

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

Wednesday, 15 November 1972,  
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

*Chairman:* Mr. Hady TOURÉ (Guinea).

*In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Carasales (Argentina), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

## AGENDA ITEM 40

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (*continued*) (A/8672, A/SPC/154-156, A/SPC/L.247, A/SPC/L.248):

- (a) Report of the Commissioner-General (A/8713 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/8849);
- (c) Report of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine (A/8830);
- (d) Reports of the Secretary-General (A/8786, A/8814)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the representative of Uganda had asked to take part in the debate, although the list of speakers had been closed on Monday, 13 November. If there were no objections he would take it that the Committee agreed to hear the representative of Uganda,

*It was so decided.*

2. Mr. AHMAD (India), speaking on a point of order, asked for a clarification of the Committee's work programme, according to which the general debate on the question of Palestine refugees was to be concluded the following day. In view of the number of speakers on the list and the importance of rights of reply, it might be well to know in advance how much time each representative intended to speak so that the time allowed for the debate might be extended if necessary.

3. The CHAIRMAN said that two meetings were scheduled for the following day and asked representatives to make a special effort to be punctual. If it was impossible to conclude the general debate on the following day, the Committee could hold an additional meeting on Friday, 17 November.

4. Mr. HEDIN (Sweden), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/L.248, said that except for the necessary references the text was identical with that of the draft resolutions on assistance to persons displaced as a result of the 1967 hostilities submitted for several years by his delegation. The text was purely humani-

tarian in character and was sponsored by 19 countries apart from his own, demonstrating their belief that the miserable plight of those ill-fated persons must not be ignored. The sponsors hoped that the draft resolution would meet with general approval and would, as at the previous session, be adopted unanimously.

*Mr. Touré (Guinea) took the Chair.*

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Saadat Hassan (Palestine Liberation Organization), took a place at the Committee table.*

5. Mr. HASSAN<sup>1</sup> (Palestine Liberation Organization) said that the Palestine Liberation Organization was the only body which represented the Palestinian people in every phase of their national life, including international forums. There was no other individual, State or organization which could speak on behalf of the Palestinian people. The Palestinian representatives, who had to listen each year to assertions—assertions based on historical and statistical distortions—that it was the Arab leaders and the Palestinians themselves who had given rise to the refugee problem, did not have an easy task. As for the Western countries, they treated the Palestinians as if they were the victims of a natural disaster or civil war, ignoring the fundamental nature of the problem. The United Nations itself had been rendered ineffective in dealing with a problem the crux of which was not assistance to refugees but the inalienable right of a people which was suffering at the hands of Israeli Zionism and imperialism. The implanting of an Israeli enclave in the midst of the Arab homeland was simply another aspect of traditional colonialism as practised in southern Africa. Colonialist interests were steadily expanding in that part of the world while the United States of America imported half of its energy supplies from the Middle East oil fields. The implantation of an alien population was more useful than a colonial army for the protection of those interests. In the course of its history, Palestine had received minorities, including Jewish minorities, into its territory which lay at the crossroads of civilizations, of commerce and trade, and of conquering armies. The struggle had always been between the indigenous Palestinian population and the organized settler groups that had invaded their shores. At the current time the transformation of the indigenous population had been conceived and organized by the architects of modern Zionism, who had started the hostilities in that part of the world.

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Hassan took the floor in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee at its 835th meeting to authorize members of the Palestine Liberation Organization to address the Committee without such authorization implying recognition of that organization.

6. Almost 25 years ago a Western-dominated United Nations, contrary to the principle of self-determination embodied in the Charter, had allowed itself to give a semblance of international legitimacy to the acts of colonialism and imperialism in Palestine. It was the United Nations itself that must be blamed for the proliferation of the problems of the refugees who, after being evicted from their ancestral homeland and after seeing that homeland occupied, had been divided into old and new refugees, displaced inhabitants and displaced refugees, refugees who received rations and relief and those who received only services. However, it was of some small comfort to see that the United Nations, which had undergone changes since 1947, had recently adopted resolutions recognizing the inalienable right of the people of Palestine to self-determination in their homeland and recognizing the right of the Palestinian resistance movement to struggle for the attainment of that inalienable right. The Palestinian people did not want to remain for ever on the charity lists of an international organization; all they desired was to lead a normal life in their own homeland, using their own land and employing their own talents.

7. In contemporary history the struggle directed against the forces of imperialism, racism, exploitation and subjugation had become a powerful factor for progress. The struggle waged by the Palestinian people was not a new one; at the time of the invasion of their shores by Zionist emigrants, the Palestinian people had begun the struggle with appeals, protests, strikes and finally recourse to armed struggle in the exercise of their right of self-defence. They had not been the mere passive refugees of the UNRWA statistics. The struggle, which had been waged for so long, was continuing under the most difficult conditions—dispersion in the neighbouring Arab countries, almost daily Israeli attacks, restrictions on movements imposed by some Arab Governments and even sometimes assaults by them. The 1967 occupation had been long premeditated as part of the Israeli policy of expansion, which involved ridding Palestine of its indigenous inhabitants completely. The policy's implementation had taken various forms. First, the Gaza Strip and the West Bank had been occupied in order to give an entirely different character to those two areas with a view to annexation of the one and conversion of the other into a subsidiary of the Israeli economy. Secondly, in pre-1967 Israel the situation of the Palestinians had been that of third-class citizens: some had had to give up their land for it to be turned into *kibbutzim*. Thirdly, Arab workers from the occupied territories were being exploited by Israel, paid discriminatory wages, denied the benefits of union protection and deprived of the right to remain at night in the towns where they were employed. Children were working in citrus groves under the most barbaric conditions. Fourthly, even the Jewish population not of European or American origin was discriminated against in the areas of housing, employment and participation in government.

8. Israeli Zionism could not be dissociated from imperialism, and the division of roles between the two could best be seen in the transformation of Israeli-

American relations over the past 20 years. Today, Israel provided the crucial link in America's Mediterranean, Afro-Asian and Indian Ocean policies. Like Taiwan, Israel had provided a surrogate presence for the United States and had acted as a barometer measuring the intensity of national and anti-Western feelings, as in the case of Israel's aid programme for certain African States. Israel, which was helping to ensure American hegemony in the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean to offset the decline of NATO, was playing the role of active custodian of imperialist interests in the area and was viewed by the national liberation movements of the world today as a counter-revolutionary force, a front for imperialism.

9. Since the last major Israeli aggression, every attempt to impose peace had failed despite the concessions made by certain Arab States and Israel had constantly escalated its demands. The feelings of the Arab masses, their endurance, commitment to freedom and willingness to sacrifice made it plain that they would never surrender to aggression or submit to permanent occupation and exploitation even though some Arab leaders thought they could bargain away the rights of the Palestinians. The only alternative that lay open was to continue the struggle. Since the Palestinian people did not have the military resources which the United States was providing to Israel, they would reply with whatever means were available to them. It was not the freedom-fighter carrying out a mission in a garrison State who was a coward but rather the person who dropped bombs on innocent men, women and children from a height of 40,000 feet. Israel's very existence had from the outset rested on the terrorism which it had introduced into the area. Israel, like the other racist, colonial States, was today being gradually isolated from the mainstream of human development, with more than 80 per cent of mankind questioning the existence of Israel and upholding the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine. The Palestinian resistance, which was a popular mass movement and not the monopoly of a few, represented the beginning of a war of national liberation. Israeli imperialism sought military, economic and technological domination. The only way to create a just and lasting peace was to effect a total mobilization of resources and ensure that the Arab masses were not isolated from the Palestinian cause. The belief of some Arab leaders that they could create an atmosphere of coexistence had led to the demobilization of the Arab masses, with the result that the latter found themselves largely reduced to the role of spectators in every confrontation with Israel.

10. The only solution for the individual Jew and the individual Arab was a State free of the ghetto mentality in which the Jew would be liberated from the odious phenomenon of Zionism, a State which would free the Palestinians from the fear of perpetually remaining refugees and would free the Arab masses from the burden of constant war, permitting them to devote their attention to the creation of a better life. That State, which today was still a vision, was the democratic State advocated by the Palestine Liberation Organization;

it represented a compromise, for the people of Palestine were convinced that it was the only moral, permanent, just and lasting solution.

*Mr. Hassan withdrew.*

11. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) deplored the fact that a quarter of a century after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 194 (III), which had offered the Palestinian refugees the choice between repatriation and compensation, Israel, which was wholly responsible for the Palestinian tragedy, was blocking all the resolutions which called upon it to facilitate the return of the refugees. Indeed, during the general debate at the current session (2045th plenary meeting) the Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs had gone so far as to deny the very existence of the Palestinian people. The Sudanese delegation, for its part, refused to deal with the Palestinian refugee problem in isolation from its historic roots and political context. It was convinced that no peace in the Middle East would prove lasting unless the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and independence was recognized.

12. His delegation was alarmed by Israel's policies. In the first place, the racist State of Israel was systematically pursuing a policy of settling Jews from Europe and elsewhere in occupied Arab territories and Palestinian lands. That policy clearly demonstrated Israel's rejection of the idea of permitting the refugees to return to their homeland and its unwillingness to surrender the Arab land which it had seized in its war of aggression in 1967.

13. Secondly, in keeping with its expansionist, militarist policy, Israel had, since its founding, continued to wage wars of aggression against its neighbours, concealing its real intentions by arguing that it was acting in self-defence or by citing Arab hostility. It was therefore not surprising that the number of refugees was constantly increasing and, according to the figures contained in the Commissioner-General's report, had risen by 2.6 per cent between 30 June 1971 and 30 June 1972. He wished to know whether that state of affairs could be tolerated and how long the United Nations would remain an idle spectator of such acts of violence and aggression. The Organization must take vigorous action against Israel if it was to remain faithful to the Charter and to its moral commitments. His delegation agreed with the Indian representative's statement that the refugees were the direct responsibility of the State which had forced them to flee their homes and not of the neighbouring States which had come to their aid. It rejected the argument that a solution to the refugee problem must depend on the terms of a final over-all peace settlement and felt that the Arab countries were not bound either legally or morally to negotiate or discuss the refugee question with Israel.

14. Thirdly, Israel's policy aimed at the complete annihilation and physical extermination of the Palestinian people, as was shown by the recent air attacks on Palestinian camps in Lebanon and Syria. Moreover, Israel had never paid compensation to UNRWA for

the shelters belonging to the Agency which Israel had demolished in Gaza in July and August 1971. It was evident from the Secretary-General's report (A/8814) that Israel had refused to comply with General Assembly resolution 2792 C (XXVI), which called upon it to desist from further destruction of refugee shelters and from further removal of refugees from their current places of residence and to take immediate and effective steps for the return of the refugees concerned to the camps from which they had been removed and to provide adequate shelters for their accommodation.

15. His delegation agreed with the view expressed in the report of the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA that as long as a just and lasting settlement of the problem of the Palestine refugees had not been achieved, UNRWA's services, in the form of relief assistance, health care and education, must be maintained at least at their current minimal level (see A/8849, para.59).

16. Mr. MANGAL (Afghanistan) said that although the General Assembly had in its resolution 194 (III) recognized the legitimate right of the Palestine refugees to repatriation or compensation, the Israeli Government had refused to acknowledge that right and for nearly a quarter of a century the refugees had been living in misery and vainly waiting for justice to be done. Israel should realize that it was neither in the interest of its own people nor in the interest of peace and prosperity in the Middle East to permit that situation to continue indefinitely.

17. A just and lasting peace could be built in the Middle East on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), but Israel had failed to heed the repeated appeals directed to it to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who had fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities. In the meantime, new problems had arisen as a result of the 1967 war.

18. That attitude towards the United Nations on the part of a State which the latter had created was a disturbing example of contempt for the Organization which, whatever arguments Israel might cite, could not be tolerated by those who believed in justice, human dignity and freedom. To permit such a situation to continue meant recognizing the failure of the United Nations, and more effective action must be taken to implement the relevant resolution and restore the rights of the Palestinian people.

19. While peace-making efforts had not yielded any tangible results, UNRWA had been carrying on its work and, in a sense, serving the cause of peace. He wished to express appreciation to Sir John Rennie, the Commissioner-General of the Agency, and his staff. His delegation also wished to thank the Working Group on the Financing of the Agency for presenting a valuable report (A/8849) suggesting means of remedying UNRWA's critical financial situation. It should be recalled that the Agency had been established more than 20 years earlier in order to provide relief to the Palestine refugees on a temporary basis and that it

had been necessary to renew its mandate nine times since then. The Agency had thus acquired a permanent character which could create the impression that the United Nations had accepted a *status quo* that was not conducive to a solution of the refugee problem. If that tendency was permitted to continue, it would mean that the United Nations was ignoring the failure to implement General Assembly resolution 194 (III) or had forgotten that its primary responsibility was to eliminate the consequences of aggression. His delegation was therefore unable to endorse the view referred to in the report of the Working Group (*ibid.*, para. 62) that the Agency's budget should be totally or in part incorporated into the United Nations regular budget.

20. He wished to stress that the occupation of territory by the Israeli Government and its demolition of houses and shelters, which was still continuing, particularly in the Gaza Strip, had affected and disorganized normal UNRWA services and that claims for compensation presented by the Agency had been ignored.

21. His delegation was well aware of the importance of the financial aspect of the Palestine refugee problem but felt that the greatest focus of concern must be its humanitarian aspect and the grave injustices suffered by the people of Palestine. Was it too much to ask that the United Nations should implement its own resolutions?

22. Finally, he wished to reiterate that, in his delegation's opinion, so long as the United Nations failed to exert the power and authority conferred upon it by the Charter in order to implement its resolutions, the tragic situation in Palestine would remain as a flagrant example of injustice.

23. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the question of the Palestine refugees had been before the United Nations for almost a quarter of a century but that the problem had still not been solved even though the plight of the Palestine refugees was one of the causes of the tension in the Middle East. What was at stake was the fate of one and a half million human beings who had been torn from their native land and condemned to long years of suffering and privation as a result of the Israel policy of aggression, territorial annexation and repression. The problem of the Palestine refugees had been growing steadily worse since 1948. Today it represented a crucial aspect of the dangerous conflict in the Middle East and threatened to cause serious complications in the international situation as a whole.

24. He referred to resolution 194 (III), in which the General Assembly as early as 1948 had indicated the course to be followed by establishing the right of the Palestine refugees to repatriation or compensation. Since then, the General Assembly had taken up the question of the Palestine refugees every session and had adopted numerous resolutions reaffirming resolution 194 (III) which had not been implemented because of the fact that Israel, relying on the support it received from outside, ignored the decisions of the

United Nations and cynically refused to comply with them. Following the Israeli aggression of June 1967, the number of Palestine refugees had been increased as hundreds of thousands of new victims had joined them. The Israeli occupation authorities were continuing to expel the Arabs from the conquered territories and encourage Israelis to settle there.

25. The measures taken by the Israeli authorities vis-à-vis the Arab population of the Gaza Strip and of Jerusalem were undisguised examples of racism and genocide, a flagrant violation of the standards of international law, international conventions and the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. Israeli air raids on Palestine refugee camps in Syria and Lebanon were shockingly cruel acts of international gangsterism.

26. His delegation felt that Israel's expansionist policy, which was blocking any settlement of the Middle East question, was aimed at maintaining indefinitely the current plight of the Palestinian people. The Israeli leaders admitted that they would never agree to the return of the refugees to their homes or their lands. They thought that the people of Palestine would ultimately resign themselves to their sad fate, abandon the struggle for the restoration of their rights and disappear as a people. That was an outright policy of genocide.

27. However, the designs of the Israeli Zionists would be frustrated by the Arab peoples, particularly the people of Palestine, who were carrying on their just struggle with the support of progressive forces throughout the world and of all freedom-loving peoples. The attempts by Israel and other States to decide the fate of the Palestinians unilaterally, without taking into consideration the views of the Palestinians themselves, could not bring about a just and lasting peace.

28. In his delegation's view, the essential condition for any settlement of the Palestine refugee problem was the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from the Arab territories which they were occupying and the effective implementation by Israel of United Nations resolutions relating to the Palestine refugees, particularly General Assembly resolution 194 (III). Israel must be compelled to abandon its expansionist policy in the Middle East, to withdraw its troops from occupied Arab territories and to agree to a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict, including the problem of the Palestine refugees and the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

29. In that connexion, his delegation continued to believe that the political and legal basis of any settlement of the Palestine refugee problem and the Middle East conflict must be sought in General Assembly resolution 194 (III), Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and the decisions of other United Nations organs.

30. After expressing his country's confidence in the victory of the just cause of the Arab peoples and, in particular, of the liberation struggle of the Palestine Arabs, he read out part of a recent statement in which

Mr. L. Brezhnev, Secretary-General of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR, set forth the Soviet Union's views on the Middle East problem—a problem which could be solved only by the cessation of aggression and the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the Arab lands that they had seized. The peace-loving States and peoples must and would succeed in restoring peace in the Middle East and restoring the legitimate rights of the Arab peoples.

31. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) expressed his delegation's appreciation to UNRWA and its Commissioner-General for the effective manner in which they were carrying out their difficult task and to all those who were contributing financially to the efforts to relieve the sufferings of the Palestine refugees.

32. He had not taken the floor in order to discuss the figures in a budget which gave little reason for optimism regarding the future of the Agency, with the modest daily sum allocated for each refugee representing less than one half of the price of a New York newspaper. Nor would he renew the appeals repeatedly addressed to those Member States which were not yet contributing to that budget. In the interests of objectivity, he would permit the facts to speak for themselves and would begin by giving a brief historical review of the origins of the Palestine question, which would, in passing, involve some anthropological observations.

33. The Jews could not claim that they were descended from a single race; like all other peoples, they represented a mixture of races, for the idea of racial purity existed only in the abstract. The Jews had originally belonged to tribes which lived in Mesopotamia, present-day Iraq, an area relatively far from Palestine. Abraham had lived in Chaldea, and it was Jacob and his sons who had left Mesopotamia to settle in the land of Canaan, whose inhabitants they had driven out. In a tribal society, it frequently happened that one tribe seized by force of arms another tribe's richer land or coveted possessions; that was referred to in Arabic as "*rezzou*", and the Arabian peninsula had been the scene of such conflicts until the advent of King Abd el Aziz. It should also be noted that Jerusalem had existed long before the arrival of the Jewish tribes, who had at that time been known as Hebrews from the word "*abara*", meaning to cross a river or territory, the word "*Jew*" stemming from the name of Judah, a son of Jacob. It was Joshua who had first conquered Jericho and then Jerusalem. That brief historical outline should be useful in making it clear that the Oriental Jews themselves were not indigenous to Palestine.

34. Moreover, the Jews, like the Christians, Moslems and Buddhists, were not a single people sharing a single culture. In the course of history, there had been a number of attempts to establish universal States on the basis of adherence to a single religion, but such attempts to subordinate temporal power to religion had always failed. The Crusades were a celebrated example at that. It was the futile aim of the Jews to reverse the course of history, but the concept of a

Jewish people in whose veins the same blood flowed was a pure invention of Zionist propaganda.

35. Nevertheless, in their statements at every General Assembly session and at every meeting of the Security Council the representatives of Israel did not hesitate to apply the phrase "our people" to Jews throughout the world. A French or American Jew, born in France or the United States, countries where his forebears had lived for generations and whose culture and way of life he had completely assimilated, had only very tenuous links with Israel. Moreover, what were the factors which united the inhabitants of a given country into a "people"? A common language? Certainly, in the United States people of various ethnic origins were united by the English language, but there were also bilingual countries such as Belgium. The way of life, culture and shared interests were also important factors, although in the United States the idea of "Americanism" firmly united people from various cultures and with different ways of life. On what grounds could the Jews claim that they were a single people? It was true that they shared a single religion, Judaism, but that was a purely individual matter related to each person's metaphysical view of the world, and nationality had nothing to do with it. As for Zionism, that was an essentially political movement, although it claimed to have a religious cast as well.

36. The political movement known as Zionism had been born in Central Europe. A majority of European Jews were not in fact Semites. Having migrated from northern Asia, they had first settled in the Caspian Sea area and then, in the first century of the Christian era, in southern Russia. During the confrontation between Byzantium and Islam, the two adversaries had agreed that, in order to maintain a certain balance of power, neither of them would attempt to convert to their own religion those non-Semitic peoples, who had then belonged to a religion which was originally a Semitic religion, as were the two other great monotheistic religions, Christianity and Islam. Those peoples were, nevertheless, strangers in Palestine; it was Theodor Herzl who had urged them to return to their so-called "homeland", where neither they nor their ancestors had ever lived.

37. One vital factor in the Jews' return to the lost homeland was the allegedly imposed exile, the Diaspora. Whether under Nebuchadnezzar or in the time of the Roman Empire, that exile had affected only rich and influential Jews in the same way that, when Hitler had taken power in Germany, all the Jews had obviously not left, since if they had, it was difficult to see which Jews had been persecuted. Both in antiquity and more recently, only the élite had left; the common people, the peasants, who made up the majority, had remained where they were, and the Diaspora was a phenomenon which had been consciously exaggerated in order to enable the Zionist leaders to call on Jews to return to Palestine. At the birth of Christianity, Palestine had essentially been inhabited by Semites, most of whom had held Jewish religious beliefs and had been converted in large numbers to the new religion. In the same way,



at the time of the Arab conquest in the seventh century, the Palestinians and the other peoples of the "fertile crescent" had adopted Islam. It was an irony of history that the people of Palestine, who were of Semitic origin and formerly of the Jewish faith, were now being expelled from their homeland by the Khazars, European Jews who had been converted to Judaism only in the seventh century.

38. Initially, zionism had been a dream of Herzl, who had been deeply concerned at the plight of the Jews in Europe. Since the Middle Ages, European Jews had been shut up in ghettos as a result of religious intolerance and deprived of the right to practise any trade but that of money-changers—which had, as it happened, made them the world's bankers. They had always been mistreated and persecuted, and their position had only begun to improve with the French Revolution, when the privileges granted exclusively to the adherents of one religion had been abolished. In 1802 also the Germans had granted Jews the same rights as non-Jews. On the other hand, Jews in the Middle East had never been persecuted. Four Arab empires had showered honours upon Jews who were eminent scholars, and at Baghdad, during the reign of Haroun-al-Rashid, the Chief Rabbi was accompanied to his synagogue by the royal guard on the orders of the Caliph.

39. It was in Europe that, at the end of the nineteenth century, the Dreyfus Affair had resurrected the spectre of anti-Semitism. Herzl had then concluded that the only way to put an end to the sufferings of the Jews was to give them a homeland once again, and many Jews had joined the European political movement known as zionism. That movement, the product of a dream which should never have become a reality, had placed Jews and Palestinians in a tragic situation which could only worsen if Israel was determined to maintain it by force—which it had the power to do. This was not the first time in history that a movement based on an ideology had had disastrous consequences. Thus, the First World War had been conducted in the name of democracy and had been followed by a setback for democracy, and whereas the Second World War had been aimed at liberating peoples from want and fear, weapons of a horror never before known had been used to spread fear everywhere and the war had given rise to violence and terrorism, both overt and covert.

40. One wondered, when the representative of Israel spoke of the Jewish people, whether he meant to include the Jews of various countries and hoped to produce divided loyalty in them. There was something shameful in placing religion at the service of political and economic ends. Palestine had been usurped by Jews from Eastern Europe, and the reason the Arabs had fled Palestine was that they were being terrorized by such actions as the Deir Yassin massacre and by the Haganah and the Stern Group. Even after 400 years of being governed by the Turks, the Palestinians constituted a distinct entity, just as the Lebanese, the Syrians and the Iraqis did. Those who had fled Palestine and been absorbed by neighbouring countries nevertheless re-

mained attached to Palestine. The new generation wished even more than the previous one to recover its original homeland. The ferment which the Palestinians had stirred up affected the entire Arab world, since they indoctrinated their young people and even made their influence felt within Governments. Even certain Israeli Jews believed not only that the Oriental Jews were treated as second-class citizens but also that it was unjust that the Palestinians had been prevented from returning to their homes. It was the Eastern European Jews, of non-Semitic origin, who were the cause of the prevailing situation. No difference could be discerned between the movement they had created and colonialism, unless it was that the colonialists were leaving the lands they had colonized while the Zionists were seizing land which did not belong to them and were remaining there.

41. The policies of the great Powers were still based on the concept of equilibrium. The Middle East was therefore a chessboard where the great Powers played not with pieces but with the destinies of human beings. That was a dangerous game, since it could set off a third world war. As stocks of arms increased, so did the risk of still greater unrest and anarchy. Israel would gain nothing by turning itself into a fortress, for the Palestinians would intensify the effort to achieve their goals. If the Palestinians were not given the opportunity to return to their homes if they wished, there could be no solution to the problem.

42. There was no need for an Israeli flag. Palestinians and Jews could live under the same flag, and the Oriental Jews would probably get on better with the Palestinians, whose culture they shared, than with the Jews from Eastern Europe.

43. The Zionists constituted a foreign body in the Middle East where they had been settled in order to serve the interests of the great Powers at a time when some countries were trying to place Palestine under the authority of the United Nations Trusteeship Council until a just solution was worked out. The United States and the Soviet Union, which had both voted in favour of the partition of Palestine, were now at loggerheads in the Middle East, as they were in Viet-Nam, while the United Nations was turning out speeches and resolutions by the thousands. He wondered whether the United Nations was going to behave like a second League of Nations and continue to play the great Powers' game. At all events, the principles of self-determination proclaimed in the Charter had been invoked in 1949 to no avail. If speakers were content to make statements which spared the feelings of others, the future was gloomy. If, in the fortress it was building, Israel continued to be supplied with arms and the Arab countries around it developed and increased their military potential, an explosion was inevitable sooner or later. The leaders who gave diplomats their instructions should come to their senses, or they would bring the world crashing down on their heads.

*Mr. Carasales (Argentina), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

44. The CHAIRMAN requested the other speakers on the list for that meeting to agree to make their statements the following day in view of the lateness of the hour. He reminded the Committee that, at its previous meeting, it had decided to limit the time granted to representatives speaking in exercise of the right of reply. He accordingly urged representatives who wished to exercise that right to be brief.

45. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, referred to the arguments advanced at the previous meeting by the representative of Israel and said that it was always instructive to hear the latter speak of what had happened in the Arab countries before anyone had heard of it. Perhaps the case of the Algerian diplomat who had been arrested at Amsterdam had also been a machination of the famous Israeli secret service. Every time that Jewish spies had been arrested and sentenced in Arab countries, Israel and the Zionists had first denied the facts, saying that they had been innocent Jews who had been used as scapegoats, and had then made them national heroes. For example, the activities of the Zionist terrorists who had operated in Egypt in the 1950s, placing bombs in books in order to worsen relations between Egypt and the United States, had been unmasked following a scandal in 1960. In 1971 *The New York Times* had reported that Mrs. Golda Meir had attended the wedding of a girl who had belonged to that terrorist group in Egypt when she had been only 16 years old. Recently, an entire chapter of a book by Bar-Zohar, *The Spies in the Promised Land*,<sup>2</sup> had been devoted to Israeli spies at Baghdad. Finally, *The New York Times* had recently announced the publication of a book by Wolfgang Lotz, *The Champagne Spy*<sup>3</sup> which told the story of an Israeli spy who had operated in Egypt and had contributed to the 1967 war. It was likely that in several years' time works would be published on the Israeli spies who had been hanged at Baghdad in 1965.

46. The representative of Israel had spoken of a Jew assassinated at Baghdad and of others who had allegedly disappeared: those individuals might very well have been *agents provocateurs*, who had been sent to Iraq to terrorize the Jewish community there in order to force it to leave its country and emigrate to Israel and who had been recalled once their mission had been accomplished. Moreover, those acts of intimidation did not take place in the Arab world alone: according to the *Jewish Chronicle* of 10 November 1972, Judaism was in danger of disappearing in Europe if measures were not taken. Mrs. Meir had warned the Jews against the dangers of assimilation and mixed marriages. According to the Israeli leaders, Jews could not survive in a free society and were encouraged in every possible way to leave their countries for the ghetto that Israel was. Finally, the Israeli newspaper *Maariv* of 11 April 1972 had quoted the words of an Arab Jew residing in Israel who had said that it was the leaders who stirred up hatred between the Jews

and Arabs. The Jews had lived in peace with the Arabs until Zionism had appeared.

47. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the statements by the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization and by the representative of Saudi Arabia amply corrected the fundamental distortions that he had noted in the Israeli representative's statement concerning the true objectives of the armed struggle of the Palestinians and the so-called historical rights of the Jews to Palestine. He would not, therefore, exercise his right of reply.

48. Mr. DORON (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, noted that the representative of the Soviet Union had once again repeated his slanderous allegations concerning Israel; he pointed out, however, that the Soviet Government had not always had the same attitude. Speaking in the Security Council on 4 March 1949,<sup>4</sup> on the question of responsibility for the problem of the Arab refugees, the Soviet Union representative, Mr. Malik, had asked why the State of Israel should be blamed for the existence of the problem of the Arab refugees. As to the matter of aggression, an article which had appeared in *Pravda* on 13 May 1948 contradicted the USSR representative: it said that the operations carried out by the Arab States could only be defined as an act of aggression. Moreover, according to an editorial in the 9 June 1948 issue of the magazine *Novoe Vremya*, Soviet public opinion had categorically condemned the aggression by the Arab States against the State of Israel. Finally, on the same question, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Gromyko, had stated in the Security Council on 7 July 1948<sup>5</sup> that world public opinion had already condemned the Arab attacks against the Jewish State. All States were, of course, entitled to change their policies, but the policy which the Soviet Union had recently been following with regard to the Middle East was not helping the cause of peace.

49. The representative of Iraq seemed to specialize in making quotations out of context; if he looked at the recent press, he would find all the details on the affair of the messenger arrested at Amsterdam.

50. A statement by the Baath party of Syria published at Damascus in 1968 said that the present Iraqi régime owed its existence to the revolution of 17 June 1968, which had put a rightist group in power. That régime functioned through terror, imprisonment and torture. *The New York Times* of 19 July 1968 had reported that Mohammed Yacoub had been imprisoned for six hours because he had been a minister of the deposed Government. Finally, he recalled the murder of King Faisal in 1958 and the minister Nuri Said, whose body had been dragged through the streets of Baghdad, and, finally, the assassination of President Kassem in 1963.

51. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq), speaking on a point of order, asked whether it was the question of the

<sup>2</sup> Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1972.

<sup>3</sup> New York, St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1972.

<sup>4</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, No. 17*, 414th meeting.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, *Third Year, No. 93*, 331st meeting.

domestic policies of the Iraqi Government that was being debated. He wanted the Israeli representative to be reminded of the rules of procedure.

52. The CHAIRMAN recalled the title of the item under consideration.

53. Mr. DORON (Israel) concluded by asking whether the Iraqi Government would permit Iraqi Jews to leave Iraq if they wished.

54. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Israel had just made slanderous allegations, as was his delegation's custom. Zionist politicians, in Israel or elsewhere, had a pathological hatred of the Soviet Union, which firmly opposed their plan of aggression and expansion in the Middle East and which was in favour of a just political settlement based on respect for the rights of all peoples, including the Palestinians. Whatever manoeuvres the representative of Israel might resort to, the facts gave the lie to the Israeli Government, and the Zionist extremists were guilty of crimes against the Arab peoples and the Palestinians. It was because of Israel's policy of aggression and the racism of the Zionists, which was based on the idea of a "chosen people", that peace had been disturbed in the Middle East since the creation of the State of Israel. Israel, which refused to comply with the decisions of the United Nations, bore a heavy responsibility. It should understand that political adventurism and aggression met with only passing success and that there was an ever-increasing price to be paid.

55. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, pointed out that the use of underhand methods was part of the behaviour of all Israeli representatives to the United Nations. By making quotations that were truncated or out of context the representative of Israel was trying to divide the two brother countries of Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic. However, the Arab countries had never been more united against the Israeli aggressor.

56. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, pointed out to the Israeli representative that the Zionist representatives always forgot that the Israeli Government had included a notorious terrorist in the person of Mr. Menachem Begin, who had directed the Deir Yassin massacre, which Mr. Jacques de Régnier, chief representative of the International Red Cross, had described in a book he had written.

57. As to the quotations he had cited, he pointed out that, contrary to the Israeli representative, he had either read out press articles of Israeli origin or had

quoted works which, far from being trashy novels, were on the contrary in one case a book by a historian and in the other the autobiography of an intelligence agent.

58. As to the Iraqi Jews, the representative of Israel must be aware that they were free to leave Iraq, since the United States press had announced that fact in December 1971. However, the fact that Iraqi Jews chose to remain in Iraq, when they were entitled to leave, was an attitude that the Israeli Zionists could not tolerate. It was therefore not surprising that the Zionists resorted to the use of *agents provocateurs* to incite Iraqi Jews to leave Iraq.

59. He read out a letter in which anti-Zionist American Jews requested the Iraqi delegation to thank the Government of Iraq for having decided to consider the Jewish holy days as national holidays.

60. Mr. DORON (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, pointed out to the representative of the Soviet Union that it was interesting to learn that quotations from statements by a USSR representative or Minister for Foreign Affairs constituted slander.

61. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that attempts to use quotations out of context, interpret them falsely, and distort facts were a normal form of Israeli propaganda. The Zionists had always been the enemies of the Soviet Union, as they were the enemies of African nationalist movements. The Soviet Union's policy was well known. It consisted in support for the United Nations resolutions which condemned the policies of Israel in the Middle East.

62. The CHAIRMAN said that there was a proposal by the representative of Pakistan that the statement by Mr. Hassan of the Palestine Liberation Organization be reproduced *in extenso*. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to that proposal.

*It was so decided.*<sup>6</sup>

63. He urged the members of the Committee to be punctual and drew their attention to the fact that the General Assembly would consider agenda item 38 in plenary during its meeting that afternoon.

*The meeting rose at 1.55 p.m.*

<sup>6</sup> The full text of the statement made by the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization was subsequently circulated in document A/SPC/PV.837.