 and would have joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/SPC/L.334.

13. He announced that his delegation had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/L.336.

14. Mr. DRAMOU (Guinea) said that his delegation had also become a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/L.336. If it had been present it would have voted for draft resolution A/SPC/L.335 and would have wished to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/L.334, which had been adopted by consensus.

15. Mr. DORON (Israel), referring to the remarks made by the representative of Jordan in introducing draft resolution A/SPC/L.336, said that his version of the events of 1967 did not coincide with the truth. The representative of Israel had demonstrated a few days earlier, at the 2397th plenary meeting of the General Assembly, that Israel had been the victim of Arab aggression and he had quoted from the published memoirs of the King of Jordan, in which the latter had frankly admitted that he had disregarded the message of 5 June 1967 which he had received from the then Prime Minister of Israel prior to the opening of hostilities. That message had stated that Israel would not initiate any action whatsoever against Jordan unless Jordan opened hostilities, in which case it would react with all its might. The Government of Israel had been informed that the message had been duly and faithfully conveyed and received. Nevertheless, Jordan had answered by opening heavy artillery fire along the whole front. Even after that the Government of Israel had attempted to localize the conflict, but Jordan had rejected those efforts. Apparently Jordan had thought that it would succeed in joining in the aggression against Israel. Those were the facts which the representative of Jordan persisted in disregarding. In draft resolution A/SPC/L.336 the enormous discrepancy between the alleged "facts" on paper and the real facts was even more evident than in similar resolutions adopted in previous years.

16. With reference to the return of displaced persons, he read out a note verbale dated 8 September 1975 from the representative of Israel to the Secretary-General, which was

reproduced in paragraph 3 of the Secretary-General's report (A/10253), stating that the Government of Israel had continued to seek to reconcile its desire to facilitate the return of displaced persons—who had fled from the area of hostilities in 1967 at the instigation of the Arab Governments—with its responsibility for the safety and welfare of the population in the administered areas and in Israel, as well as the security of the State itself. The note went on to state that certain Arab Governments continued to furnish aid to terrorist organizations grouped under the Palestine Liberation Organization, which were established in and operated from their territory against Israel. Thus the prevailing situation did not permit a large-scale return of those displaced persons. Nevertheless, the Government of Israel had continued to facilitate the return of those persons. However, the facilities established by Israel were exploited by certain Arab Governments for purposes of subversion in order to facilitate the entry of terrorists and the transport of explosives into Israel-administered territory. Such actions obviously undermined any efforts to improve the situation.

17. In the circumstances there was no basis for reaffirming any alleged right of the displaced persons to return, or for deploring the refusal of the Israeli authorities to take steps for the return of the displaced inhabitants, as was done in operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution.

18. Nor was there any reason for the call addressed to Israel in paragraphs 3 and 4. It was well known that Israel had taken no measures affecting the physical and demographic structure of the areas under its administration and that it was taking all necessary steps to provide decent housing for refugees instead of the accommodation they had in the crowded camps. Israel had frequently explained the various considerations relevant to the matter, such as security and the improvement of the general situation and living conditions of the refugees.

19. As for paragraph 5, in a number of letters written to the Secretary-General and in statements made on various occasions, Israel had made it quite clear that it did not take action against refugee camps but only against bases and other installations of the terrorist organizations located in or near the camps. In that connexion he quoted from an article in *The New York Times* of 13 November 1975, stating that Lebanon was the only Middle Eastern country where the guerrillas had been relatively free to keep base facilities and to plan operations against Israel. Furthermore, numerous newspaper articles, as well as communiqués from the terrorist organizations themselves, bore witness to the fact that the targets attacked by the Israel Defence Forces had always been military installations of the terrorist gangs and that all possible steps had been taken to avoid injury to the residents of the camps.

20. The weekly magazine *Ila El Amam*, published by the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, said in its issue of 13 March 1975 that the accuracy of the Israeli air raids on the Palestinian camps in Lebanon was not only the result of aerial photographs, because those could not provide accurate information on who lived in each house and where the equipment was hidden. He wondered how anybody could be asked to condemn the defensive action against terrorist bases which Israel was constrained to take,

² Adopted by the General Assembly on 17 December 1974 as resolution 3330 (XXIX).

and concluded by stating that the whole of draft resolution A/SPC/L.336 was unacceptable, since it was misleading and not based on facts.

21. Mr. SHARAF (Jordan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he was not surprised that Israel was seeking once again to distort the facts.

22. In referring to the 1967 aggression against three Arab countries, the representative of Israel had so radically rewritten history that there was reason to suppose that, if he applied the same logic, he might say that the Arab countries were actually occupying a considerable portion of the territory of Israel, that one and a half million Israelis had been displaced by the Arabs in 1948 and were living in camps, and that the Committee was considering the displacement of thousands of Israelis as a result of the hostilities in 1967. However, all the members of the Committee knew that that had nothing to do with the truth. What the Committee was considering was the case of the Arab refugees who had been driven from their homes in 1948.

23. As for Israel's intentions towards the Arabs, no amount of quotations could obscure the truth. It was true that the Israeli leaders, just before a premeditated attack on their Arab neighbours, had talked of peace, but their actions had been diametrically opposed to their words. On the eve of the 1967 attack on Egypt, Jordan and the Syrian Arab Republic, the Israeli Minister, Moshe Dayan, had said that diplomatic negotiations were continuing in an effort to resolve the conflict and that Israel would not resort to war. Similarly, in 1956, just before the attack on Egypt which had resulted in the occupation of vast areas, Ben Gurion had spoken explicitly and emphatically of peace.

24. In any case, the quotations in question and those of all the propaganda organs of the Israeli Government were irrelevant. The Committee was considering the question of the Palestinians and the future of those people who had been refugees twice in their lifetime and who were now living in temporary shelters because they had been expelled and displaced by Israel in 1967. The representative of Israel had said that his Government was allowing those persons to return by degrees, but it was common knowledge that the Government of Israel and the occupation authorities had taken strict measures which made their return virtually impossible. It would be interesting to know how many persons had been allowed to return to their homes.

25. With regard to the physical changes made by the Government of Israel, particularly in the Gaza strip, it was

typical that the representative of Israel should have spoken of improving living conditions, but there again, what he said had no bearing on the issue. It was not improvements in the accommodation of the population that were needed; it was necessary to preserve the physical integrity of that population, and that would only be achieved when all the displaced persons were able to return to their homes.

26. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that draft resolution A/SPC/L.336 only referred to the situation of the persons displaced from the Arab territories occupied by Israel in 1967. The representative of Israel repeatedly used the word "terrorists" when referring to the Palestinians, overlooking the fact that possibly even before he had gone to Palestine those who had begun to use terrorism for their own ends had been the Zionists of central and eastern Europe. In actual fact, the Jews of the east had been peaceful people who had never engaged in terrorism. The people of Palestine, whether they had been Christians, Moslems or Jews, had never given cause for concern to the Government of Istanbul because they were peaceful by nature and by calling. The problems had begun with the Khazars, who had not belonged to the Semitic race and had been converted to Judaism in southern Russia during the eighth century.

27. He often told the Palestinians that they should not use terrorism as Zionism did, and they replied that Israel had won its victories through terrorism. In actual fact, that was not so, because those victories were due to the assistance provided by the United States of America.

28. He thought that unless they changed their tactics, the Zionists would always continue to be a foreign element in the Middle East. If they wished to be accepted they must change their policy. Otherwise they would disappear, since they would have no future unless they won the acceptance of all the Arab peoples, of which the Palestinians were an integral part. Zionism was spreading its political and financial tentacles and seeking to appear as a helpless minority. It was to be hoped that it did not become a scapegoat; however, if that did happen he would be the first to defend the Zionists' human rights.

29. Mr. DORON (Israel), exercising the right of reply in connexion with the comments made by the representative of Jordan, said that he had no intention of trying to rewrite history but accepted it as written by the King of Jordan in his memoirs.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.