

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 792nd
MEETING**

Wednesday, 1 December 1971,
at 3.25 p.m.



NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Cornelius C. CREMIN (Ireland).

AGENDA ITEMS 38 AND 12

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (*continued*) (A/8366, A/8383 and Add.1, A/8403, A/8413, A/8432, A/8476, A/8526, A/SPC/147, A/SPC/148, A/SPC/L.225/Rev.1 and Corr.1, A/SPC/L.226, A/SPC/L.229, A/SPC/L.230, A/SPC/L.231, A/SPC/L.232):

- (a) Report of the Commissioner-General (A/8413);
- (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/8476);
- (c) Report of the Secretary-General (A/8366);
- (d) Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter XVIII (section D)) (A/8403)

1. Mr. DHALEE (People's Democratic Republic of Yemen) said that the problem of the people of Palestine was in essence a political one. Their tragic plight was caused by wilful designs of the Zionist movement, supported in particular by the United Kingdom and the United States of America. The partitioning of Palestine, coupled with atrocities and terror, had created Israel and uprooted the indigenous people of Palestine. That people had been forcibly deprived of its inalienable right to self-determination and independence. Despite world public opinion and the numerous resolutions adopted by the United Nations, Israel had pursued its policies aiming at the complete subjugation of the people of Palestine and the annexation of new Arab territories.

2. The expulsion of the Arabs of Palestine from their homes and lands, irrespective of its repercussions on them, whenever room was needed to accommodate new Jewish settlers had become a routine. Israel and the Zionist movement persuaded Jews of different nationalities from all over the world to emigrate to Palestine and promised them a home, land and a job, even if that led to the displacement of an Arab, which was always the case. The recent measures adopted by Israel in the Gaza Strip clearly demonstrated the extent of Israel's lack of respect for human rights.

3. The Balfour Declaration of 1917 had marked the beginning of the United Kingdom's policy of granting an integral part of Arab land to the Zionists. The British Mandate had been used to pave the way for Jewish supremacy and the weakening of the people of Palestine. The United Kingdom had not left Palestine until the State of Israel had been established. The United States of America had then undertaken to ensure the growth of that State, under its protection. It had helped Israel financially,

economically and militarily. Only a week earlier, the United States Government had decided to grant Israel \$500 million worth of assistance.

4. If the aid given by those great Western Powers to the people of Palestine was examined from another angle, it would be noted that they had worked to deprive that people of its rights and had collaborated with the Zionists in impeding its development into a free and independent nation. After being driven from their lands by terror, the people of Palestine had been reduced to refugees living in camps on charity. The United Kingdom and the United States had done nothing but pay lip service to the refugees, while continuing to support the usurpers. The establishment of UNRWA 20 years earlier was intended as an emergency measure, but it had now become a permanent arrangement. A million and a half Palestinians were now living on charity. The deliberations of the Committee seemed to be directed towards the continuation of that miserable condition of the people of Palestine rather than towards finding a solution which would ensure their national rights. The Agency's deficit of \$5 million could easily be met by those Western countries that had helped in the creation of Israel and thus in the creation of the hardships of the Palestinians. The United States of America alone could cover the deficit if it gave the Agency only 1 per cent of the amount it had decided to grant Israel.

5. The people of Palestine wanted to live freely and independently in a democratic State in which all the indigenous people of Palestine, whether Christian, Moslem or Jewish, could live together in peace. If the Jews really wanted peace, they should accept that solution advocated by all Palestinian organizations. If Israel refused to accept that just and lasting solution, the people of Palestine would have no alternative but to continue their struggle. That armed struggle formed part of the struggle of all the world's peoples against imperialism, colonialism, racism and zionism. General Assembly resolution 2672 C (XXV) recognized the right of the people of Palestine to self-determination. The Zionists were obstructing the implementation of that resolution and intended to deny the people of Palestine all their inalienable rights.

6. The Government and people of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen had always supported the people of Palestine in their just struggle and would continue to do so until they attained their goals.

7. Mr. SYKES (United Republic of Tanzania) congratulated Mr. Laurence Michelmore on the remarkable way he had carried out the functions of Commissioner-General of the Agency for seven years. The Tanzanian delegation was pleased to welcome Sir John Rennie, the new Commissioner-General, and congratulated him on the compre-

hensive report he had presented to the Committee. The sufferings of the Palestinians and the violation of their rights was one of the greatest tragedies in history. The complexity of that drama must not be underestimated. His delegation was fully conscious of the seriousness of the problem, and its humanitarian, financial and political aspects. However, whatever the amount of money put at the disposal of the Agency and whatever measures were adopted, they could only constitute a short-term solution. Serious attempts must be made to find a just solution to prevent UNRWA from becoming a permanent institution. Nothing short of the return of the Palestine refugees to their homeland could solve that tragic problem. After nearly a quarter of a century of deliberation nothing had yet been achieved.

8. The representatives of the Palestinians had stated emphatically that only the Palestinians had the right to be the spokesmen of their people and that no one else could make settlements on their behalf. That legitimate demand of the Palestinians must be respected. So long as their legitimate rights were not fully recognized and restored, the Committee would be discussing the problem of the refugees for many years to come.

9. Mrs. GAVRILOVA (Bulgaria) considered the situation of the Palestine refugees to be primarily a political question, although it also had humanitarian and financial aspects, and therefore that a just and lasting solution of the whole Middle East question must be found, i.e. Security Council resolution 242 (1967), of 22 November 1967, must be strictly implemented by all the parties concerned.

10. Another year had elapsed without any improvement in the conditions of life of the Palestinian refugees, who had been driven from their homeland by the Israeli aggressors. It was regrettable that the United Nations and the international community were concentrating on relief work of a charitable nature, instead of looking for political means of solving the problem in order to permit the repatriation of the displaced Palestinians to their homeland and payment of full compensation to them for all their material and moral losses.

11. There had been more than 120 General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on the Palestine refugee problem. If in the general solution of the Middle East problem too many factors and parties were involved, in that of the Palestine refugee problem there was only one possible objective, namely, the full restoration of all the rights of which the Palestinian people had been deprived, and the will of only one party was involved, that of the Israeli Government.

12. There was of course no question of converting the Palestinians and their future generations into foster-children of the United Nations and the world community, living on charity and forgetting their origin, history and ancient culture. In any case, the Palestine refugees could not count indefinitely on the financial and other assistance supplied by the United Nations through UNRWA, and the tension created by that situation was a threat to world peace and was detrimental to the authority of the United Nations.

13. The Israeli representative had spoken about sterile debates on the issue but for that only one delegation—the

representatives of the Zionist authorities—and their Government's expansionist policy were responsible. There was no "anti-Israeli coalition" in the United Nations, as the Israeli representative claimed, even if the whole world community was concerned at the fate of the Palestine refugees.

14. The Bulgarian delegation was not deceived by Israel's alleged concern for the refugees' well-being. It need only think of the conditions imposed by that country on the Palestinian population: martial law, arbitrary intrusion into the refugee camps, arrest and torture of the prisoners in those camps.

15. Her delegation wished to express its solidarity with the Palestine refugees and their national liberation movement and assure them that the assistance which her country had so far been providing in the form of tinned food, flour, medical supplies and other goods would be continued. An International Trade Union Conference of Solidarity with the Peoples and Workers of Palestine had been held in September 1971, attended by 70 delegations representing international, regional and national trade unions. During that Conference, the participants had appealed to workers to support the just struggle of the Arab people of Palestine to recover their rights, condemn Israel's aggressive policy against the Arab countries and render material assistance to the Palestinians.

16. In a letter to the Secretary-General dated 13 September 1971, that Conference had stated that the millions of working people it represented were interested in the United Nations position with regard to a people that had been deprived of its inalienable rights because another country made a mockery of the United Nations resolutions and rejected its decisions. The Conference had expressed the hope that the United Nations would adopt stiff measures to halt the aggression. The President of the Bulgarian State Council, Mr. Todor Zhivkov, had said at the end of his message to the Conference that the People's Republic of Bulgaria would continue to support the struggle of the Arab peoples and their efforts for a peaceful settlement of the crisis in the Middle East on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

17. Mr. TREKI (Libyan Arab Republic) recalled that the United Nations had assumed a heavy responsibility towards the Palestinian people by recognizing the racist aggressor State of Israel, to the detriment of a population driven from its territory and deprived of its freedom by force. The Palestine refugee question involved the destiny of an entire people struggling against Zionist colonialism to regain freedom and dignity. There was a people fighting for its right to self-determination, recognized in the Charter of the United Nations. The illegal occupation of Palestine by the Zionists constituted a denial of fundamental human rights.

18. Beginning in 1917 with the Balfour Declaration, the massive emigration of Jews to Palestine had been encouraged by the British imperialists. The United Kingdom had then decided to terminate the Mandate for Palestine and hand its territory over to the Zionist settlers. The French writer Maxime Rodinson had written that the introduction into Palestine, inhabited by Arabs, of a new population of European origin had been the result of a European ideological movement. The Zionist movement fell

within the framework of European expansionism, and a number of Zionists had themselves recognized that their movement was nothing else than another form of colonialism. Sir Winston Churchill had written that if the world had the opportunity to behold the birth of a Jewish state, it would witness an event which was absolutely in keeping with the real interests of the Empire. The human tragedy now in question was simply the result of a determined expansionist plan carried out by the colonialists and the Zionists. The Palestine people now found themselves under the domination of one of the most inhuman racist régimes that history had ever known. Since the first days of its existence, Israel had been committing even more terrible atrocities than those committed earlier by the Zionist terrorist gangs. The State of Israel was pursuing that policy in occupied Palestine and in the Arab territories occupied following the aggression of 1967. In the Gaza Strip, the racist State of Israel had applied a brutal military policy which had resulted in the forcible displacement of approximately 15,000 Palestine refugees and in the destruction of their homes.

19. The State of Israel could not pursue that policy of aggression and contempt for United Nations resolutions without the support of the United States of America, which unstintingly provided it with military and financial aid. The alliance between the United States and Zionism against the Arab people of Palestine and all other Arab peoples constituted a threat to all the peaceful, freedom-loving peoples of the world. The Arab peoples would never give up their struggle against the Zionist-imperialist coalition. It would go on until the final victory, the liberation of Palestine and the other territories occupied by the Zionist imperialists.

20. His country supported without reservation the just struggle of the Palestinian people for the restoration of their freedom and national dignity. All peoples who had experienced colonialism and struggled for their independence must support the just cause of the Palestinian people and vigorously condemn the racist policies of the Zionist colonialists. The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization had clearly stated that only the true representatives of that people were qualified to speak on its behalf.

21. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) wished to present to the members of the Committee the true facts of a problem with which he had been concerned since 1920.

22. The partition of Palestine was the conclusion of a process which was essentially foreign to the Middle East, and which had begun to take shape with the drafting of the Treaty of Versailles. Although Woodrow Wilson, in his well-known Fourteen Points, had provided for the liberation of colonial peoples and for their right to self-determination, after the First World War, the Ottoman Empire had been divided among the victors without the indigenous population, who were not only Arabs, being given any opportunity to choose their destiny. The British had, however, promised Sherif Husein ibn Ali, who had helped them during the War, that the Arab lands would be liberated; in fact, they were awarded to the United Kingdom and France as a "Mandate", and he remembered demonstrating with other students in the streets of Arab capitals, including Beirut and Damascus, to protest against

that veiled form of colonial domination. Balfour, yielding to the pressure of the Zionists in 1917, had promised them the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine. He had felt that he was serving the interests of the United Kingdom, which would thus have the opportunity to intervene in the affairs of a region at a strategic crossroads on the routes of the British Empire. Moreover, in 1917, the Allies, weakened by three years of war, were seeking to gain the support of the Zionists in order to push the United States of America into the conflict.

23. The Mandatory Powers had been supposed to be preparing the populations under their Mandate for self-determination; in fact, the British had promoted the arrival in Palestine of a stream of Jewish immigrants from central and eastern Europe. It had then become clear that the Jews thought they could take advantage of the weakness of the Arabs to establish a State in the Middle East. The Arab reaction had made the British belatedly aware of their error. They had then passed themselves off as arbitrators between the Arabs and the Zionists and, between 1920 and 1939, sent numerous "Royal missions" to the region. The majority of the new emigrants from Europe were composed of Khazars, who, according to the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, had been converted to Judaism only in the tenth century of the current era and were not Semites. As alien to the region as the Crusaders of Richard the Lion-Hearted, they had no right to take the place of the indigenous populations, who had lived on good terms until then, whether they were Jewish, Christian or Moslem by religion.

24. The arguments advanced to justify that usurpation were difficult for twentieth-century minds to accept: God was supposed to have given Palestine to the Jews, His chosen people, caring nothing for the rights of other peoples, in a land which was the cradle of the three great monotheistic religions. After the Second World War, the Jews had invoked the misdeeds of the Nazis also. While those misdeeds were unquestionably deplorable, there was no reason why the Palestinian people should suffer their consequences. The right of self-determination was one of the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter, the provisions of which had been violated by the partition of Palestine. While it was true that the establishment of the State of Israel had taken place owing to a majority vote of the United Nations, that result had been achieved only by resorting to all possible forms of pressure and corruption. The fait accompli was no more justified than it was convincing, as King Faisal had made General de Gaulle admit when he had asked him whether he would have accepted the occupation of France by the Germans as a fait accompli.

25. The Zionists had expected the Palestinians to vanish into the sea of Arabs; but they had remained alive, and, in the Arab countries which had received them, they constituted active minorities protesting at every opportunity against the usurpation of their country; they would stop at nothing to regain their rights, as the latest events in Jordan had recently proved. There were 60,000 of them in Kuwait, about 10,000 in Saudi Arabia and Lebanon, between 5,000 and 6,000 in Syria, 20,000 to 30,000 in North Africa and Egypt, and an undetermined number in the United States of America. Even in Israel they threatened to become a majority; Mr. Litvinov, in a book published two years

before, based that statement on the average number of children born to Arab families in Israel, which was 7.8, while the figure was 3.4 for Jewish families. The Jews considered marriages with non-Jews to be a dishonour, thus showing a clannish attitude which had made them many enemies, but which did not prevent them from protesting against discrimination when it was practised against them. They refused to realize that they were doomed to be drowned in the mass of the Arab population or that they would draw the entire world into a fearful conflagration.

26. The Middle East had become a chess-board on which the great Powers played with the destinies of peoples in order to carve out spheres of influence. While the dollar was threatened by inflation and the United States of America was going through an economic crisis, it had granted Israel, in 1970, \$500 million in credit to buy armaments, \$100 million in military aid and \$40 million in food surpluses, not counting the \$250 million worth of Israel bonds purchased by Jews in the United States. Israel, yesterday the spoiled child of the United States, was today its faithful ally against communism. According to the United States, Israel helped it to hold the influence of the Soviets, who had introduced themselves into the area only through the fault of the United States, and doubtless that of China, in check in that region of the world. In *The New York Times* of 1 December 1971, the journalist Peter Grose had written that the Israeli Government thought it could contain the Arabs on its own but expected the United States Government to use its military and political strength to avert Soviet intervention in the event that war broke out in the Middle East. Of the 16 or 17 million Jews in the world, only 20 per cent were Zionists, supported by the others out of religious feeling. Was it conceivable that 3 million people could set the world aflame? Was it possible to turn time backwards and try to make a religion into a nationality, thus renewing an effort which the history of Europe before Protestantism had already shown to be useless?

27. The Committee was endeavouring to find a way of balancing the budget of UNRWA, which amounted to 2.2 cents per refugee per day, while the refugees had owned 94 per cent of the land in Palestine in 1947, and the annual income from their property was \$200 million. Those figures provided a striking illustration of the iniquity of a situation which could not endure, just because it was so iniquitous. Justice would prevail, but at the price of the suffering which would have to be borne by the Arabs as well as the Jews, who had also been exploited victims. Jews, Christians and Moslems could live together like brothers in the Middle East, but there would never be peace so long as the flag of an alien State still flew over it.

28. Mr. BABAR (Pakistan) recalled that, despite the efforts made by the United Nations during the previous 21 years, the plight of the Palestine refugees had not improved. In fact, the problem had become even more intractable. It was not at all certain that UNRWA would be able to continue to maintain its essential programmes and services because of the financial difficulties confronting it. There was a visible lack of enthusiasm on the part of a large number of countries to provide aid to the Palestine refugees. Because of its continuing deficit, the Agency would be constrained to reduce its activities at a time when the number of refugees was continuing to grow. The

refugees felt increasingly frustrated. The Israeli authorities continued to be hostile towards them and dismantled their shelters without warning and without worrying about providing them with new shelter. In its report (A/8476) the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA had based itself on the assumption that no solution of all the existing problems in the Middle East, including a just and lasting settlement of the problem of the Palestine refugees, was likely in the immediate future. As the Commissioner-General of the Agency had indicated in paragraph 4 of his report (A/8413), there had been by the end of the year little to lessen the frustrations of the refugees. The time seemed as distant as ever when effect would be given to General Assembly resolution 194 (III), to which reference had been made in subsequent resolutions and which had been adopted on 11 December 1948, more than 20 years earlier.

29. The problem of the Palestine refugees could not be solved in the near future because of the non-implementation of various resolutions of the United Nations.

30. The partition plan for Palestine contained in General Assembly resolution 181 (II), of 29 November 1947, should have made it possible to avoid a refugee problem, but it had been sabotaged by the Zionists, who had launched a campaign of violence and terror and had obliged more than 300,000 persons to seek refuge in neighbouring Arab countries. Israel persisted in refusing to respect the will of the international community and strengthened its policy of aggression and its programme of expansionism. Besides the Arab part of Palestine and the international zone of Jerusalem, Israel had now annexed large territories belonging to the neighbouring Arab countries. Such a policy of aggression and expansionism would not have been possible without outside support. For its part, Pakistan supported the cause of self-determination for the Arab people. Israel professed to be a democratic State. If that was true, it should not hesitate to take account of the will of the majority of the nations of the world, to apply the resolutions of the United Nations and to look for a solution to the Palestine problem. His delegation fully appreciated the efforts of UNRWA and other international agencies to alleviate the sufferings of the people of Palestine. As was apparent from annex II to the report of the Working Group, the Pakistan Government had made a modest financial contribution to the Agency.

31. Since reference had been made to the refugees from East Pakistan, he wished to point out that there was no parallel or analogy whatsoever between the problem of the Palestine refugees and that of the Pakistan refugees. The people displaced from East Pakistan had not been so because another State had usurped their land. Moreover, Pakistan did not deny them their right to return to their homes and recover their property. The two problems, therefore, had nothing whatever in common.

32. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia), taking the floor for the first time in the Special Political Committee, expressed his admiration and gratitude to the former and current Commissioner-General of the Agency and also to the Chairman of the Working Group, for their untiring efforts on behalf of the Palestine Refugees.

33. He expressed the hope that the Palestine people, whose tragic destiny moved him deeply, would be able to unite to build a united Palestine where men of all faiths could co-operate and live in peace and equality. That was the only way in which a lasting peace could be established in the Middle East. Immediately following the Second World War, the United Nations partitioned Palestine and established the State of Israel but it had not been prepared for the expansionist policies of that country, which, supported as it now was by the great Powers of the world, was extending its territory to the detriment of the Arab people of Palestine and the neighbouring Arab countries. The Israelis themselves could not but see the precariousness of the situation they had created by means of force and military strength.

34. It was regrettable that the State of Israel was not willing to make of its country a spiritual and moral meeting-place for the Jews of the world without expelling the Palestine Arabs from a land that had been theirs since the most distant past while contributing to the rebuilding of a unified Palestine in peace and understanding between all communities and faiths.

35. The existing situation could not last. The General Assembly and the Security Council had attempted, however timidly, to remedy it since the resolution of 1947 on the partition. Israel had always refused to comply with their decisions. In those circumstances, it was absolutely necessary that the General Assembly should recognize the people of Palestine's right of self-determination, as laid down in the Charter, and take concrete measures to alleviate the sufferings of the refugees. The Palestinians must recover their rights, exchange their current status of refugees for that of citizens and take their proper place in the international community.

36. Mr. KUSUMASMORO (Indonesia), after stressing the importance of the humanitarian work of UNRWA, expressed the hope that States Members of the United Nations would participate in the search for a solution to the question of the Middle East, not only through financial contributions but also through actions calculated to resolve the underlying political question, namely, the right of the people of Palestine to self-determination.

37. He strongly regretted that Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which aimed at a just settlement of the refugee problem, had not yet been implemented. Although much had been done towards decolonization in the post-war years, efforts in that direction now seemed paralysed, at least in so far as the people of Palestine and southern Africa were concerned.

38. It was difficult to discuss the financial and political aspects of the question of the Palestine refugees separately. For many years, his delegation had stressed the paramount importance of the political implications of the problem. In its resolution 2672 C (XXV), the General Assembly recognized that the problem of the Palestinian Arab refugees had arisen from the denial of their inalienable rights under the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In its resolutions 194 (III), 513 (VI)

and 2672 (XXV), the Assembly had stressed the need to ensure the return to their homes of the displaced persons and to compensate them for the wrongs inflicted upon them.

39. The actions of Israel in the Gaza Strip resulting in the demolition of shelters and the displacement of 15,000 refugees constituted a violation of articles 49 and 53 of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.¹ The most recent example of Israel's defiant attitude was its refusal to co-operate with the Security Council on the sending of a mission to investigate the implementation of Council resolution 298 (1971), of 25 September 1971.

40. The injustices suffered by the Palestinian people must be rectified and, in order to restore lasting peace in the Middle East, nations must do everything within their power to support the efforts of UNRWA and ensure a peaceful settlement of the problem. His delegation wished to emphasize that justice must be done and the inalienable political rights of the Palestinian people must be recognized.

41. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Australian representative had asked to speak in explanation of his vote after the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.228/Rev.1.

42. Mr. BRADY (Australia) said that he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.228/Rev.1 because his country had given financial support to the work of UNRWA for many years. However, he wished to record a reservation regarding the recommendation in subparagraph 100(b) of the report of the Working Group (A/8476). His Government was unable to support the establishment of a committee that would review past performance in voluntary contributions of each country and indicate targets for the coming years. His country's position regarding any specific financial targets was one of principle and did not prejudice the percentage of its gross domestic product that Australia devoted to development assistance.

43. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) introduced draft resolutions A/SPC/L.230, A/SPC/L.231 and A/SPC/L.232. After consulting other delegations, the sponsors had decided to amend the draft contained in document A/SPC/L.230 as follows: in operative paragraph 1, the words "constitute grave breaches" should be replaced by the word "contravene" and the words "a violation of" should be deleted; at the end of operative paragraph 4, the words "rebuild their shelters which Israel has demolished" should be replaced by the words "provide adequate shelters for their accommodation"; and the beginning of operative paragraph 5 should read as follows:

"Requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations, after consulting with the Commissioner-General of UNRWA, to report . . .".

Further, draft resolution A/SPC/L.232 was to be amended as follows: in the fourth, fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs and in operative paragraphs 1 and 3, the words "displaced persons" should be replaced by the words

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75 (1950), No. 973.

“displaced inhabitants”. Operative paragraph 2 should read as follows:

“Expresses grave concern that their displaced inhabitants have not been able to return in accordance with the above-mentioned resolutions;”

44. He announced that Mali had joined the sponsors of the three draft resolutions and Guinea had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.231.

45. In draft resolution A/SPC/L.230, the General Assembly addressed itself to Israel as a result of the destruction of many shelters, which had caused great suffering to about 15,000 Arab refugees, deplored the measures which had been reported in detail by the Secretary-General and the Commissioner-General, called upon Israel to provide adequate shelters for the refugees and, above all, declared that the destruction of the shelters was a breach of articles 49 and 53 of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.

46. In draft resolution A/SPC/L.231, reaffirming its resolution 2672 C (XXV), the General Assembly recognized that the people of Palestine were entitled to equal rights and to exercise their right to self-determination, which they had not so far been permitted to enjoy. In operative paragraph 3 it declared that, without full respect for those rights, there could be no lasting peace in the Middle East.

47. Draft resolution A/SPC/L.232 dealt with a new group of refugees—those who had been obliged to abandon their homes or their camps after the hostilities of 1967—and reminded the international community that, despite the many resolutions that had been adopted almost unanimously by the General Assembly, their plight remained the same. It called once again upon the Israeli Government to take, without any further delay, effective steps for the return of the displaced inhabitants. He requested that all three draft resolutions be put to the vote at the current meeting.

48. The CHAIRMAN said that the revised texts of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.230 and A/SPC/L.232 would be circulated on the following day.² The Committee should now hear several representatives who wished to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

49. Mr. FARAH (Somalia), speaking on a point of order, said that there was a mistake in the English text of the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/SPC/L.232: the reference to document A/8366, of 27 August 1971, should be placed in parentheses at the end of the third preambular paragraph. He had requested that the draft resolutions be put to the vote that same day and suggested that the Committee might hear the representatives who wished to speak in exercise of the right of reply after the vote had been taken.

50. The CHAIRMAN said that he had no objection but pointed out that he had received at least one request for an explanation of vote before the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.232.

² The revised texts were subsequently circulated as documents A/SPC/L.230/Rev.1 and A/SPC/L.232/Rev.1.

51. Mr. AZZOUNI (Jordan) agreed to speak in exercise of the right of reply after the vote, if the draft resolutions were put to the vote at the current meeting.

52. Mr. CAHANA (Israel) expressed surprise at the procedure followed by the Committee and said that it was an example of the concerted effort of the Arab delegations and their allies to monopolize the Committee's time and prevent Israel from speaking on the draft resolutions, on which it would have much to say. He insisted on speaking on the draft resolutions.

53. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) said that he had no objection but he suggested that if the Israeli representative wished to speak in exercise of the right of reply, he should do so after the vote.

54. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the 790th meeting, the Israeli representative had asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply and had agreed to do so at a later time. He suggested that he should be allowed to make his comments on the draft resolution as soon as possible.

55. Mr. CAHANA (Israel) said that he would restrict his comments to the three draft resolutions which were before the Committee. He wondered why the Arab delegations had so little confidence that they had to mobilize all their allies to prevent Israel from speaking.

56. Mr. TREKI (Libyan Arab Republic) said that Israel should not be allowed to insult the representatives of the Arab countries.

57. Mr. CAHANA (Israel) reminded the representative of Saudi Arabia that the Jewish people was one of the oldest in the world, that its history was well recorded. The Koran called the Jewish people “the people of the Book” and said that God had promised the children of Israel their country, Palestine. However, it was not the moment for a historical discussion.

58. It was characteristic that the three draft resolutions A/SPC/L.230, A/SPC/L.231 and A/SPC/L.232, drafted by the Arab delegations and submitted by their avowed patrons, had not found a more ardent defender of human rights than Pakistan.

59. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/L.232, the problem of displaced persons in time of war brought into play humanitarian issues, on the one hand, and security issues, on the other; it was not realistic to consider only one of those aspects. The continued state of war was responsible for the existence of displaced persons; the Arabs continued to act in such a way as to maintain a state of war but expected his country to behave as it would in peace-time and assist them in their aggressive plans by facilitating the entry of saboteurs and spies from enemy States into its territory. Such an attitude was particularly absurd since Israel was surrounded by hostile Arab countries which seized every opportunity to indulge in sabotage.

60. In the past, when similar draft resolutions had been submitted to the Committee, material questions had been the first consideration. However, that was not the case with

the draft resolution in question, which was unacceptable to his country because its implementation would raise serious security problems. Perhaps that was the aim of the sponsors of the draft resolution, none of which had diplomatic relations with Israel and one of which had even declared that it was at war with his country. However, despite the evident problems, his Government was willing to do its best to improve the lot of the refugees: since the beginning of the year, 4,000 displaced persons had returned to their homes, which brought the total number of persons who had been authorized to return to Israel since 1967 to some 38,000. His country accepted the humanitarian principle of repatriation, but could only apply it with caution; it was sole judge of the risks involved.

61. Draft resolution A/SPC/L.230 deliberately disregarded the facts and misused the principles of international law. He recalled that, in his statement at the 788th meeting, he had described conditions in the camps in the Gaza Strip and how they had become the centre of terrorist and subversive activities, an aspect upon which the reports of the Secretary-General and the Commissioner-General on Gaza had not commented. It was for the Israeli authorities on the spot to evaluate the security risks and requirements. Obviously it was easier for the terrorists to operate inside the camps, and the Committee would note that, since the beginning of 1971, the terrorist campaign, largely directed against the refugees and Arab inhabitants of the Gaza Strip, had intensified. In June alone, before his country had taken the measures referred to in the draft resolution, 34 acts of sabotage had been committed in Gaza, 29 inhabitants of Gaza or refugees had been killed and 153 wounded. The draft resolution did not mention those acts of violence.

62. Under the terms of Security Council resolution 237 (1967), of 14 June 1967, Israel was responsible for the security and well-being of all the inhabitants of the territories it controlled. It was therefore inevitable that a certain number of shelters had had to be demolished to make it possible to police the camps. As he had stated at the 788th meeting, out of 1,900 families, 250 had left for El Arish and about 30 for the west bank, but all the rest had been resettled in the Gaza Strip, mostly in better conditions than before. Those who had left were free to return whenever they wished and some of them had already done so. It was not surprising that such measures did not meet with the approval of the Arab countries, because they undermined their attempts at terrorism.

63. The reference to the Geneva Convention was extremely deceptive because in article 49 it was stated that "the Occupying Power may undertake total or partial evacuation of a given area if the security of the population or imperative military reasons so demand". Furthermore, in article 53 it was stated that "any destruction by the Occupying Power of real or personal property... is prohibited, except where such destruction is rendered absolutely necessary by military operations", which had been confirmed by the official comments of the International Committee of the Red Cross. It was for the occupying power to decide what destruction was necessary. He recalled that, when they had been occupying Gaza, the Egyptians themselves had demolished about 100 houses in the Eastern sector, between 1965 and 1967, so as to open a path for their tanks.

64. The measures taken had been effective and had radically reduced the outbreaks of terrorism: whereas there had been 11 incidents of sabotage in May and 34 in June 1971, there had been none in September and October. However, when the Committee was examining the humanitarian aspects of the refugee question, the agents of certain member countries had made sure that terrorism continued: in a grenade attack on the Shati camp on 24 November, a refugee child had been killed and five other children injured. The sponsors of the draft resolution used terms that would stir the pity of States Members of the United Nations and were concerned for the respect of human rights, but they kept quiet about those victims of Arab terrorism.

65. The purpose of draft resolution A/SPC/L.231 was to support the policy advocating replacement of the State of Israel by an Arab State of Palestine. Some Arab States would obviously use the text to strengthen their hostile attitude. The first preambular paragraph was a fallacy. In fact, the right to self-determination had not been denied to the Arab refugees of Palestine. They had had an opportunity to exercise that right in 1948 by voting for one or another of the two States provided for in the partition plan. If the Palestine Arabs had not exercised their right to self-determination, it was because the thoughtless policy followed by their leaders had not led them to do so. In 1949 the Arab leaders had gambled with the rights of the Palestine Arabs and had lost them. But even after that date, the Palestine Arabs could have founded an Arab State in Palestine, in the areas occupied by Trans-Jordan and Egypt. Israel did not deny the Palestinian Arabs the right to entertain and pursue national aspirations, as other population groups throughout the world had. Many groups entitled to such rights were not even mentioned in the United Nations. Israel accepted the right of the Palestine Arabs to pursue national aspirations, but they must understand and recognize that the Jewish people of Israel also had its rights. Draft resolution A/SPC/L.231 took into account only the rights of Arabs, and the spokesman for the sponsors had said explicitly that it referred to the Arab people of Palestine.

66. In any case, some consideration should be given to what Palestine was. It had been created as an entity only after the end of the First World War. From Roman times to 1919 there had been no political entity known as Palestine. The territory later to be known as Palestine had been inhabited by a variety of peoples and had formed only a part of one empire or another. It had not been until 1919 that the colonial Powers—the United Kingdom and France—had agreed on its boundaries. As conceived in the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine entrusted to the United Kingdom, Palestine had included the current territories of Israel and Jordan. Under the Mandate, the United Kingdom had been required to see that a national home for the Jewish people was established in Palestine. He reminded the Committee of the great effort required of the Jewish national movement, first to ingather from the Diaspora to settle in Palestine and then to go through the struggle of other national movements and fight for the creation of the State of Israel, while States such as Syria and Lebanon had attained their independence without difficulty. Since the territory referred to as Palestine in the Mandate entrusted to the United Kingdom comprised both Israel and Jordan,

the Palestinian Arabs were free to pursue their national aspirations provided that they respected the rights of Israel. However, draft resolution A/SPC/L.213 as it stood distorted the historical and geographical facts and contradicted principles and resolutions of the United Nations.

67. The political scope of resolutions adopted by the United Nations could be measured by the application given to them, and it was obvious that the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly the preceding year had allowed Arab elements to advance an exclusive Arab solution to the problem which took only Arab interests and aspirations into account. By proposing draft resolutions A/SPC/L.230, A/SPC/L.231 and A/SPC/L.232, some Arab countries were attempting to prepare the ground for renewed hostilities against Israel. Even though the future of the Middle East did not depend on the decisions taken by the Committee that very day, delegations should reflect upon the consequences of their votes.

68. The CHAIRMAN announced that Senegal had become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.230, A/SPC/L.231 and A/SPC/L.232.

69. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) proposed that those draft resolutions should be put to the vote immediately.

70. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. AZZOUNI (Jordan) and Mr. KANOUTÉ (Mali) said that if the Committee voted immediately on the draft resolutions before it, they would be willing to postpone speaking in exercise of the right of reply to the following meeting.

71. The CHAIRMAN, drawing attention to the corrigendum (A/SPC/L.225/Rev.1/Corr.1), suggested that the Committee should vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.225/Rev.1 and Corr.1.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted without objection.

72. Mr. CAHANA (Israel) said that he would like the fact that he had abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/SPC/L.225/Rev.1 and Corr.1 to be noted in the summary record of the meeting.

73. The CHAIRMAN announced that Japan and Belgium had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.226 and asked the Committee to take action on that draft.

The draft resolution was adopted without objection.

74. Mr. EDREMODA (Nigeria) pointed out that his country had been a member of the Committee of Ten and the Sub-Committee of Four which had been entrusted by the Organization of African Unity with a mission to the Middle East with a view to promoting a settlement of the problems confronting that region. Since the Nigerian delegation would not have the results of that mission until the following day, he would have to abstain in the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/L.230, A/SPC/L.231 and A/SPC/L.232. However, his abstention should not be taken as any indication of his delegation's position on the texts con-

cerned when they were considered by the General Assembly in plenary meeting.

75. Mr. MONTAGNE (Peru) said that he would abstain in the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/L.230, A/SPC/L.231 and A/SPC/L.232 and would explain his delegation's position with regard to those texts when they were under consideration by the General Assembly.

76. Mr. JAISEY (Ghana) said that he would have to abstain in the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/L.230, A/SPC/L.231 and A/SPC/L.232 for the reason given by the representative of Nigeria.

77. Mr. FALL (Senegal) said that since the African Heads of State had completed their mission to the Middle East and had formulated their conclusions, although those conclusions had not been made public, there was nothing to keep representatives of African countries from voting on the draft resolutions before the Committee.

78. Mr. EDREMODA (Nigeria) said that he still felt that since he did not know the results of the mission by the African Heads of State, it would be better for him to abstain in the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/L.230, A/SPC/L.231 and A/SPC/L.232.

79. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (Barbados) said that he was inclined to share the views expressed by the representatives of Nigeria and Ghana. The Committee should not take any decisions which might compromise the results of the mission carried out by certain African Heads of State in the Middle East. Moreover, his delegation had difficulty in accepting texts which were obviously based on political considerations. Furthermore, the texts had been drafted in a way which left a great deal to be desired. It was not clear which actions by Israel were referred to in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.230. Before requiring the refugees to be returned to the camps in which they had been located, as stipulated in operative paragraph 4 of the same draft, it should be ascertained whether their new dwellings were not superior to the ones they had left.

80. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syria) recalled that the text of draft resolution A/SPC/L.230 had been revised.

81. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (Barbados) had doubts about even the new wording. He thought the refugees referred to in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.230 were now better housed than they had been in the camps from which they had been removed. Before requesting their return to the old camps, it should be ascertained whether their new living conditions were better than the old. His delegation could not support politically inspired texts and it would have thought that the first task of the Committee should be to obtain aid and succour for the Palestine refugees; this had no connexion with their inalienable rights or their right to self-determination.

82. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.230, as orally revised.

At the request of the representative of Somalia, the vote was taken by roll call.

Chad, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon.

Against: Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Haiti, Israel.

Abstaining: Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Singapore, Swaziland, Uganda, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada.

The draft resolution as amended, was adopted by 66 votes to 4, with 32 abstentions.

83. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.231.

At the request of the representative of Somalia, the vote was taken by roll call.

Malaysia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Malaysia, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Republic.

Against: Netherlands, New Zealand, United States of America, Uruguay, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Colombia,

Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Israel, Italy, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi.

Abstaining: Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Singapore, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Brazil, Burundi, Chad, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Guyana, Iceland, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar.

The draft resolution was adopted by 46 votes to 20, with 36 abstentions.

84. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.232, as orally revised.

At the request of the representative of Somalia, the vote was taken by roll call.

Malaysia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg.

Against: Israel, Malawi.

Abstaining: Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Portugal, Swaziland, Uganda, Uruguay, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 75 votes to 2, with 25 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 8 p.m.