

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 681st  
MEETING**



Wednesday, 3 December 1969,  
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 36:	
United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East ( <i>continued</i> )	
(a) Report of the Commissioner-General;	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General . . . . .	217

Chairman: Mr. Eugeniusz KULAGA (Poland).

**AGENDA ITEM 36**

**United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine  
Refugees in the Near East (*continued*) (A/7577, A/7614,  
A/7665, A/SPC/133, A/SPC/134, A/SPC/L.175):**

- (a) Report of the Commissioner-General;  
(b) Report of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. SHARAPOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that on three occasions in the last twenty years Israel had caused the suffering of thousands of innocent persons. The hostilities of 1948 and 1949 had resulted from the fact that Israel had expelled one and a half million Palestinians from their homeland. In 1956, Israel had invaded Egyptian soil, but had been compelled to withdraw. Since 1967, there had been thousands of new refugees as a result of Israel aggression. Over the past few years, most of the work of the Security Council had been concerned with the problem of the Near East because of Israel's aggressive policy. The latest report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA (A/7614) provided ample information on the activities carried out on behalf of the most recent victims of Israel aggression. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considered that UNRWA was doing very useful work, but felt it was not possible to resolve the refugee problem if, as a result of Israel's policy, the number of new refugees and homeless persons was increasing day by day. Furthermore, Israel authorities had arrested and tried UNRWA staff members. Israel had perpetrated barbarous attacks against peaceful villages. Every day there was new evidence that Israel's ruling circles were continuing their policy of sabotage. Massive military installations had been built up in the occupied territories.

2. Israel was holding the territories it had occupied in 1967 in violation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which emphasized the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war. Under orders from General Dayan, Israel was practising the so-called doctrine of "neighbourhood responsibility", which consisted of collective punishment against all those who sympathized with the just aspirations of the Palestinian people.

3. Such conduct was not conducive to a speedy solution of the problem in the Near East. Why had Israel been violating the principles of the United Nations Charter for twenty years? Was it likely that the ruling circles of Israel, on their own, would have been able to set up a well-equipped army and carry out their imperialistic plans? Such a policy could be implemented only with the support and the assistance provided by the Western monopolies and the Governments that were carrying out their will.

4. The subsoil of the Near East and North Africa had 76 per cent of the prospected reserves of oil in the world and one third of the known reserves of natural gas. The operations carried out by American oil companies in the area were five times larger than their operations in the United States. Over the past twenty years, American monopolies had invested \$1,500 million in those operations, but had obtained a profit of \$12,000 million on that investment. When compared to those figures, the assistance provided by the United States to UNRWA was a drop in the ocean. The desire of the American oil monopolies to retain their control in the Near East was one of the basic causes of the tension in the area.

5. The imperialist Powers were striving to prevent the growth of the liberation movements of the Arab countries. To that end, they were using the Zionist rulers, who had their own plans of aggression. The roots of the problem were to be found in social and class considerations, as the profit-seeking countries wished to prevent the social transformation of the Arab States.

6. The Government of Israel was sabotaging all United Nations decisions aimed at solving the refugee problem and at reaching a political solution. The régime in the occupied territories resembled that of Hitler. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, like the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, understood the struggle being carried out by the Arab States for their lawful rights. The problem of the Palestine refugees and victims could only be resolved within the framework of the entire Near East crisis.

7. On 17 June 1969, a conference of Soviet Communist and Labour Parties had taken place in Moscow. At that conference, the Parties had expressed their solidarity with the struggle of the Arab people against the forces of imperialism and had stated that the withdrawal of Israel troops from the occupied territories, in compliance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967), was an essential condition to a peaceful settlement of the Near East problem.

8. In a statement published on 27 November 1969 the parties, people and States of Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, the Soviet Union and

Czechoslovakia had said that the present serious situation in the Near East called for the adoption of urgent measures, that the peoples of the world must compel Israel to remove its troops from occupied territories and that the lawful interests of the people of Palestine must be protected against imperialism.

9. The Socialist parties, peoples and States had further expressed their firm resolve to do everything possible to foil the plans of the aggressors and said that they would continue to assist the Arab countries. They had appealed to all peace-loving nations to provide effective assistance to the Arab struggle for freedom, independence and justice.

10. The United Nations must adopt all effective measures to ensure that Israel would comply with the resolutions on the Middle East and Palestine.

11. Mr. ALLIMADI (Uganda) said that the report of the Commissioner-General (A/7614) reflected a very sad state of affairs and it was no wonder that the question engendered heated discussions.

12. The policy of his Government towards the refugees in the Middle East was the same policy it had applied to all refugees without distinction. All refugees should have a worthy life as human beings. However, his Government viewed the refugees in the Middle East with particular compassion. It was distressing to realize that those refugees had been living in wretched conditions for the past twenty years and that a whole generation of people had been born in the cold, brought up in the cold, and in some cases, died in the cold.

13. His delegation was not against UNRWA; however, there was a danger implicit in resolutions which contemplated its indefinite continuance. Such resolutions implied that the Committee and the United Nations did not foresee that the people concerned would ever cease to be refugees. Sooner or later, the refugees would become disillusioned with UNRWA. They would begin to suspect that its main task was to provide some palliative in order to keep them at least partly contented, thus diverting attention from the main reasons for their condition. His delegation did not wish to suggest that that was the objective of UNRWA. However, should such a misunderstanding arise, it would not be surprising.

14. Most people who suffered as a result of war were usually innocent. So it was with the refugees in the Middle East. During the debate there had been numerous statements regarding the alleged collective punishment practised by Israel against the Arabs in occupied territories. Those acts, if true, did not facilitate UNRWA's task and his delegation wished to appeal to Israel to discontinue that policy.

15. His delegation believed that the refugee problem was part of a wider problem. All parties in the dispute must accept Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. Every delay would simply add to the plight of the refugees and in the end everybody in the area would be turned into a potential refugee. The concern of the people of Uganda was not simply how to apply small doses of international charity which might keep the lid on an explosive charge, but rather how to redress injustice.

16. Mr. NOAMAN (Southern Yemen) said that it was an established and unchallengeable fact that there were human beings in the world who were called Palestinians. They possessed all the qualifications of a State and a people. As a result of plotting, intrigues and collaboration for several decades amongst alien racists—Zionists—colonialists and imperialists, the State of Palestine had been temporarily liquidated. The people of Palestine had never been consulted on that state of affairs and had never accepted it. They were still in existence, and still yearned to return to their homes and homeland.

17. As a result of the forcible liquidation of the State of Palestine, the so-called "State of Israel", composed of foreign and alien peoples who claimed to adhere to the Judaic faith and who called themselves Zionists, had been formed in its place. The only relation the Zionists had ever had with Palestine was their ambition to colonize it. It should be clear that the so-called modern State of Israel was not a continuation of the biblical Israel that had existed several thousand years ago. Today's "Israel" had been created twenty-one years ago as a result of an unprecedented tragedy that had caused the dispersal and displacement of about 2 million Palestinians.

18. Palestinians were often erroneously thought of as merely refugees whose only problem was food and shelter. In fact, they were a people who had been immorally, illegally and unjustly deprived of their homeland and nation-State. His delegation appreciated the endeavours of UNRWA and its Commissioner-General to improve the status of the refugees, who survived on bare subsistence. However, the proper manner to solve the refugee question was to restore the nation-State of Palestine and to recognize Palestinian nationalism.

19. The terms "Palestinian" and "Arabs" were often confused. If the problem was to be understood in its true framework, a distinction must be made between them: all Palestinians were Arabs, but not all Arabs were Palestinians. The real question before the Committee concerned Palestinians and their right to a nation-State. The fact they were also Arabs was immaterial. All peace-loving representatives should limit themselves to the use of the term "Palestine" and/or "Palestinians".

20. The Middle East problem was distinct from, though related to, the Palestinian problem, which was the basic one. The Middle East problem had arisen as a result of the 1967 aggression by Israel against the neighbouring Arab States and its subsequent occupation of territories belonging to them. That particular problem could subside when the Israel troops withdrew from the occupied Arab territories. Security Council resolution 242 (1967) addressed itself to the Middle East problem and any solution within the framework of that text would apply only to the parties concerned. Such a solution should not and could not touch upon the fundamental political, social and human rights of the Palestinian people, as they had neither been consulted nor been a party to it. No one could speak in the name of the Palestinians.

21. Since 1965, the Palestinian National Liberation Front had been gaining momentum. That development was natural to all Afro-Asian peoples who had resisted foreign

domination. It would be wise to pay due attention to the views and demands of the Palestine National Liberation Front, as embodied in the resolutions of the National Palestinian Congress held in January 1968. Those resolutions, the most important articles of which he quoted, constituted a kind of "Palestinian manifesto". They stated clearly the basic facts of the Palestine situation and the basic rights of the Palestine people. They expressed the consensus of all Palestinians. His delegation strongly recommended them to all peoples, who should study them seriously and support them. The Government of Southern Yemen would continue to support the armed struggle for the liberation of Palestine from Zionist occupation and the achievement of its right of self-determination.

22. Mrs. GAVRILOVA (Bulgaria) observed that the Commissioner-General's report (A/7614) and the Committee's discussion had again shown that the Palestine refugee problem could not be solved by international charity alone. There could be no establishment of peaceful relations in the Middle East until the rights of the refugees had been restored to them. Israel was clearly responsible for the deteriorating situation. Its occupation forces had attempted not only to reduce the refugees to a state of starvation but also to hamper the Agency's work and interfere with its staff, in violation of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations. Refugee camps under Israel control had been turned into concentration camps in which searches, arrests and torture were rife. Israel's attempts to distort the facts of history in school textbooks in the occupied territories in flagrant violation of the Agency's Statutes could have dire consequences for the future of the Palestine people. UNESCO and other competent agencies should give urgent attention to that matter.

23. Her Government was providing all possible direct assistance to the Palestine refugees, and appreciated the value of the Agency's work, which should not, however, be considered as the ultimate solution to the problem. The representatives of some Western countries had spoken as if the refugees were the victims of some natural disaster rather than of a carefully premeditated aggression. They had chosen to ignore Israel's repudiation of the numerous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions calling for the immediate repatriation of the refugees and the restoration of their property and rights. If those representatives and their Governments were genuinely interested in the sorry plight of the refugees, they should exert their influence on Israel to ensure its compliance with those resolutions. Their contributions to the Agency were of little value as long as they continued to supply Israel with aircraft for bombing Arab countries. Such a policy only added to the numbers of new refugees. In helping Israel to carry out its expansionist policies and to continue its unlawful occupation of Palestine, the United States and certain other Western Powers bore equal responsibility with that country for the refugee problem.

24. Israel militarism was part of an over-all effort by the imperialists to retain their influence in the Middle East and their control of the resources of the area. During a recent visit of five United States Governors to Tel Aviv, the Governor of Florida had stated that Israel was the only bridgehead of the United States in the Middle East. The

Governor of Ohio had added that, in their report to the regular Governors' Conference in December 1969, the five visiting Governors would call for the adoption of a resolution designed to strengthen Israel's policy. Such action was thwarting all the sincere attempts of the international community to end the sufferings of the Palestine refugees.

25. The Israel representative's attempts to depict his country's aggressive policies as a defence of national interests were typical of the arguments used by nazi, fascist and militarist régimes. Hitler himself had begun his aggression against the Soviet Union on the same pretext, and the United States was also pleading defence of national interests to justify its war against the Viet-Nameese people. Israel was now using the same fallacious arguments in an attempt to justify its aggression in June 1967, its continued bombing of the civilian population, its acts of collective punishment and other repressive measures. Far from winning the support of world public opinion, such tactics had served only to isolate Israel ruling circles internationally, and were likely eventually to isolate them even from right-thinking people in Israel itself. The Israel Government vainly tried to represent as anti-Semitism the mounting international indignation against its aggressive policies. In placing Israel among the most militant and openly racist States in the world, its rulers had jeopardized the aspirations of its own citizens, many of whom had themselves been victims of the racist policies of Hitler. Those rulers had focused upon Israelis the hatred of all peace-loving nations, but that hatred had nothing to do with anti-Semitism.

26. Her country sympathized with the Palestinian people's struggle for national liberation and supported the Arab States in their defence of national independence and territorial integrity. It would continue to support all those who were striving for the restoration of peace and neighbourly relations among States. If the Israel Government genuinely desired a peaceful solution it should comply with Security Council resolution 242 (1967). Its attempts to impose its will on the people of the area were doomed to failure, and compliance with that resolution was the only way open to it.

27. Mr. SYKES (United Republic of Tanzania), after paying a tribute to the work of the Commissioner-General and his staff, said that all representatives should protest at the fate of the refugees and join in appeals to help them. The community of nations, on which they had set their hopes, had shown but small concern for their plight. Their uncertainty about the future had deepened, and since 1967 hope had given way to despair. Much could nevertheless still be done to lessen their misery. The Committee and its individual members should appeal to the main parties concerned to refrain from unnecessary actions which would worsen the conditions of the refugees.

28. There was evidence to show that Israel had not carried out its responsibilities in accordance with the moral and humane principles customarily governing the conduct of an occupying Power towards civilian populations in times of armed conflict and political tension. The inhabitants whose safety, welfare and security Israel had been called upon to uphold by Security Council resolution 237 (1967) included

the refugees in Gaza and on the West Bank, yet the Commissioner-General's report (A/7614) had shown that the measures which Israel had taken had had a detrimental effect on the morale of those refugees. There had been numerous reports of the demolition of houses in the occupied territories, which had resulted in an increase in the refugee population, and many representatives had referred to measures of deportation, random imprisonment, torture, curfews and other restrictions and intimidations resulting in unprecedented suffering. Such reports had not emanated only from Arab countries. *The New York Times* and *The Times* of London, which could hardly be described as pro-Arab, had published articles which read like a bitter indictment of Israel. An article in *The New York Times* of 30 November 1969, for example, revealed a deep moral conflict in Israel itself regarding that country's behaviour in the occupied territories, particularly concerning the measures of collective punishment imposed by its military authorities, which the Israel Minister for Foreign Affairs himself had condemned.

29. He had made those remarks not because his delegation had any doubt about Israel's legitimate right to exist as a State but because the measures which its Government had been carrying out against the population in the occupied areas deserved condemnation. It was wrong that Israel should occupy Arab territory and worse that it should persecute Arab populations indiscriminately when they questioned the moral and legal basis on which it continued to occupy their lands. Israel was a foreign Power which they felt justified in fighting, and as long as it refused to withdraw the struggle would go on, with more collective punishment, destruction of homes, deportations, imprisonments and a worsening of the refugee problem.

30. In such circumstances, it was urgent for the United Nations and the entire world community to heed the Commissioner-General's appeal and make it possible for UNRWA to carry on its important task. His delegation whole-heartedly endorsed the Arab Government's strong opposition to any reduction in UNRWA's services (see A/7614, para. 24), since those services could not be reduced without causing a human tragedy. The United Republic of Tanzania, which had been host to thousands of refugees, believed that it was right to help a refugee regardless of political views or ideology. It therefore hoped that UNRWA would continue to discharge its responsibilities with the same devotion and tireless dedication as it had displayed hitherto.

31. Mr. AMEER (Ceylon) said that the Palestine problem could not be reduced to a question of basic rations. Responsible discussion of the agenda item called for close study of paragraphs 20 to 37 of the Commissioner-General's report (A/7614). As a new decade approached, the mere extension of UNRWA's mandate was an insufficient exercise for the United Nations. It must stand by the decisions which, as the Secretary-General had said, had been taken in principle. The Ceylonese delegation shared the Commissioner-General's apprehension concerning the humanitarian consequences of discontinuing or curtailing the Agency's services and the repercussions of such action on stability in the area. Member States' compassion for the refugees and displaced persons must be translated into real terms. Ceylon would continue to pledge its support for the Agency in accordance with its means.

32. Discussion of means to alleviate the plight of the refugees without considering measures to reach a fundamental solution reflected upon the United Nations as a whole. As the Secretary-General had said in his statement before the Committee at the preceding session (612th meeting) the plight of many refugees and displaced persons could best be relieved immediately by their return to their homes and to the camps which they had formerly occupied. Despite efforts to secure that return, the numbers who had done so had been relatively small. The continuing occupation of the area concerned by Israel forces was a fundamental link between the situation before and after June 1967 and between the plights of the refugees and UNRWA and the basic Palestinian problem.

33. Twenty-one years after General Assembly resolution 194 (III), in paragraph 11, had called for repatriation or compensation for the refugees, the latter were being treated as ciphers in a bigger game. They were not a mere haphazard collection of individuals, but the greater part of a society that had been displaced, with a common land, language and heritage. The shock of exile had created a more-than-ever determined Palestine Arab nation, which had not melted away or been absorbed into the surrounding Arab States. Israel's obligation to allow the refugees repatriation or compensation had no moral connexion with a peace settlement. Nor was there any moral connexion between Israel's access to the sea and the exile of thousands of Arabs, nor between Israel's *de facto* existence and desire for security, on the one hand, and the refugee camps and occupation of Arab territory on the other.

34. Israel continued to defy not only General Assembly resolution 194 (III) but also Security Council resolution 237 (1967) calling upon Israel to facilitate the return of the so-called "new refugees". The Israel representative's contention that they had left the area of their own free will was pure sophistry, the intention of which was clear. Israel wanted the land without its inhabitants. That aim had led to another new development: the repressive measures and collective punishment in Israel-occupied areas. The reality was very different from the dream of a Zionist outpost of European civilization opposed to the barbarism of Asia. There was cynicism in Israel's attempt to avoid the responsibility of her acts as an occupying Power and to oppose the unambiguous provisions of General Assembly resolution 2443 (XXIII). The Ceylon delegation rejected such attempts and the cynicism which mocked the clear intent of the General Assembly and the Security Council. It condemned all such acts, which were incompatible with the Charter.

35. There was cause for concern in the apparent powerlessness of the United Nations to alleviate the plight of the Palestine refugees, whom the United Kingdom representative had termed "the victims of an intolerable injustice". The historical background to the partition of Palestine was well known. The United Nations had resolved to do what the United Kingdom had considered impossible, to divide Palestine into an Arab State, a Jewish State and an internationalized Jerusalem. Of those, only the Jewish State now existed.

36. The United Nations must take effective measures to impose its will in a situation for which it bore a heavy

responsibility. The Arab people had a right to their homeland and self-determination and must be supported in their fight for liberation from all forms of colonialism and racism. His delegation fully supported those rights. Israel must accept first, that the indigenous population of Palestine were human beings, second, that they had a freedom of choice and third, that Israel's fate was inexorably linked with theirs.

37. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that the so-called Palestine manifesto supported by the Arab Governments left no doubt as to those Governments' designs in the Middle East and the existence of an organized campaign mercilessly to destroy the State of Israel and explained why that country had to defend itself and the population of the areas under its control by taking security measures.

38. The repeated use of the epithet "nazi" to describe the Jewish people was an insult to the sacred memory of the six million Jews who had been murdered by the Hitler régime.

39. The Byelorussian representative, true to the well-known spirit of Soviet support of the Arabs in defiance of the Charter, had made an unbridled attack on the Israel Government. But what credence could be given to the representative of a Government which now accused Israel of aggression in 1948 and held it responsible for the Arab refugee problem, whereas at the time the self-same Government had put on record that it was the Arab States which were guilty of aggression. On 21 May 1948 at the 299th meeting of the Security Council, the Soviet Minister for Foreign Affairs, had expressed surprise that some of the Arab States had sent their troops into Palestine and carried out military operations aimed at suppressing the national liberation movement in Palestine. On 27 May 1948 at the 306th meeting of the Security Council, the Ukrainian representative had referred to an armed struggle taking place in Palestine as a result of the unlawful invasion of that territory by a number of States. On 4 March 1949 at the 414th meeting of the Council, Mr. Malik had also asked why the State of Israel should be blamed for the Arab refugee problem and had said that the Security Council should take steps to counter the forces of aggression, which were furthering the interests of a group of United Kingdom and United States monopolies exploiting oil wells in the Middle East. Those were the same monopolies which had been referred to by the Byelorussian representative in another context. That was characteristic of the present Soviet attitude to the Middle East question, which was motivated by blind hostility towards Israel, disregard of truth and encouragement of Arab aggression.

40. The Byelorussian representative had quoted a recent statement published by the Tass agency on 27 November 1969 in the name of a number of Soviet bloc Governments. In reply, the spokesman of the Israel Minister for Foreign Affairs had issued a statement on 30 November 1969, saying that the intention of the content and timing of the Soviet statement was to help Nasser to rally the Arab States around his aggressive plans, outlined in his recent speech. The Middle East crisis had been fanned by the Soviet policy of unreserved support for the designs of the Arab leaders, ostensibly to thwart "imperialist plots" but in reality to broaden and consolidate Soviet intervention in the Mediter-

anean, which was itself designed to prevent peace and increase tension. The arguments in the Tass statement were fraudulent, like the Soviet statements which had played a decisive role in setting off the war of June 1967. Despite its reiterated desire for a peaceful solution, the Soviet Government had never announced that the Arab States and Israel must establish a true peace between them. The policies and deeds of the Soviet Government in the Middle East had countered these ends and were evident of its interest in the continuation of the crisis. A Government whose policy was expressed in such a document could not be an unbiased party, in the consultations on the establishment of peace in the Middle East which affected the most vital interests of the State of Israel.

41. Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that he would be pleased to answer the rhetorical questions asked by the Bulgarian representative when the name of her country appeared in the annual list of contributions to UNRWA.

42. Mr. SHARAPOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that in defence of his very difficult position, the Israel representative tended to use his right of reply to rearrange history and correct other speakers. It was, however, impossible to distort truth, which was reflected in United Nations reports and resolutions.

43. The answer to his remarks about Mr. Gromyko's statement was contained in a statement by the representative of the Soviet Union made at the 677th meeting. At the fifth special emergency session of the General Assembly in 1967 (1526th plenary meeting), Mr. Kosygin had said that respect for the right of all peoples, large and small, to establish their own independence as a national State was a basic principle of Soviet policy. That principle had determined his Government's vote when the United Nations had divided Palestine into two independent States and had led the Soviet Union to establish diplomatic relations with the new State of Israel.

44. For the same reasons, his Government condemned the attitude of any State which occupied foreign territory and enslaved its population. The ruling circles in Israel had adopted an aggressive and expansionist policy towards the neighbouring Arab States. Already in 1948 and 1949, Israel had taken by force substantial portions of Arab territory, forcing over a million people to leave their homeland. The crucial problem of the Palestine refugees still remained unsolved and Israel "hawks" had said that Israel's only possibility of development was to settle territorial problems from a strong base and to reduce the Arabs to total obedience. The statement by Mrs. Golda Meir on 21 October 1969 that Israel should not rely on the United Nations was paradoxical, coming from the Prime Minister of a State which had been created by that Organization. Above the entrance to the Israel Parliament was a significant inscription stating that the Jewish motherland stretched from the Nile to the Euphrates.

45. Mr. NOAMAN (Southern Yemen), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that, despite the Israel Prime Minister's denial of the existence of the Palestine people, the Israel representative must realize that it was impossible

to deny facts, which would triumph in the end. He must realize that the Palestine national State, Palestine nationalism and a Palestine national liberation movement did in fact exist. He deliberately tried to confuse two distinct problems, the Palestine problem and the Middle East problem.

46. In his own statement at the present meeting, he had explained some of the salient features of the Palestine problem, with particular reference to points which had been distorted by the Israel representative, although he had not mentioned him expressly. In his statement, the Israel representative referred indiscriminately to Palestinians, refugees, Arab refugees and Arabs. The first three were the same people.

47. He challenged the Israel representative to refute any of the facts to which he had referred. The Palestine manifesto which he had mentioned expressed the inalienable rights of the Palestine people to self-determination.

48. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that Mr. Tekoah had added a new technique to those he had used so far in his statements—diversion from the main subject, outright distortion of facts, abuse of other speakers and the production of quotations detrimental to any State which might criticize Israel. Mr. Tekoah now accused any representative who compared Israel racism and brutality with nazi practices of insulting the memory of the six million Jews massacred by Hitler. The people who were insulting that memory were in fact those who had resurrected the methods used by Hitler.

49. Mr. TEKOA (Israel), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, expressed surprise at that remark, coming from

the representative of one of the countries which had supported Hitler against the allies and still distributed *Mein Kampf* to its soldiers. The Kuwait Government was still inspired by the former Mufti of Jerusalem, who had spent all the war years in Berlin as an adviser to Himmler on the extermination of the Jews, and who was still wanted as a war criminal by certain Western countries. That Government still spoke of the destruction of the Jewish people and accused them of racism and nazism.

50. As a newcomer to the Committee, he was often surprised at the misquotations of Israel sources contained in his colleagues' statements. The most fantastic was that of the inscription above the entrance to the Knesset. Surely the Byelorussian representative did not have to stoop so low as to quote words which were printed in "hate propaganda" distributed on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. He could not have forgotten the words of his country's representative in 1948 or the words the Soviet diplomats must have seen only a few years before when that country was still represented in Israel.

51. Mr. SHARAPOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, noted that the Israel representative was still trying to correct statements and rearrange facts. He wished to confirm that, in the face of the aggressive, imperialistic policy practised by Israel, his country stood solidly behind the Arab peoples in their call for full implementation of the Security Council resolutions, which was an essential condition of peace in the Middle East.

*The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.*