

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 628th
MEETING



Thursday, 5 December 1968,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 33:

Report of the Commissioner-General of the
United Nations Relief and Works Agency for
Palestine Refugees in the Near East (*con-*
tinued) 1

Chairman: Mr. Abdulrahim Abby FARAH
(Somalia).

AGENDA ITEM 33

Report of the Commissioner-General of the United
Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine
Refugees in the Near East (*continued*) (A/7213,
A/SPC/126, A/SPC/127, A/SPC/L.165)

1. The CHAIRMAN, in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee at its 616th meeting concerning a letter dated 11 November 1968 (A/SPC/126), invited Mr. Issa Nakhleh to address the Committee.
2. Mr. NAKHLEH (speaking as one of the persons constituting the Palestine Arab delegation, in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee at its 616th meeting, which did not imply recognition of that delegation by the Committee) thanked Mr. Michelmore, the Commissioner-General of UNRWA, and his staff for the humanitarian services they were rendering to the people of Palestine in spite of great difficulties. However, he noted with regret that the Commissioner-General's annual report (A/7213) contained no statements supporting the rights of the Arab refugees, as had been the case in previous reports. That omission was no doubt due to the fact that as the Commissioner-General had stated in his letter of transmittal, he had taken the views and comments of the authorities of the illegal Jewish occupation into account in preparing the final text.
3. The Commissioner-General had given as true a picture as possible of the situation of the Palestine refugees. However, the statement on paragraph 2 of the report that "For all of the refugees, the future was uncertain as they anxiously awaited the measures that might follow the Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 calling for a just and lasting peace and including as one of its elements a 'just settlement of the refugee problem'", must not be taken to mean that the Palestine refugees had accepted that resolution. On the contrary, the Palestine Arab refugees had rejected resolution 242 (1967) *in toto* and were determined to resist any settlement which deprived them of their inalienable right to self-determination and of their right to return

to their ancestral homeland. They were also determined to resist any Arab State or any Arab leader who might be forced to submit to the pressure of the great Powers and might be tempted to recognize any right of sovereignty for the Jew-Khazar invaders over one square metre of Palestine soil.

4. The Palestine Arab delegation was grateful to the Commissioner-General for bringing to the attention of the General Assembly, in paragraph 15 of his report, the plight of the Arab refugees in the Gaza Strip. Twice in twelve years, the people of the Gaza Strip had become victims of the Jew-Khazar war crimes and persecutions. In 1956-57, during and after the war by the British, the French and the Jews against the United Arab Republic, the Jews had shot more than 3,000 young men and buried them in mass graves. In 1967, over 2,000 others had been murdered in cold blood by the Jews in the Gaza Strip and countless others had been imprisoned. As the Jews controlled the Press, radio and television in all the Western countries and suppressed any news concerning the war crimes committed against the Arabs in the occupied areas, the only hope of the Palestine Arab delegation was that the Secretary-General would focus world attention on the Jewish war crimes which were even worse than those committed by the Nazis in occupied Europe.

5. The Commissioner-General was asking in his report for \$42,469,000 for the 1969 budget. Ten times the amount of that budget, however, would not provide the refugees with a standard of living equal to the standard they had enjoyed in their homes and homeland. The \$15 million or so provided in the budget for rations for 875,000 beneficiaries meant an expenditure of some paltry five cents per day per person.

6. The Palestine Arab delegation wished to express its gratitude to the Secretary-General for the statement he had made to the Committee (612th meeting) pleading the cause of the Palestine Arab refugees, in the course of which he had reminded members that in twenty years the General Assembly had never taken any steps towards a real solution of the tragic problem of the refugees. The Secretary-General had invoked the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly which called for the return of the new refugees. He had said that unquestionably the plight of many refugees would be relieved immediately by their return to their homes and to the camps which they had previously occupied and that the continuing occupation of the area by the Israel forces was a major obstacle to the restoration of the *status quo*. That courageous and just statement by the Secretary-General had been viciously attacked by the Jewish Press in Tel Aviv and the United States.

7. All the representatives who had addressed the Committee had expressed their sympathy for the sufferings of the Palestine refugees and had strongly supported their right to return home. The only dissenting voice had been that of Mr. Comay, who represented the invaders of Palestine and for whom the Arabs were the aggressors because they refused to live in the desert in order to permit the Khazar usurpers to enjoy their loot in peace. Mr. Comay's position and fallacious arguments were diametrically opposed to the views of the Secretary-General and to those of all the speakers in the Committee.

8. At the 624th meeting, the United Kingdom representative had made some discourteous remarks about the representative of the Soviet Union. The Palestine Arab delegation, for its part, found much to criticize in the behaviour of the United Kingdom delegation when it boasted of the practical assistance given by its Government to the Palestine Arab refugees. There would not have been any Palestine Arab refugees had it not been for the wicked policy of the United Kingdom Government which had promised Palestine to the Jews of the world, in breach of its obligations to the people of Palestine. The United Kingdom had opened the door of Palestine to Jewish immigrants, whose number had increased from 50,000 in 1918 to 650,000 in 1948. It had done everything in its power to suppress the Palestine Arab national liberation movement. In 1948, the British Government and the British armed forces had aided the Jewish terrorist gangs—the Hagana, Irgun Zvai Leumi and the Stern group—to usurp 80 per cent of Palestine and expel over 1 million people from their towns and villages. What was more, the United Kingdom and the United States were solely responsible for the existence of the illegal colonial régime of the Jewish racists and consequently for the exile of the refugees. The United Kingdom and the United States delegations were the only obstacle to any effective United Nations action to compel the Jewish invaders to permit the return of the Arab refugees to their homes or to pay them the income from Arab property, amounting annually to more than fifteen times the budget of UNRWA.

9. The United Kingdom representative had told the Committee that he had a personal interest in the Palestine refugees because there were few who knew them better than he did. Indeed, Lord Caradon—then Mr. Hugh Foot—had spent seven years in Palestine as an Assistant District Commissioner, enforcing the immoral British policy. The Palestine Arab people had expected that Lord Caradon, knowing all the facts of the Palestine tragedy, would use his influence in the United Nations to atone for his sins and to defend the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine. Lord Caradon, however, had played a reprehensible role in the Security Council and the General Assembly. He had taken an important part in the concoction and adoption of the sinister Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, whose praises he had again sung in the current debate. The party principally concerned, however, the people of Palestine, was unalterably opposed to that resolution and the solution recommended. The United Kingdom and the United States representatives had outraged the Arabs by appealing to the magnanimity of Abba Eban, Moshe Dayan, Levi Eshkol and their cohorts to permit the

Arab refugees and displaced persons to return to their homes. One could only wonder what standards of morality or justice those representatives were applying when they showed such consideration for invaders, criminals and usurpers.

10. Had the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States been genuinely interested in ending the suffering of the Palestine Arab refugees and in bringing peace to the Middle East, they would have allowed the General Assembly and the Security Council to take the appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations to put an end to the Jewish aggression and occupation in 1967 as well as in 1948. It was their assistance to the illegal Jewish racist régime which enabled the Zionists to defy the United Nations and encouraged them to continue their occupation and acts of aggression and to attempt to exact the surrender of certain Arab leaders or Governments. No Arab Head of State would dare to permit such an act of treason without causing his régime or his head, or both, to fall.

11. At present, all the homeland of the Palestinian Arabs was occupied by the Jewish colonial invaders. Another million Arabs were languishing in refugee camps and living on international charity, while 400,000 others had been expelled during and after the Jewish aggression of June 1967. Many among them had become refugees for the second time. Moslem and Christian holy places were being desecrated and the homes and property of the Arabs were being usurped by their enemies. Arab freedom fighters were being tortured, imprisoned and murdered in cold blood, or tried as common criminals, contrary to the Geneva Convention. Those who daily committed those crimes were regarded as heroes by the Western Powers and at the United Nations, where the Jews occupied the seat which by right should be that of Palestine. The Jewish representatives, who were not even Palestinians, repeatedly claimed without the slightest shame that they had liberated Palestine and achieved their "independence and sovereignty". They demanded that their illegal racist régime should be recognized by the Arab States as a sovereign State.

12. Mr. Tekoah, replying to the speech of the representative of Yemen, had said it was clear that the Arabs wanted to annihilate the Jewish people and to destroy his country's sovereignty. He would like to know on what grounds Mr. Tekoah could justify Jewish activities which had practically wiped the Arab population off the map of Palestine. The Zionist spokesmen were constantly saying that the Arabs wanted to drive the Jews into the sea. Yet was it not a fact that they had themselves driven the Arab people of Palestine into the desert? Jewish propagandists such as Mr. Eban, Mr. Comay and Mr. Tekoah, whose parents or ancestors had never set foot in Palestine, were distorting facts in the most shameless manner. They justified the Jewish wars of aggression as being acts of legitimate self-defence, and the Jewish occupation and usurpation of Arab property as liberation and integration.

13. The world Jewish leaders had unleashed a propaganda campaign on an unprecedented scale to endeavour to justify their monstrous crimes. Having

achieved their object and proclaimed a Jewish State, they were asking the world to forget the past and the fact that there was a Palestine or a people of Palestine. The Jews contended that international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples had no application to the Palestine problem because the "chosen people" had been repatriated to the land of its forefathers as the fulfilment of Jehovah's promise. The occupation of Palestine and other parts of the Middle East by the Jews was the most dastardly colonial crime of all time.

14. In 1896, Theodore Herzl had published a book entitled The Jewish State in which he declared that the Jewish question could be solved only if the Jews set up their own State. In 1897, he had organized the first Zionist Congress at Basle. Despite all efforts and activities of the Zionists, who had organized a conspiracy to acquire a territory where the Jewish State could be set up, they had made no progress until the First World War, although a province of Argentina, Cyprus, the Sinai Peninsula, Uganda, Mozambique, the Congo and Tripoli had all been considered in turn as territories where a Jewish State could be erected.

15. The First World War had enabled the Zionist leaders to further their conspiracy. After unsuccessfully supporting Germany and Turkey and attempting to extract from them a promise that the Jews could colonize Palestine, they turned in 1916 to the United Kingdom and in October of that year they concluded a secret agreement with the British War Cabinet under which they promised to use Jewish influence and pressure to bring the United States into the War, in exchange for which the United Kingdom would assist the Jews to colonize Palestine and establish a Jewish national home in that country. The infamous Balfour Declaration, on 2 November 1917, had been merely the confirmation of the conspiracy of 1916.

16. The members of the Committee were well aware of the way the Zionists had arranged for the United Kingdom to be appointed as Mandatory Power and for the British administration in Palestine to be used, not for the achievement of self-government and independence for the people of Palestine, but for the realization of Jewish colonial objectives. Everyone knew, too, how the United Kingdom had rid itself of the Palestine problem in 1947 by placing it in the lap of the United Nations, and what scandalous proceedings and pressures had compelled the General Assembly to adopt the resolution on partition. But no country could be partitioned against the wishes and without the consent of the overwhelming majority of its indigenous inhabitants, for such a partition was a negation of all the principles embodied in the United Nations Charter and the principles of international law and justice.

17. He recalled the conditions in which the so-called Jewish State had been set up in 1948 as a result of the support of the four great Powers and to the detriment of the Palestine population, which had been decimated and driven from its lands. It had to be remembered that at that time the Arab population of Palestine, Moslem and Christian, had been 1,350,000, whereas

the Jewish population, most of which had consisted of illegally transplanted Eastern European Jews, had amounted to only 650,000. The four great Powers had used the Security Council and the General Assembly to assist the Jewish racist illegal régime of Palestine and to admit it to membership of the United Nations. The Jews of the whole world and the Western Powers had helped the régime to build up its military potential, providing the Jewish forces with the most modern weapons to menace neighbouring Arab countries.

18. The Suez War of 1956 had demonstrated the connivance between two colonial Powers, the United Kingdom and France, and the Jewish colonial régime of Palestine. Although the General Assembly had condemned that war of aggression and ordered the withdrawal of all the invaders' forces from Egypt, yet the Western Powers had enabled the Jews to reap the fruits of their war of aggression by demilitarizing the Sinai Peninsula, stationing United Nations Emergency Force on Egyptian territory only, and opening the Gulf of Aqaba to Jewish navigation and trade.

19. During the last twelve years, from 1956 to 1968, Jewish circles in the United States had completed their domination of United States politicians and of the United States administration, so that the United States could protect and strengthen the Jewish colonial occupation in Palestine and block any resolution in the United Nations which might give a semblance of justice to the Arabs of Palestine. The Jews of America had thus been able to collect annually tax-free funds amounting to more than \$650 million, \$500 million of which had been poured into the coffers of the Tel Aviv clique. In addition, direct aid amounting to more than \$1,500 million had been given by the United States Government, in the form of grants and aids during the past twenty years. The United States and the world Jewish leaders had extracted from the Federal Republic of Germany, under the pretext of "atoning for German guilt against the Jews," more than \$1,000 million of compensation and grants for the Tel Aviv colonial régime as well as more than \$4,000 million in compensation for the relatives of alleged Jewish victims of Nazi Germany.

20. In 1955, Jewish leaders had made a secret deal with the French Government whereby they had given that Government the secrets of the manufacture of nuclear weapons, illegally obtained by Ben Gurion from Jewish scientists who had served in the United States Atomic Energy Commission. In exchange, the French Government had undertaken to build the atomic reactor in Dimona and to supply the Tel Aviv régime with all the military supplies it might need. The Jewish aggressors had refused to sign the Treaty for the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons so as to avoid all international inspection of the reactor.

21. With regard to the Jewish war of aggression of June 1967, it had been proved beyond any shadow of doubt that it had been unleashed in collusion with the United States Government. The real aim of that colonial war was evident from the declarations of Jewish leaders as reported in the Jewish and world Press. Mr. Eshkol was reported to have said, on 10 June 1967, that the whole of Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip must remain part of Israel. According

to the Jerusalem Post, he had later said that he considered the Suez Canal and the Jordan River as natural frontiers. The same newspaper reported Moshe Dayan as saying that Sinai, the Golan Heights and the Gulf of Aqaba lay at the heart of Jewish history. He had also said that the cease-fire lines were ideal border lines, since the Jewish troops were thus very close to Cairo, Amman and Damascus. Moshe Dayan was said to have favoured the integration of Hebron and the surrounding occupied area into a single economic entity with Jerusalem and Beersheba. According to The New York Times of 19 November 1968, he had clearly stated that the economic integration of the occupied areas with Israel was Government policy and not just his own idea. The New York Times of 16 August 1967 had reported that another member of the Tel Aviv gang, Mr. Yigal Allon, who was being groomed to succeed Levi Eshkol, had proposed the establishment of paramilitary settlements on the Golan Heights, in the Jordan Valley, in the southern part of the Gaza Strip and on the Hebron Hills. Mr. Allon had also said that the border between Israel and Jordan should be formed by the Jordan River and a line passing through the middle of the Dead Sea. It must be emphasized that all those opinions were shared by the overwhelming majority of Jews in occupied Palestine. On 20 June 1968 The New York Times had published a map of "Israel's intentions", which had been presented to delegates at the Zionist Congress then being held at Jerusalem.

22. However, those Jewish colonial plans were only the second stage in their wicked plan of expansion. The third stage would be the occupation of Arab lands from the Nile to the Euphrates which Jews claimed that their God had promised them. It was for that reason that the Jewish colonialists were frantic to entice more immigrants from the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom, Latin America and other parts of the world. Their goal was to increase the number of Jews in the occupied areas to 5 million. They were interested only in the young generation from ten to forty years old. A few quotations from statements by Jewish leaders would give the Committee a clear picture of those colonial plans. Mr. Eshkol had called for a great wave of Jewish immigration from the "free world" to help meet the tremendous challenges now facing the Jewish people. He had specified that the population of Israel must rise from its present 2.7 million to 5 million by the end of the century. Mr. Yitzhak Rabin, and Mr. Abba Eban had made similar statements. Mr. Eban had also said "our small numbers here are a constant threat to our security".

23. With the object of winning the support of Jews throughout the world for their colonial programme, the Jewish leaders had injected into the Zionist movement an element of religious fanaticism. Giving the widest interpretation to certain verses in the Old Testament and trying to make believe that God had promised the Jews all the land in the Middle East up to the Euphrates, they had stated that current developments in the area constituted the fulfilment of the divine promise.

24. In the United States more than 2,000 Protestant ministers had become the mouthpiece of the Zionist leaders in spreading and proclaiming such absurdities.

He wished to quote the views of the Jewish religious leaders, both in occupied Palestine and in the United States, to demonstrate the extent of Jewish fanaticism and expansionist schemes. According to the Jerusalem Post of 29 October 1967, Chief Rabbi Nissim had said that the land of Israel was the heritage of every Jew and that no religious or secular authority, including the Government of Israel, had the power to yield a single inch of it. Chief Rabbi Nissim had emphasized that the land of Israel was promised to the Jewish people by the Almighty, and it was therefore forbidden for any Jew even to consider returning any part whatsoever of the land of their forefathers.

25. The New York Times of 5 January 1968 had published a full-page advertisement signed by 100 rabbis from leading cities in the United States, which showed that the schemes for Jewish colonial expansion represented the aspirations of the Jews of the United States. The advertisement said that Israel soldiers, forced into a war, had liberated territories which Egypt and Jordan had previously occupied by force, and had returned them to their rightful owner, the State of Israel. Those areas included in particular the west bank of the Jordan, including Old Jerusalem, which had been illegally occupied by the Jordanians in 1948.

26. Since the aggression by Israel in June 1967, the Jews had demonstrated that they regarded the war as their war against Islam and its holy places, they had bombarded the Holy City of Jerusalem, damaging or destroying religious monuments, and had dynamited a number of buildings and a mosque to clear the way for a square in front of the Buraq, which they called the Wailing Wall. It would be recalled that in 1929 the Jews had caused disturbances in Palestine by attempting to establish for themselves new rights in the Buraq, and that a commission appointed to examine the rights and claims of the Arabs and Jews to the site had decided, after hearing numerous witnesses and examining documents for evidence, that the present western wall had been built by Moslems, belonged exclusively to Moslems, and had no relation whatsoever to the Jewish temple. Nevertheless, the Jewish authorities in occupied Palestine and Jewish organizations throughout the world were attempting to convince public opinion that the wall was a Jewish holy place.

27. The Israel forces, which had occupied Hebron in June 1967 had also taken possession of the Mosque of the Haram Esh-Sharif, had raised their flag on it and had erected signs in Hebrew stating it to be a Jewish holy place. They denied entrance to Moslems except on Fridays, and had made it into a tourist attraction. The Jews did not hide their desire to destroy the Masjid Al-Aqsa, at Jerusalem, and to build a Jewish temple in its place. In 1920 they had unsuccessfully requested the British Government to hand over to them the land where that mosque was situated; nevertheless, in 1922 Lord Melchett, a British Zionist, had stated that the day was coming when the Jewish temple would be rebuilt, and in 1929 the Chief Rabbi of Palestine had said that Jewish young people all over the world were ready to sacrifice their lives to redeem the holy temple occupied by the Masjid Al-Aqsa. As far back as 1948, committees of Jewish rabbis and scholars had prepared minute descriptions of the Jewish Temple which had existed two thousand

years ago and which had been completely destroyed in A.D.70. A committee of architects had been set up in 1949 to design the Jewish Temple on the site of the Masjid Al-Aqsa. After the Jewish occupation of Jerusalem in 1967, world Jewry had set up a secret fund of \$200 million for the construction of that Temple, and since March 1968 the Jewish authorities had carried out excavations under and around the mosque in the hope of discovering the traces of the Jewish Temple.

28. In the magazine *Time* of 30 June 1967, the author of an article on Judaism had suggested that the time might be ripe to erect the Third Temple, adding that it ought to be built on the original site, a proposal which would involve the demolition of the sacred Dome of the Rock, the spot from which Mohammed had ascended into heaven. According to the writer, some Jews saw plausible theological grounds for discussing the reconstruction of the Temple. In that respect, the speaker had been authorized by the Grand Mufti of Palestine, President of the World Moslem Congress, representing the 700 million Moslems, and also by the Secretary-General of the Congress to warn the Jews of the world most categorically that any attempt by them to destroy, desecrate or damage the Masjid Al-Aqsa, the Haram Sayidna Ibrahim Al-Khalil in Hebron, or any other Moslem shrine would plunge them into a holy war with the 700 million Moslems. The world's Jews would do well to ponder the matter carefully. He himself, a Palestinian Christian Arab, deemed it a great honour to be responsible for conveying that warning to the Jews from the World Moslem Congress; it showed that, in the Arab world, Moslems and Christians lived in harmony, dignity and freedom. In contrast, the Khazar Jews who had invaded Palestine from Eastern Europe were fanatical and chauvinistic believers in racial superiority.

29. The present tragic situation in the Middle East had originated in the Palestine war of 1948, which had been started by the Zionist conspiracy to create a Jewish State by stealing the Arabs' homeland in Palestine. There would be no peace in the Middle East as long as Jewish colonialism and the illegal Jewish régime continued to exist in Palestine. There, as elsewhere, peace could be established only when foreign domination had been ended. Responsibility for the bloodshed and the present suffering in the Middle East lay not only with the Jewish war criminals in occupied Palestine but also with the Jews of America and the heads of Governments of the great Powers which, in 1948, had enabled the Khazar Jews to carve out a State and had given it a semblance of legality by admitting it to the United Nations.

30. The General Assembly and the Security Council had been, and still were, tools in the great Powers' hands; that was why they had regrettably failed in their duty, which was to uphold the Charter and the principles of international law and justice. They disregarded the Palestine people's right to self-determination. They failed to recognize that the Charter had outlawed war and conquest, that any territorial acquisition obtained by force was illegal, that United Nations organs and Members had no right to recognize the fruits of such conquests, that the aggressor had no right in the conquered territory and could exercise

no sovereignty there, and that the aggressor should derive no benefit from his acts. They disregarded the principles endorsed in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The 2.5 million Palestine Arabs were indeed a people and had inalienable rights to freedom, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

31. By its resolution of 22 November 1967, the Security Council, manoeuvred by the great Powers, had violated the United Nations Charter and the principles of international law in allowing the Jewish aggressors to reap the fruits of their crimes. It had called on the neighbouring Arab States to recognize the illegal Jewish régime established as a result of war and conquest. The Jewish usurpers were dictating their terms to the United Nations and were using that Organization to achieve their expansionist aims. The Security Council had exceeded its powers, since it was not competent to deprive the Palestinian people of their inalienable right to self-determination in their ancestral homeland. The Arab States, despite the pressure at present being applied to them by four great Powers who were members of the Security Council, had no authority to barter away the rights of the Palestine Arabs. Both the interests of the Arab nation and the principles of the Charter barred them from recognizing the existence or sovereignty of the colonial and illegal régime of the Khazar Jews in Palestine. The Palestine Arab people would never submit to the injustice committed by the Security Council and would do their utmost to oppose it. They were determined to struggle to the end in order to free their homeland from the invader.

32. Only a just settlement of the Palestine problem could put an end to bloodshed and injustice. The nine-point peace programme put forward by Mr. Eban in the General Assembly on 8 October 1968 (1686th plenary meeting) would merely sanction injustice, aggression and conquest. The Palestine Arab delegation submitted the following ten-point programme of its own for a just and peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem:

(1) The Security Council must decide that, in accordance with the Charter and the principles of international law, it could not recognize the fruits of war and conquest and, therefore, the proclamation of a "Jewish State" in Palestine was null and void *ab initio*.

(2) The Security Council, must recommend to the General Assembly, in accordance with article 6 of the Charter, that "Israel" should be expelled from the United Nations on the grounds that its admission had been illegal, since it had never been a State in either fact or law, had never satisfied the basic requirements of United Nations membership and had persistently violated the principles of the Charter.

(3) The Security Council must take measures, under chapter VII of the Charter, to disarm the Jewish colonial illegal régime in occupied Palestine.

(4) The Security Council must declare an embargo on shipments of arms and munitions to that régime.

(5) It must call on all United Nations Member States to sever diplomatic relations with that régime.

(6) It must call on the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Canada and other

Member States to prohibit the direct or indirect transfer of funds to that régime.

(7) The General Assembly must establish a United Nations commission to facilitate the repatriation of Palestine Jewish immigrants to their homelands or to any other country that would accept them.

(8) The General Assembly must establish a United Nations commission to facilitate the return of Palestinians to their homes and to assist them in regaining possession of their property.

(9) The General Assembly must establish a United Nations commission to supervise the reconstruction of Palestine either as an independent State or in federation with Jordan, and to supervise the creation of a democratic government elected by the indigenous Moslem, Christian and Jewish people.

(10) The United Nations must guarantee freedom for all religions and free access to the Holy Places in Palestine to Christians, Moslems and Jews throughout the world.

33. The Palestine Arabs had expected the United Nations to adopt the measures set out in those ten points, which alone could bring about a just peace in the Middle East. However, they had no illusions, since the great Powers were not trying to solve the Palestine problem and were using the struggle between Jewish colonialism and the Arab peoples for their own selfish interests. Under the circumstances, the Palestine Arabs were resolved to continue the struggle to liberate Palestine and regain possession of their homes, land and property. This struggle might be long, but they were certain that their just cause would triumph, since national liberation movements had always prevailed over colonial invaders. The Palestine Arab delegation welcomed the General Assembly resolutions adopted at the present session in connexion with apartheid and Southern Rhodesia. Those resolutions had a bearing on the struggle waged by the Palestine freedom fighters.

34. The very important principles which the General Assembly had affirmed in its resolutions dealing with apartheid, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia must be applied to the Palestine people's national liberation movement. The tragedy of the Palestine Arabs was even greater than that of the indigenous peoples of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. The Khazar Jewish minority had not only seized power by force in 1948, depriving the Palestine Arab majority of its right to self-determination, but also expelled Christians and Moslems from Palestine and had usurped their homes, lands and property. By their criminal war of June 1967, the Jewish colonial invaders had occupied all the territory of Palestine as well as parts of Syria and the United Arab Republic, and had committed war crimes and acts of genocide against the civilian population. The Palestine national liberation movement deserved the support of all peoples who believed in peace and freedom. The Jewish usurpers dared to regard the Palestine freedom fighters as "terrorist gangs", whereas it was the Jews themselves who had desecrated the Holy Land and had persistently carried out atrocities and acts of terrorism since 1948.

35. As Abu Amar, leader and spokesman of the Palestine resistance movement, had said according to The New York Times of 3 December 1968, the hopes of the Palestinian Arabs driven from their homes by the Zionists and imperialists had been dashed: the United Nations had not re-established justice, and the dispersion of the Arabs had grown worse. The Palestinians believed that armed struggle was now the only means by which they could return to their homes. The Israel occupation of June 1967, far from stopping the resistance, had strengthened the Palestinian revolution, which would continue until final victory. Resistance was a legitimate right of all oppressed peoples. A political solution would mean surrender. The Palestinian Arabs were not against the Jews, for they themselves were Semites and had lived for centuries at peace with Jews and Christians. They intended to liberate the Jews from Zionist domination and would sincerely welcome all Jews who would like to live in an Arab State as citizens enjoying equal rights under law and constitution. When the Palestinian Arabs achieved victory, they would not drive out anyone but would, on the contrary, do their best to find a humane solution for every problem.

36. Those words of the leader of the Palestine resistance movement expressed the sentiments, hopes and objectives of the Palestinian people. All they wanted was to exercise their right to self-determination, recover their property and live in dignity and freedom in the land of their ancestors. He was convinced that the Palestinian people were entitled to the understanding, sympathy and support of all freedom-loving countries.

37. Mr. DUMA (Romania) praised the Commissioner-General and the staff of the Agency for their humanitarian work in Palestine and their objectivity in fulfilling their mission.

38. His delegation believed, however, that the Agency's activity could not be a substitute for a just and permanent settlement of the question of the Palestine refugees, whose situation was still growing worse from year to year. The events of June 1967 and military operations since the end of the conflict had aggravated the problem still further. The debates that had been going on for twenty years in the United Nations showed that the failure to solve the refugee problem was due chiefly to political reasons. A settlement would be possible only when the existing tension between the States had been reduced and political stability prevailed in the region.

39. In his delegation's view, peace could not be restored in the Middle East until the Palestine Arabs had regained their rights. No long-term solution could be found until the principles of international law and the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights were observed and implemented by all the parties concerned. Romania, like most States Members of the United Nations, believed that the question of the Palestine Arab refugees should be settled on the basis of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, primarily General Assembly resolution 194 (III), in which the General Assembly had resolved that the refugees wishing to return to their homes should be permitted to do so at the earliest

practicable date and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return. Each year the General Assembly repeated its appeal, and each year it was forced to conclude that little progress had been made in implementing the resolutions adopted. Palestinians must regain their lawful rights to their land and property. Any solution other than repatriation and compensation would be a mere palliative that could not satisfy the aspirations of the refugees.

40. His delegation was convinced that until the question of the refugees was settled in conformity with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, the international community would find peace and security in the Middle East threatened. It did not share the view that the problem could be reduced to humanitarian and economic aspects. The interests of the people of the Middle East required the restoration of normal relations of coexistence and co-operation, the withdrawal of Israel troops from the occupied territories and respect for the security and independence of all States in the region.

41. The decisions taken by the Security Council on 22 November 1967 in its resolution 242 (1967) and the joint efforts of the Governments concerned could end the conflicts and the suffering of the people of the Middle East. In particular, the provision for a just settlement of the refugee question must be implemented if there was to be lasting peace in the region, not only for humanitarian reasons but for political and practical reasons as well.

42. It could not be expected that the Agency should prolong its activities indefinitely, laudable as they might be, and that the Palestinian people should continue to live on charity. It was a fact, however, that the Agency must continue its work, and his delegation would give favourable consideration to any proposal to extend the Agency's terms of reference for a fixed period. Nevertheless, the essential purpose was still to find a lasting political solution, and all States, especially those directly concerned, must co-operate to that end.

43. His Government would continue to support the Secretary-General's appeal to Member States to give his special representative, Mr. Jarring, all possible co-operation and assistance in order to reach a settlement of the Middle Eastern conflict and the question of the Palestine refugees.

Mr. Ghaus (Afghanistan), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

44. Mr. PLAKA (Albania) deplored the fact that at every session of the General Assembly the imperialist Powers tried still harder to depict the question of the Palestine refugees as a matter of humanitarianism and pity. His delegation had always supported the just position of the Arab countries and emphasized that the right of Palestinians to return to their homes and achieve self-determination was a matter involving the freedom of a people and its struggle to regain the national dignity and identity of which it had been robbed by imperialism and Zionism. The unprecedented criminal action twenty years earlier by international Zionism with the support of the imperialist Powers, primarily the United States of America,

constituted one of the most monstrous events of the period following the Second World War.

45. The Palestine problem resulted from crimes committed against the Arab peoples by imperialism, which was ceaselessly trying to establish its hegemony in the East. One of the most recent expressions of that policy of enslavement was the imperialistic Zionist aggression of June 1967, launched by the Israel aggressors with the participation and support of the United States imperialists and the complicity of the Soviet revisionists. Beyond question, that imperialistic aggression had inflicted immeasurable suffering on the Arab Palestinian people. Subsequent events, particularly the resolution adopted by the Security Council on 22 November 1967, Israel's occupation of Arab territories, the arbitrary measures taken by Israel authorities and the military provocations were all aimed at intensifying the United States imperialists' ideological, political, economic and military aggression against the Arab countries. Those activities posed a grave danger to all peoples and to international peace and security.

46. The United States and the Soviet Union were co-ordinating their actions. While the United States imperialists continued to support Israel against the Palestinian people and the other Arab peoples, the Soviet revisionists were pretending to be friends of the Arab peoples and enemies of Israel while in fact co-operating with the United States imperialists to carry out concerted plans of aggression in the Middle East. The aim of Israel's conflict with the Arab countries was still to consolidate its position as the watchdog of imperialist interests in the Middle East and of the key position of Palestine, which dominated the main routes leading to Africa and Asia. Those same objectives were now being pursued by the new imperialists of the Kremlin revisionist clique. That same goal was being pursued by the navies of the United States of America and the Soviet Union in the Mediterranean.

47. It must be admitted that the United Nations had always proved incapable of helping to solve the problem, owing to its manipulation by American imperialists. That was why General Assembly resolution 194 (III) had not been implemented. Under those circumstances, what purpose could the resolutions proposed each year by the United States possibly serve, other than to help the imperialists to divert attention from the true problem of Palestine? The problem was not one of providing aid or imperialist aims to the people of Palestine, but of restoring the inalienable and legitimate rights of that people.

48. The Palestinian people had chosen dignity rather than humiliation, armed struggle rather than capitulation. Adhering firmly to the revolutionary principle that freedom was not granted but won, the Palestinians had taken up arms and intensified their struggle for national liberation. Their determination to fight to the last and to overcome every obstacle was the best guarantee of their ultimate victory. The people of Palestine had decided to continue their struggle until they emerged victorious over the Zionist usurpers. That was the only means by which they could be sure of returning to their homeland and recovering their

sovereign rights. Palestine enjoyed the support of all revolutionary peoples in its heroic struggle.

49. In accordance with their unwavering policy of unreserved support for the struggles of peoples for national and social liberation, his country's people and Government stood firmly on the side of the Palestinian people and fully supported their just cause. In the United Nations, his delegation had associated itself with the efforts of the Arab delegations and the delegations of other freedom-loving countries in support of the struggle of the Palestinian people for the realization of their inalienable rights, and would continue to do so in the future.

50. Mr. COMAY (Israel), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, recalled the statements made by his delegation at the 622nd and 624th meetings setting out his Government's position on the question of displaced persons, said he had gathered, from contacts he had since had with various other delegations, that his statements had not been fully understood by all members of the Committee and required further clarification. He briefly recalled the main elements of the humanitarian resolutions adopted by the Security Council on 14 June 1967 and by the General Assembly on 4 July 1967, and reaffirmed on 19 December of the same year.

51. First, his Government had been called upon to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who had fled the areas where military operations had taken place. That was not a demand for their immediate and unconditional return, regardless of continuing difficulties in the area, especially of a security nature. His delegation had already informed the Committee of his Government's efforts to meet that request.

52. Secondly, in those resolutions the question of the return of displaced persons was deliberately linked, in the same sentence, to the need to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations had taken place. In that connexion he wished to point out that all the inhabitants of Israel were in fact living in the area of hostilities.

53. Thirdly, those resolutions were not addressed only to his Government and did not concern only the inhabitants of territories occupied by Israel. They were addressed to all the Governments in the region involved in the hostilities and took into account the necessity for respecting humanitarian principles and for protecting civilians throughout the Middle East region. The extent of that obligation had been defined by the Secretary-General for the fact-finding mission carried out by Mr. Nils Gussing shortly after the end of the hostilities.

54. He then read out a passage of the Secretary-General's report, dated 2 October 1967, on Mr. Gussing's mission, in which it was stated that the Secretary-General had replied to a question on that subject put to him by the special representative by saying that "the provisions of Security Council resolution 237 (1967) might properly be interpreted as having application to the treatment, at the time of the recent war and as a result of that war, of both Arab

and Jewish persons in the States which are directly concerned because of their participation in that war".^{1/}

55. It was in the light of those elements of the existing resolutions that his delegation would view any proposals that might be submitted. It could not agree to any text which departed from those resolutions, first, if the expression "facilitate the return" was replaced by more peremptory language; second, if the question of the return of the displaced persons was separated from his Government's other responsibilities under the existing resolutions and was treated in isolation; and, third, if those passages in the resolutions which were concerned with the plight of other civilian groups in the Middle East area were altered or abandoned, particularly those dealing with Jewish minorities which were being persecuted in certain Arab countries of the Middle East. It should be emphasized that, as the aforementioned report had indicated, the special representative, Mr. Gussing, had had to tackle the problem within the framework of the existing humanitarian resolutions.

56. As members of the Committee knew, the implementation of those resolutions had given rise to divergent opinions, but their great virtue was that they were of a humanitarian and not of a polemic nature and that they had received unanimous endorsement, including that of his own Government. Their implementation could at least be discussed on the basis of a common text accepted by all concerned. Any decision to destroy that basis of unanimity in order to submit resolutions which his Government would in any case be unable to endorse, would be a very serious one, and it was precisely that result which the Arab delegations were striving to achieve, both in the Special Political Committee and in the Third Committee. The Arab delegation perhaps felt that the adoption of such proposals by majority votes from which Israel was excluded would subsequently give them some propaganda advantages. But third parties which were sincerely concerned with the humanitarian aspects of the matter would wish to ask themselves what course of action would best serve that humanitarian aspect. He hoped that, whatever their views might be on the substance of the issue, many delegations would refuse to sponsor or support proposals which were unacceptable to those directly concerned and which would only lead to a stalemate and might do more harm than good.

57. As far as the displaced persons were concerned, he reminded the Committee of the statement he had made at its 622nd meeting. Events over the past few days had sharply and painfully underlined the validity of the observations his delegation had made at that meeting. Those events were the concern of the Security Council and not of the Committee, but they had frequently come under discussion during the debate, and some of the well-meaning statements had lacked realism. The problem under consideration unfortunately still existed on a battlefield, and the military operations which had brought about a movement of the civilian population had not yet truly come to an

^{1/} See Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-second Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1967, document S/8158, para. 212.

end. It was therefore pointless to discuss the question in abstract terms as if it were not part and parcel of a specific situation in a specific strife-torn area.

58. The situation along the cease-fire line was very tense; wanton acts of murder and violence were being committed against innocent civilians on a territory for which Israel was responsible. In that unpropitious context the United Nations, through the intermediary of Mr. Jarring, had undertaken a delicate and vital peace-making effort. The Committee would be within its rights if it decided to tear up the existing unanimous resolutions and to rewrite them in a way which would only inject more friction. That would apply very specifically to one Arab draft resolution which several other delegations were being asked to co-sponsor. His delegation would definitely not be able to support that text, and he considered that it would hardly be wise or prudent in the present circumstances to complicate the question still further.

59. Mr. FRACKIEWICZ (Poland) said that, when he had exercised his right of reply at the previous meeting, the representative of Israel had not replied to any of the remarks on the issue, which had been contained in his statement. It was understandable, as he could not deny or retract any of the facts he had mentioned in it.

60. The representative of Israel had to resort to intimidation techniques already used by him in the Committee. Among some rather wild accusations, which the representative of Israel had touched upon, was in connexion with the Second World War. The context and purpose in which he had spoken of the martyred soil of Poland was an outrageous insult to the memory of more than 6 million Polish citizens, half of them of Jewish faith, who had been victims of nazi genocide. It was an insult to the memory of 200,000 Poles executed by Nazis for having helped the Jews in their fight for survival. It was an insult to those millions of Russians, French, Danes, Norwegians and men of many other nationalities who had perished at nazi hands.

61. Whatever the representative of Israel had intended to say, he had kept silent on who had really committed that genocide and he hated the idea that it could have anything to do with some billion dollars which Israel had received as compensation from the West German Government. The representative of Poland found it entirely unnecessary to enter into the question of who had moral standing and who had not. He left it to the intelligent judgement of the Committee and he did not intend to continue those exchanges with the representative of Israel. The Committee had a concrete, urgent and important question to decide and he urged it to proceed with its work, irrespective of whether the representative of Israel liked it or not and in spite of his attempts to dictate.

62. Mr. COMAY (Israel), replying to the representative of Poland, said that he had been very careful at the previous meeting, to specify that the murder of the Jews to which he had alluded took place in Poland under the nazi occupation and had never said or implied that the Polish people was responsible for it. The fact was that, in a country where such events had taken place, anti-semitism was on delicate ground.

63. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said, with reference to the arguments put forward by the representative of Israel concerning the humanitarian draft resolution before the Third Committee and the draft resolution considered by the Special Political Committee, that the adjective "polemical" he had used about those two draft resolutions was more applicable to the arguments he had advanced. Thus, he had spoken of the mistreatment to which Jews were allegedly subject in certain Arab countries, forgetting that those Jews were citizens of the countries in question: even Mr. Comay could not claim they were nationals of Israel. Consequently, there was no reason to bring up their fate in the current debate except to cloud the issue and raise obstacles to the resolutions submitted. If the Israel delegation was worried about the fate of Jewish minorities living in the Arab countries, it should also, for example, concern itself with the profaning of synagogues in Brooklyn; it was impossible for it to do so, however, since the Brooklyn Jews were citizens of the United States. It would never enter the mind of the representative of Israel to hold the Government of the United States responsible for such actions unless it considered that all Jews in every country were Israelis.

64. Moreover, the representative of Israel had described the Arabs as aggressors. The Arab States to which he had referred had frequently repeated that the dispute was not only between Israel and the Arab States with which Israel was at war, but between Israel and the people of Palestine, who were not citizens of the other Arab States. There was thus no question of drawing a parallel between the Jews living in the Arab States, who were citizens of those countries, and the Palestinian people who were of Palestinian nationality only.

65. The representative of Israel had attempted to intimidate the Committee, on the subject of the draft resolutions which he had described as "polemical", by stating that if the Committee did not conform to the requirements of the Israeli delegation, its decisions would be of no practical significance. In doing so, he had completely ignored the Palestinian people who had, however, a part to play, a part which they were determined to play. The disputed land belonged to the people of Palestine and nobody had the right to tell them whether or not they should fight to regain it. Unfortunately, there would be much more bloodshed and many innocent victims. They would all be the victims of the Zionist movement, which was trying to turn a religion into a nationality by using it for political and economic ends.

66. In fact, the Middle East as a whole was a chess-board in the hands of the great Powers. They had oil interests throughout the area and each of them was trying to make its influence predominant. He repeated once again that no State, whether Arab or not, could speak in the name of the Palestinian people. Israel was well aware that there could be no dialogue with the Palestinians because, if the latter returned home, the Zionists would be in the minority. That was the crux of the matter.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.