

883rd meeting

Monday, 12 November 1973, at 3.20 p.m.

President: Mr. Károly SZARKA (Hungary).

A/SPC/SR.883

AGENDA ITEM 43

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (*continued*) (A/SPC/163, A/SPC/164, A/SPC/L.273-275):

- (a) Report of the Commissioner-General (A/9013);
- (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/9231);
- (c) Report of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine (A/9187);
- (d) Reports of the Secretary-General (A/9155, A/9156)

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. JOB (Yugoslavia) said that, as his and other delegations had repeatedly stressed, the problem before the Committee was not merely one of refugees who had to be resettled, compensated or allowed to return to their homes in token numbers. Instead, it was the great issue of the entire Arab people of Palestine, whose national consciousness was an indisputable fact and who wanted to participate in all decisions relating to their legitimate, national rights. In its discussion of the entire Middle East crisis during the past summer, the Security Council had recognized two closely interrelated factors as the one major cause of tension and war in the area, namely, the continued occupation by Israel of Arab territories and the denial to the Arab people of Palestine of their legitimate national rights to repatriation and self-determination. Whatever the formal outcome, that had been the real, political conclusion of the Security Council's debate. Further, even before the eruption of 6 October 1973, the work of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Middle East and all the refugees in the Middle East had been directly affected by constant military attacks by Israel against neighbouring Arab States. The report of the Commissioner-General (A/9013) showed that the bombing of UNRWA camps had resulted in many dead and that Israel's practices in the occupied territory of Gaza had added new hardships to the already inhuman conditions in which the Palestinians lived. The many letters from the representatives of Egypt and Syria to the President of the Security Council showed that Israel's latest military action on the west bank of the Suez Canal and in the Golan Heights had created new refugees. All that was taking place in occupied Arab territory.

2. It was against that backdrop that his delegation had studied the report of the Commissioner-General and that of the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA (A/9231). It had come to the regrettable conclusion that UNRWA remained beset by the same old problems, particularly a chronic shortage of funds. The growing deficit resulting from dollar devaluation and general inflation had been partially controlled only by increasing the burden on the Arab host countries. It was an international disgrace that UNRWA was unable to

increase the number of persons receiving rations and the contents of those rations. Education of the future generations of leaders and fighters was essential if the Palestinian people was not to lose its identity and ability to present and promote its just claim. Accordingly, no curtailment of UNRWA's educational programmes could be permitted.

3. The steady increase in Yugoslavia's annual contributions to UNRWA, which were additional to its bilateral assistance, reflected his country's concern at the Agency's financial difficulties and its feeling that it should assist as much as possible. It agreed that all Member States should contribute to UNRWA. Recent events, including the recognition, after 6 October, that the Arab nations would not tolerate the occupation of their territories, should reassure States which feared that contributions to UNRWA would lead to the permanent transformation of the Palestinian nation into a group of refugees and displaced persons. His delegation was prepared to consider favourably any new proposals to alleviate UNRWA's financial problems.

4. The events subsequent to 6 October proved that the Arab peoples would, if necessary, fight to recover their occupied land and that support for their cause from African, non-aligned and all other peace-loving countries was constantly growing. They also showed that the great Powers could overlook the Middle East crisis only at their own and the world's peril and that, without the involvement of the Security Council as a mediator, the crisis would proceed unchecked. The main lesson to be learned was that until the Arab people of Palestine could implement their legitimate national rights to repatriation and self-determination and until their representatives were permitted to participate in any negotiations for a settlement, it would be impossible to guarantee the peace and security of the Middle East States, including Israel. Meanwhile, all States should do their utmost to enable UNRWA to discharge its noble and temporary task.

5. Mr. VAZHNIK (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) pointed out that the problem of the Palestinian refugees had been discussed in the United Nations for many years, resulting each time in no more than temporary measures for its solution, involving the granting of economic aid to the suffering Palestinian people. The real root of the problem and of the political instability in the Middle East was the seizure by Israel of Arab lands, the persistent refusal of Tel Aviv to recognize the legitimate rights of the Arab peoples and the support of Israeli aggression by those capitalist forces which sought to hinder the free and independent development of the progressive Arab States. A key factor in the solution of the Middle East problems would be a political settlement on the basis of the implementation of all parts of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973) and 339 (1973).

6. At the World Congress of Peace Forces held in Moscow in October 1973, the General-Secretary of the

Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had expressed the continued support of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for just and lasting peace in the Middle East, for the exercise by all States in the area of the right to live as they chose, for the return of the Arab lands occupied by Israel and for justice for the Palestinian people. His delegation, therefore, believed that the problems of the Palestinian refugees could best be settled by observance of the principles of General Assembly resolution 194 (III) and Security Council resolution 242 (1967). Israel should desist from its aggression against the Arab peoples and withdraw its forces from and return occupied Arab lands. The Byelorussian people, like all the peoples of the Soviet Union, would continue to provide the necessary assistance to all Arab peoples in their just struggle. His delegation could not accept any proposal to defray the administrative and other expenses of UNRWA from the United Nations regular budget and considered that the Agency could continue to be financed strictly on the basis of voluntary contributions.

7. Mr. SAHAD (Libyan Arab Republic) said that the view expressed by some delegations that the Committee should deal only with the humanitarian aspects of the item before it could not be accepted by his delegation; it believed, on the contrary, that the work of UNRWA could not be set in its proper perspective until all aspects of the tragedy had been adequately discussed.

8. The question before the Committee was not one of ordinary refugees forced to leave their country by a natural disaster, but a problem which involved the entire people of Palestine. Two thirds of them had been forced to search for refuge, and the remaining third was forced to live under abnormal conditions of occupation. The problem had clearly arisen from a political plot in which the Palestinians were to be the victims. Moreover, the current situation had arisen as the result of actions and developments initiated by the United Nations, although the Organization had not anticipated such unfortunate consequences. The adoption in 1947 of General Assembly resolution 181 (II) had undoubtedly contributed to the tragedy of the Palestinian refugees, and all were aware that that resolution had been enforced by the great Powers in the United Nations. By that resolution, the belligerent Powers of the Second World War had relieved their conscience by securing a future for the victims of nazism. Justice had been sacrificed in order to mitigate the guilt of some and serve the interests of others. The name of Palestine had to be erased in favour of a mythical concept, namely, the perfidious notion of the exclusive in-gathering of immigrants of one faith into one place.

9. For 26 years, the people of Palestine had been looking to the United Nations and the international community for justice. They had been given only meagre material assistance and empty promises, although the international community had in one form or another confirmed and guaranteed the inalienable rights of the Palestinians.

10. From the very beginning, Palestine had been the target of zionism under the protective wing of the imperialist Powers. In keeping with the Balfour Declaration, the United Kingdom had blessed the invasion of Palestine and connived with the Zionists in uprooting the people from their homes and dispersing them in

order to open the gates of Palestine to foreign immigrants from South Africa, the United States of America, Europe and the whole world. The United States had provided them with weapons to stockpile against the return of the Palestinian people, and by doing so had made it possible for the Zionists not only to maintain their oppression against the people of Palestine but also to commit further aggression.

11. The report of the Commissioner-General (A/9013) reflected the tragedy of the Palestinian people who, despite years of suffering, poverty and deprivation, continued to insist more and more forcefully on their inalienable right to their countries and to their homes. The Commissioner-General had pointed out the disturbing financial situation of the Agency and the measures it would have to adopt if funds were not provided. Such measures would seriously and adversely affect the situation of the recipients. The United Nations, which bore a large measure of responsibility for the problem, had a duty to provide the Agency with the necessary funds to enable it to carry out its task.

12. The people of Palestine persisted, in spite of their difficulties and the harshness of their lives, in their determination to see the day when their legitimate rights would be fulfilled. The sentiment which attached them to Palestine was so deeply rooted that neither time, terror, poverty nor American bombs could destroy it. They had embarked upon an heroic struggle to recover their usurped freedom, homeland and dignity, and they would triumph because no power on earth could resist for ever the irrepressible desire for freedom.

13. In conclusion, his delegation wished to reaffirm the obligation of the international community, under the Charter of the United Nations, to restore the land of Palestine to its people, and to restore the people of Palestine to their land.

14. Mr. WANG Jun-Sheng (China) agreed with the Arab representatives that the discussion on the so-called question of Palestine refugees should not be confined to the humanitarian aspects but should attack the roots of the matter. The facts were clear. The Israeli Zionists, with the support and connivance of the super-Powers, had long been pursuing a policy of aggression and expansion. They had repeatedly launched large-scale wars of aggression against Arab countries, occupied large tracts of Arab territories and driven the Palestinian and other Arab peoples from their homelands where they had lived for generations, causing over a million people to remain destitute and homeless over a long period. The question was therefore not one of humanitarian relief but of aggression and of the restoration of the natural rights of the Palestinian people. So long as those rights were not restored and the territories recovered, there could be no genuine solution of the Middle East question. The two super-Powers' contention for hegemony in that region was the essence of the Middle East question and the reason why it had remained unsolved.

15. After the Egyptians, Syrians and Palestinians had risen up to resist the Israeli aggressors, shattering the myth of the "invincibility" of Israel and liberating part of the occupied territories, the two super-Powers had hurriedly concocted a draft resolution on a cease-fire which did not condemn that aggression, explicitly call for the unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all the

occupied Arab territories or mention the restoration of the national rights of the Palestinian people. That resolution was obviously designed to re-impose the situation of "no war, no peace" which they had deliberately created and bring the Middle East situation again under their control. China was firmly opposed to any such deal at the expense of the national rights of the Palestinian people and the territories and sovereignty of the Arab countries. However, history was made by the masses. Even though the super-Powers might succeed in their schemes for a time, they were doomed to failure in the long term. The indomitable heroism and unprecedented militant solidarity displayed by the Arab people in the October war had eloquently shown the greatness of the Arab people, who would never allow their fate to be decided by others. They would draw the necessary experience from the October war, see more clearly the power politics practised by the super-Powers and make redoubled efforts to fight to recover their lost territories and national rights.

16. The Arab people's just struggles against aggression and hegemony had won increasing support in the world. For example, 27 African countries had already severed diplomatic relations with Israel. The Chinese Government and people deeply sympathized with the sufferings of the Palestinian people and would unswervingly support their struggle and that of other Arab peoples subjected to aggression and humiliation. Although the forthcoming struggles would be protracted and arduous, China was convinced that so long as they relied on their own efforts and persevered in unity, with the assistance of justice-loving countries, they would surmount all obstacles and finally attain their lofty ideals.

17. Mr. SAITO (Japan) said that the current Arab-Israel conflict, the fourth in 25 years, should remind everyone of the urgent need for concerted efforts to bring about a just and lasting peace in the Middle East on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which was accepted by the majority of States Members of the United Nations, including all the parties directly concerned. Paragraph 2 of that resolution which, *inter alia*, affirmed the necessity for achieving a just settlement of the problem, recognized that otherwise there would be no real peace in the region. Although the strengthening of the unstable cease-fire would remain the primary issue for some time, the General Assembly should help to lay the groundwork for peace negotiations by renewing its insistence on equitable treatment of the Palestine refugees, based on General Assembly resolution 194 (III), which laid down the principle of repatriation or compensation.

18. The Japanese Government supported the principle of equal rights and self-determination for all the peoples of the Middle East, as emphasized by previous speakers, and sincerely hoped that the necessary measures would be taken as soon as possible to meet their legitimate aspirations. Since the twenty-sixth session his delegation had supported the General Assembly's annual resolution which recognized those rights under the Charter of the United Nations and was convinced that those goals should be achieved within the context of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

19. However, pending a settlement of the refugee problem, the relief work of UNRWA must be continued in order to sustain the minimum subsistence level of the refugees and alleviate further suffering. His delegation was gravely concerned over the immediate danger of a reduction in the Agency's services, already reduced to a bare minimum, and in particular in the education programme. His delegation endorsed the United Kingdom representative's statement (879th meeting) that the provision of relief for refugees in the Middle East should be considered the common responsibility of all the Members of the United Nations and strongly appealed to all delegations to urge their respective Governments to make more generous contributions to UNRWA.

20. Japan had actively participated in the efforts of the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA to improve the Agency's financial situation. It had consistently increased its contribution and was now the seventh largest contributor. It was considering a further increase for 1974 and a substantial increase in the cash portion, in view of UNRWA's current financial situation. Owing to the growing public concern over the plight of the Palestine refugees, contributions to the Agency by non-governmental organizations in Japan were also increasing.

21. Mr. SEITZ (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his country was aware from its own experience of the suffering of refugees and had observed with particular attention and deep sympathy the efforts of the United Nations since 1948 to assist the Palestine refugees.

22. Since that date, the Federal Republic of Germany had regularly contributed substantial funds to the Agency and had been the third largest donor in terms of contributions made over the past few years. In 1973 alone, his Government had provided a total amount of 12.1 million Deutsche Mark in addition to its contribution to UNRWA through EEC. In 1973 the contribution of EEC had risen from \$5 million to \$7.4 million. His country had also given approximately 476,000 Deutsche Mark in 1973 in bilateral assistance to Middle East countries in connexion with the refugee problem.

23. His Government was greatly concerned about UNRWA's deficit for the current year. It agreed with the Commissioner-General (877th meeting) that reductions in any educational programmes would not be without serious political consequences and considered that such measures could bring about additional unrest at a time when all hoped that the deadlock might at long last be overcome and a comprehensive political solution be found to the Middle East conflict. His delegation found it difficult to believe that at that crucial time the international community could deny UNRWA the necessary sources for the continuation of its relief programme. All were aware that the Agency's relief programme was not a permanent solution, but concern for the rights of the refugees and for their future should not outweigh concern for their current situation.

24. His delegation felt that as long as there was a need for UNRWA's humanitarian relief programmes, their continuation was a joint responsibility of all Members of the United Nations who voted unanimously each year for their maintenance. The principle of voluntary contributions enabled every country to assess its contribution according to its economic possibility. However, that did not mean that some countries need not

contribute at all. His Government therefore associated itself with the urgent appeal of the Working Group (A/9231, para. 24) to those countries which in the past had contributed either inadequately or not at all to reconsider their position and to contribute generously.

25. Mr. BIRIDO (Sudan) commended the Commissioner-General of UNRWA and his staff for their work on behalf of the Palestinian refugees, as described in the Commissioner-General's report, he also expressed his delegation's gratitude to the Chairman and members of the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA.

26. The reports of the Commissioner-General and the Working Group suggested that UNRWA would be forced to consider reductions in its services unless the estimated deficit of \$10 million was covered by voluntary contributions in the near future. In his delegation's view, the international community, and particularly those States which were the cause of the tragic situation of Palestine and the plight of the Palestinian people, had a moral obligation to meet that deficit.

27. He noted with satisfaction the growing awareness that a just and lasting peace in the Middle East required a settlement of the Palestinian problem, the return of the refugees to their homes and the recognition of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, which had been repeatedly reaffirmed by General Assembly resolutions. As reported in a letter dated 6 November 1973 from the representative of Denmark to the Secretary-General (A/9288), the nine member countries of EEC had stated that one prerequisite for peace in the Middle East was "recognition that in the establishment of a just and lasting peace account must be taken of legitimate rights of the Palestinians". Other statements emphasizing the close relationship between the problem of peace in the Middle East and the rights of the Palestinian people had been made recently by the representatives of the United Kingdom, Netherlands and Japan. The Assembly of Heads of State and Government, at its session at Addis Ababa in May 1973, had condemned Israel and expressed support for the just cause of the Arabs and the Palestinian people. Israel had been expelled from the African continent except for the parts controlled by South Africa and Portugal. The Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, at their Conference at Algiers in September 1973 had also supported the inalienable right of the Palestinians to self-determination and the just struggle of the Arabs to liberate their occupied territories.

28. For those reasons, it was his delegation's view that the problem of the Palestinian people was essentially one of colonization, occupation, expansion and aggression by Israel against the Palestinians and the Arab States. It was no coincidence that Israel's policies were similar to those pursued by the Governments of South Africa and Portugal and by the Southern Rhodesian régime, nor was it a surprise that, as reported by the *Rand Daily Mail*, the South African Minister of Defence had stated on 15 October 1973 that 'South Africa would find ways of showing sympathy with Israel in a practical manner.

29. At the 881st meeting the representative of Israel had asserted that the standard of living of the ordinary inhabitants in the areas administered by Israel since 1967 had risen. That argument was similar to those used

by South Africa and Portugal to justify their exploitation and occupation of African lands. He drew attention, however, to the Commissioner-General's warning in paragraph 24 of his report (A/9013) that, regardless of any immediate material benefits, the longer-term economic effects and the cumulative, pervasive social and cultural effects gave cause for concern.

30. On 6 October 1973 Israel had launched its fourth war of aggression against the Arab countries. That war had added new victims to the long list of Palestinian refugees. The Commissioner-General had informed the Committee (877th meeting) that the fighting in Syria had brought death or injury to a number of refugees and damage to refugee camp facilities and that 7,700 refugees had had to be evacuated from their camp or village quarters. According to a letter dated 3 November 1973 from the representative of Egypt to the President of the Security Council¹, nearly 300 persons living in two Egyptian villages had been forced by the Israeli armed forces to evacuate their homes and move to the nearest Egyptian military position. Thus, Israel had again demonstrated its consistent policy of uprooting Arabs from their homes in order to replace them with European and foreign settlers and establish new settlements, in violation of the Geneva Conventions and United Nations resolutions. Such Israeli action must be condemned by all Member States, and Israel must be forced to put an end to its atrocities and crimes.

31. In conclusion, he reaffirmed his Government's unequivocal support for the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and independence and the continuation of Sudan's contribution to the UNRWA budget.

32. Mr. SOKALSKI (Poland) observed that the Special Political Committee's agenda, unlike those of other Committees of the General Assembly, included perennial problems which the United Nations had had to deal with almost since its inception, such as the problem of *apartheid*. The item now before the Committee was of a similar nature, with a 25-year history. A closer look at the developments of the past year alone, however, would suffice to give a clear picture of the situation.

33. The report of the Commissioner-General stated (A/9013, para. 1) that between 1 July 1972 and 30 June 1973 there had been no progress towards a settlement of the basic Palestine refugee problem in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, that Israeli military occupation of the west bank, the Gaza Strip and part of the Golan Heights continued and that the vast majority of the refugees and other persons displaced from those territories as a result of hostilities of 1967 were still unable to return to their homelands. Similarly, the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine had stated in its report that the situation remained "essentially unchanged as regards the circumstances governing the possibilities open to the Commission" (see A/9187, para. 4).

34. The UNRWA documents before the Committee could serve as an indictment of Israel's treatment of the Palestinian refugees. General Assembly resolution 2963 C (XXVII) had called upon Israel to desist forth-

¹ Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-eighth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1973, document S/11080.

with from all measures that affected the physical structure and demographic composition of the Gaza Strip and to provide adequate shelter for the accommodation of refugees. Israel's response, as described in the Secretary-General's report (A/9155), had been the destruction of hundreds of rooms and shelters inhabited by the refugees, and neither the Secretary-General in his report nor the Commissioner-General in the documents he had provided had been able to give a confirmation that the residents of those shelters had been compensated. Thousands of families remained inadequately housed. Israel claimed that 50,000 displaced persons had returned to their homes since 1967, but UNRWA had been able to ascertain the return only of 7,500 (see A/9156). Further evidence of Israel's failure to heed the appeals of the international community could be found in the Twenty-sixth World Health Assembly's resolution WHA 26.56, of 23 May 1973, calling upon Israel to refrain from such practices as the destruction of refugee shelters and the dispersal of the refugees.

35. The lack of progress referred to by the Commissioner-General consisted, first, in failure to effect repatriation or compensation as provided for in General Assembly resolution 194 (III); secondly, in the lack of any substantial progress in the programme for the reintegration of refugees either by repatriation or resettlement, as called for in resolution 513 (VI); and, thirdly, in the growing urgency and expanding political scope of the problem owing to successive acts of aggression against Arab lands and continuing failure to comply with United Nations resolutions.

36. His delegation had therefore been dismayed to find that the fundamental political aspects of the problem had been totally neglected in some of the statements made in the Committee. Fortunately, numerous speakers in the latter part of the debate had returned it to the proper track, towards the only correct appraisal of the plight of the Palestinian refugees. As the representative of the Palestine Arab Delegation had said at the 881st meeting, the problem involved the Palestinians' homeland, their right of self-determination and their freedom and dignity as a people.

37. The 1.5 million victims of the Palestine tragedy were receiving help from the world community in a number of forms, of which UNRWA's activities, under its able Commissioner-General, were important but by no means the only one. His delegation believed that a multi-channel voluntary system of assistance which, whatever its faults, did not impose any rigid limitations upon States, was of practical advantage to all concerned. An attempt to change it with respect to UNRWA might unnecessarily complicate, if not aggravate, the already difficult financial situation.

38. Poland had been participating in assistance programmes other than those at UNRWA for many years, mostly on a bilateral basis and through various non-governmental organizations. Contributions had been made by numerous Polish civic groups, including the Red Cross, trade unions, youth organizations and schools. Polish food, clothing and medicines were being sent to the refugee camps, young Palestinians were attending Polish schools and universities and Poland would continue to spend considerable sums of money on assistance to Palestinian refugees as long as it could afford to do so.

39. He emphasized, however, that not even the most extensive and generous programme of international assistance could be a substitute for a just political settlement, nor could it bring about the implementation of United Nations resolutions by those who had notoriously failed to respect them.

40. Mr. ABDULJALIL (Indonesia) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the work done during the past year by the Commissioner-General of UNRWA and by the members of the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA.

41. Today UNRWA faced the worst crisis in its history. That was particularly tragic in view of the recent events in the Middle East, which had again demonstrated that, in the words of the representative of the United Kingdom, no lasting settlement could be achieved which did not take into account "the legitimate rights of the Palestinians" (879th meeting). The importance attached to those rights throughout the world was illustrated by the declaration issued by the nine member States of EEC (see A/9288). It would be a tragedy if UNRWA's services to the refugees had to be reduced because of the financial difficulties of the Agency, which, according to the Commissioner-General, would have a deficit amounting to perhaps \$10 million during the coming year. Such a reduction would indeed have the serious political consequences and ominous implications for peace and security that the Commissioner-General predicted. UNRWA was currently almost the sole support of more than 1.5 million people who had been driven from their homes and lands and would have nowhere to turn if the United Nations and its agencies failed them.

42. The very existence of the Palestinian people might be said to be in the hands of the international community today; unless greater assistance was supplied during the coming year, the living standard of those unhappy exiles would fall even lower. Although the Commissioner-General and the members of the Working Group had done an excellent job under extremely difficult conditions, it was clear that the international community had a duty to provide for the refugees in such a way as to prevent the yearly recurrence of increasingly severe financial crises. In its resolution 194 (III), adopted in 1948, the General Assembly had expressed the international community's hope that the displaced people of Palestine would soon be able to return to the land of their fathers in peace. Yet the Palestinians had remained exiled for 25 years, living in makeshift tents and rooms, and their situation had not improved over the years.

43. In his delegation's view, the term "Palestinian refugee" also applied to those whose circumstances did not compel them to live in UNRWA camps but who had refused to become assimilated in any land other than their own. From a political perspective, to be a Palestinian refugee was to have achieved a particular state of mind which was independent of economic considerations; it involved an attachment to the land of Palestine that superseded all other loyalties and could not be explained in a purely objective fashion. The inalienable right of self-determination, enshrined in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), had continued to elude the Palestinians' grasp. Despite numerous United Nations resolutions, they were no closer to the exercise of their basic human rights today than they had been in

1948. Israel had done nothing to fulfil its obligations under those resolutions and evidently had no intention of taking any steps which would return the land to the refugees. It was not surprising, therefore, that the Palestinians continued to struggle to regain their rights.

44. Indonesia would continue to show its concern for the Palestinians and their problems by maintaining its contribution to UNRWA; those nations which had not yet contributed should do so now. With the fraternal assistance of peoples throughout the world, the Palestinians too would soon enjoy the exercise of the rights of self-determination and dignity which all peoples so deeply cherished.

45. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania) commended the Commissioner-General and staff of UNRWA for their dedication to their task. The Commissioner-General's report (A/9013) graphically illustrated the difficulties faced by UNRWA as an institution, while the difficult life of the Palestinian refugees dislodged from their homeland had been made clear by the statements made in the debate, particularly that of the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (882nd meeting). The peoples of Africa, having had long experience of humiliation and denial of their rights in their own homelands, could not but sympathize with the Palestinian people.

46. Originally established basically as a temporary agency to provide necessary relief services until the Palestinian people could return to their homeland, UNRWA had now been in existence for over two decades, during which the Israeli authorities not only had refused to allow the refugees to return to their homeland but had taken actions which had increased the number of refugees. He shared the concern expressed by the majority of delegations over the outrageous measures taken by the Israeli authorities, particularly in the occupied Arab territories. Israel, which owed its very existence to the United Nations, had flouted the Organization's resolutions, had steadfastly refused to let the refugees return and was intensifying its persecution and maltreatment of the Palestinian people. It had shown by word and deed its expansionist purpose of annexing Arab lands, thus extending and aggravating the root cause of the refugee problem.

47. The millions of individuals served by UNRWA did indeed require humanitarian assistance, but what the Palestinians as a people needed was to regain the rights denied them by the State of Israel. A people should not be compelled to live on international charity. The urgent need for humanitarian relief should not becloud the Palestinians' more urgent need for justice nor divert attention from the basic issues, thereby perpetuating the denial of the fundamental rights of the Palestinian people and legitimatizing the aggrandizement of the Israeli authorities, which had defied the will of the international community.

48. While his delegation supported the essential tasks of UNRWA, it believed that concerted action was urgently needed to give meaning to the basic concepts of the United Nations Charter and the relevant resolutions and restore justice to the Palestinian people. The refugee problem and the dangers arising therefrom would continue so long as Palestinians were denied their rights, for the denial of rights inevitably brought resistance. His delegation fully supported the efforts necessary to obtain a lasting solution, namely, restora-

tion of the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

49. Mr. DESOUZA (Jamaica) said that the Middle East conflict could at least boast of one enormous humanitarian achievement, the establishment of an agency whose preoccupation with the welfare of the refugees was sincere and far-reaching. The Jamaican delegation appreciated the Commissioner-General's constructive report and wished to thank him and his staff for their tireless efforts, administrative ability, deep human commitment and devotion to the principles of the Charter and, finally, their efficiency and integrity in helping to prevent the collapse of UNRWA in the face of real dangers and increasing financial difficulties. It must be noted, however, that the Agency could never have succeeded in its task without the almost superhuman endurance of the refugees themselves. Moreover, it was regrettable that the situation had changed so little in recent years: the need for UNRWA's services remained as urgent as ever and no solution of the underlying problem seemed to be imminent.

50. It was to be hoped that Member States would ensure enough funds to allow the Agency to continue its noble work and to hasten the day when the refugees would no longer be referred to as such, but would enjoy a higher standard of living in their homeland area in an atmosphere of peace and international co-operation. While the world must remain actively concerned with the rights and future of the refugees, it must also pay attention to their welfare and basic human needs, for their survival and well-being were important factors in the movement towards a just peace in the area.

51. The Agency's acute financial crisis of recent years might bring to an end some of its most careful education and training programmes and might greatly curtail its relief services, with a consequent serious increase of unrest in the area. The Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA that the Assembly had set up at the twenty-fifth session had shown great ingenuity in tapping old and new sources, but the problem remained acute and would no doubt continue unless there was some broader settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict. The humanitarian aspects of the refugee problem were not easily separated from its historical and political context: lack of progress in finding a just and lasting solution of the Middle East crisis not only made peace elusive, but also aggravated the refugees' sense of abandonment and betrayal by the international community and increased their despair and unrest. There seemed to be no real substitute for the complete political settlement desired by all the inhabitants of the area, and it was to be hoped that conditions would soon be created for such a settlement.

52. Wars were, of course, by nature destructive and aroused the conscience of mankind, which inevitably sought ways to find appropriate remedies for past evils. Yet constant harping on the subject and incessant complaining over the vicissitudes of the innocent victims of war tended to perpetuate their plight. Every effort should be made to improve the living conditions of the Palestine refugees and to provide their young people with the education that would give them a chance of a better future. The stamina, ingenuity, skills and innate intelligence of those people, enriched over the years by UNRWA activities, might well prove to be a boon for the Middle East area. In any case, their mental and

physical well-being must be the paramount concern of the international community until such time as they could regain full enjoyment of their human rights with the unflagging support and encouragement of the United Nations.

53. Since peace in the Middle East was inextricably linked with the implementation of resolutions on the right of the Palestinians to their homeland, which was an essential factor of peaceful coexistence, it was anomalous that in an area of continuous immigration the indigenous people should be confined to camps, dependent on the charity of donors. Their plight was surely deserving of sympathetic consideration.

54. Mr. POPOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the problem of the Palestinian Arab refugees attracted the attention of the international community not only in connexion with its humanitarian aspects, but also in connexion with its political side, which was the basis of the entire problem. The fundamental cause of the military conflicts in the region and of the plight of the Palestine refugees was the aggressive seizure of Arab lands by Israel and that State's stubborn refusal to recognize the legitimate rights of over 1.5 million Palestinian Arabs who had been driven from their own lands. As a result of Israel's expansionist policy, most of the Arab population of the part of Palestine in which the State of Israel had become consolidated, had been exiled from their homeland in 1948 and still lived outside its territory. That policy was still hindering the settlement of the Middle Eastern problem as a whole and of the Palestine refugee problem in particular. The situation had been further aggravated by Israel's aggression in 1967 and during the current year.

55. The entire history of the Middle East in recent decades showed that Israel's policy of depriving the Palestinian Arabs of their homeland was doomed to failure. The problem of the Palestine refugees called for an urgent political solution, since no lasting settlement could be expected from purely philanthropic palliatives. That situation was confirmed by the report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA, in which it was stated that "the problem of the refugees had been further complicated and the political dimension enhanced since the hostilities of 1967" (A/9013, para. 2).

56. The crux of the problem was to enable the Palestinian Arabs to leave their camps in exile, to return to the land of their fathers and to cease being refugees as soon as possible. The essential prerequisite for a settlement was the cessation of Israel's aggression against the Arab States, the withdrawal of its armed forces from the occupied territories and compliance by Israel with the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly for a just settlement of the Middle Eastern problem.

57. It should be borne in mind that none of those decisions had cast any doubt on the right of the Palestinian Arabs to their homeland, where their ancestors had dwelt for many generations. Indeed, General Assembly resolution 181 (II), provided that the Arabs had a legitimate right to decide for themselves where they should live. That political approach was further reflected in other relevant United Nations decisions: thus, General Assembly resolution 194 (III) provided that the Palestine refugees had an unlimited right to return to their homeland, and subsequent resolutions reaffirmed that the people of Palestine were entitled to

equal rights and self-determination in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

58. The well-known Security Council resolution 242 (1967) emphasized "the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war", provided for the withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in 1967 and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace and affirmed the necessity for achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem.

59. The international community was paying increasing attention to the situation in the Middle East. Thus the problem had been stressed in the final communiqué of the World Congress of Peace-Loving Forces, held in Moscow in October 1973 and attended by representatives of 120 international and over 1,100 national organizations and movements from 143 countries. The communiqué stated that the bases for a settlement in the Middle East were immediate compliance with the Security Council resolutions adopted in October 1973, complete withdrawal of Israel armed forces from all the occupied territories in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and the comprehensive guarantee of the legitimate rights of all States and peoples in the area, including the Palestinian Arabs, to return to their countries and to self-determination in accordance with United Nations resolutions.

60. Although United Nations decisions provided a sound political and legal basis for the settlement of the Palestine refugee question, the Government of Israel was stubbornly refusing to comply with them, including those concerned with the Palestine refugees. It was obvious that Israel would not have been able to resist the will of the United Nations and the demands of the world community without support from the forces of Zionism and imperialism. The United Nations could not remain passive in the face of such a situation. All peace-loving States were in duty bound to unite their efforts to compel Israel to submit to the will of world public opinion and to comply with the many United Nations decisions on the Middle East.

61. The position of the Soviet Union on the question of the Palestine refugees was well known, and the attempts that had been made to distort that position could not be successful. Everyone was aware of the assistance that the Soviet Union was giving to the Arab peoples, including its aid during Israel's latest aggression and its help to the Palestine refugees. The Arab States themselves had expressed recognition and appreciation of that assistance: thus, Egypt had recently voiced its deep gratitude to the USSR for its genuinely disinterested aid in the war against Israel. In his statement to the World Congress of Peace-Loving Forces, Leonid I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, had announced the Soviet Union's past, present and future policy of insisting that the lands occupied by Israel should be returned to the Arab States and that justice for the people of Palestine should triumph.

62. Taking into account all the complexities of the Middle East situation, it should be noted at the same time that conditions for the stable and just settlement of the crisis in that area were now more favourable than ever before. The United Nations should take effective steps to secure Israel's immediate and strict com-

pliance with the Organization's decisions on the question, which would open the door to the solution of the problems of the Palestinian people.

63. Mr. RAWA (Malaysia) said that the fact that for more than 25 years the Palestine refugees had been subjected to enforced exile and the misery of camp life was not due to any failure by the United Nations to seek a just and lasting settlement. Almost every year during that period, the Organization had recommended a solution of the problem on the basis of the return of the refugees to their homeland or of fair compensation for them. It had also called for restoration of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, in accordance with the United Nations Charter. Yet more than 1.5 million Palestinian Arabs continued to endure enforced exile without any hope for the future. The injustices perpetrated against them had grown in magnitude, so that a whole new generation had grown to adulthood knowing only the misery and deprivation of refugee camps.

64. That lamentable situation was mainly due to Israel's refusal to respond to numerous appeals from the United Nations and to co-operate in the implementation of the relevant resolutions. Thus Israel bore the full responsibility for the failure of the international community to find a solution for the problem. The recent hostilities made the need for such a solution even more urgent, and the United Nations must apply itself to a new effort for a just and lasting settlement. In his delegation's opinion, the crux of the problem was the plight of the Palestinian Arabs, and while their fate hung in the balance no true and durable peace could be achieved in the Middle East.

65. Turning to the Commissioner-General's report, he paid tribute to the Commissioner-General for his dedication to his task and his understanding of the complex refugee problem. The Malaysian delegation considered education to be one of the most important aspects of UNRWA's programme. While it did not underestimate the importance of such other aspects as relief and health services and noted with satisfaction the results achieved in the latter sphere, it believed that for people who had been deprived of their homes, lands and means of livelihood, it was particularly important to ensure that their children were not robbed of their only hope, that of engaging in positive and constructive education. It was therefore most gratifying to note the increase of enrolment in schools and in vocational training.

66. The Agency's financial situation was a matter of grave concern to his delegation. The further deficit that UNRWA was likely to suffer owing to the increase of the refugee population, devaluation and inflation would seriously affect the programme and would consequently bring more misery and deprivation to a population which was already living far below the level tolerated by any decent modern society. Their legitimate needs must be maintained at all costs, and his delegation joined others in appealing to those who were more fortunate to come to the immediate assistance of the Agency.

67. In conclusion he emphasized that, despite the importance of UNRWA's work in solving the immediate problems of the refugees, it must be borne in mind that the Agency could only be regarded as temporary and that the ultimate objective must be that of restoring the

inalienable rights of the Palestinian Arabs and securing a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

68. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia) said that he had been involved with the Palestine refugee question personally even before it had been brought before the United Nations. Since he had discussed the political aspects of the matter in his statement at the 879th meeting, he would confine himself to its financial aspects.

69. The United States of America had been trying to find a solution to the question for many years and in the current emergency had, with the Soviet Union, played an important part in initiating the cease-fire resolution.

70. The United States representative at the forementioned meeting had called him a foreigner living on the bounty of the United States. However, even the United States Secretary of State had not been born in the country and he himself had spent over \$1 million in foreign currency in that country over the past 25 years.

71. He agreed that the United States contributed generously to the Agency. Arab States also, apart from their regular contributions to UNRWA, contributed large sums to relieve hardship to the refugees. That was a sacred duty—which they did not even advertise—to their Palestinian brothers whose plight was caused by the partition of Palestine and the recognition by the United States of Israel as a State Member of the United Nations, in contravention of the Palestinians' right to self-determination.

72. Draft resolution A/SPC/L.274 was commendable. He assumed that the United States had sponsored it because it was a major contributor to UNRWA and therefore felt it had the right to call upon other States to equal its generosity. Before submitting it officially, he wished to ask the United States representative to seek his Government's reaction to the following amendment:

"Calls upon the United States of America, which has recently involved itself very actively to find a lasting solution to the problem of the Middle East, to double its annual contribution to the budget of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Middle East considering that in a single day a decision was taken by the United States of America to send military aid to Israel amounting to \$2 billion."

It was true that the United States was already the highest contributor to the Agency but the next highest, the Scandinavian countries, acted strictly from a philanthropic urge and were not involved in the Middle East question like the United States. At the beginning of the recent war, \$200 million had been raised in the United States to enable Israel to buy arms, and American Jewry was now requesting a higher contribution from the Government. The United States involvement in the partition of Palestine was such that Israel's first President, Chaim Weizmann, had been smuggled out of the back door of the White House, thus showing that President Truman did not wish that participation to be too obvious.

73. He did not take issue with the Soviet Union because, although they had participated in the partition of Palestine in 1948—perhaps because they had thought that they could spread communism in the Middle East through Soviet immigration—no sooner had Israel been

established than the Zionists had turned their back on the Soviet Union which at that time was emerging from one of the costliest wars in history, on the pretext of humanitarian concern for the persecution of Jews in Europe. It was however illogical that the Palestinians should pay for the ill-treatment of Jews in Europe. The responsibility for the creation of the Middle East situation lay squarely on the shoulders of the United States, because of the policy of that President whose claim to fame was to have initiated the Marshall Plan, a so-called humanitarian enterprise, the real aim of which was to halt the influence of communism in the world.

74. Most Zionists did not practise their religion but played on the sentiments of poor Jews who had lost all in Nazi Germany. The Nazi persecutions had led successive German Chancellors to try to make amends by paying millions of Deutsche Mark to Israel, although the victims were all nationals of European countries. The German Democratic Republic did not recognize Israel but, although the Federal Republic of Germany had no responsibility for Israel's creation because it was still a defeated nation at the time and not a Member of the United Nations, it should share some of the burden of the United States because Israel would long since have come to its senses had it not been for the arms and other aid it supplied. The Arab States had tried to improve relations with the Federal Republic of Germany but when its Government had assured them that it would not send arms to Israel and had then succumbed to United States pressure to do so, they had been forced to break off relations with that country.

75. It might be said that the Soviet Union had only severed relations with Israel for some ulterior motive. But every country pursued its own interests. The United States said that they supported Israel in order to maintain the balance of power in the Middle East, when they were in fact responsible for bringing the Soviet Union to that region because of their support for Israel.

76. It had been suggested that Japan should also increase its contributions to UNRWA. However, since Japan was in no way involved in the Middle East question, there was no reason why it should do so unless it so desired. It might also be asked why the United Kingdom should not be asked for a larger contribution. It had, however, had an uneasy conscience since it had become almost insolvent after the Second World War.

77. On the other hand, were the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany to double their contributions to UNRWA, the Agency's financial problem would be solved. He therefore called for a direct answer from the delegations of the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany as to their Governments' reaction to the submission of the amendment he had already mentioned and a similar one concerning the Federal Republic of Germany.

78. Mr. BARROMI (Israel) said, in exercise of the right of reply, that at the previous meeting, in deference to the Chair, he had refrained from dealing with certain substantial aspects of the refugee question. He had been challenged on several occasions and consequently found it necessary to clarify his delegation's position and viewpoint, particularly with regard to the misleading references to paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III). It would be recalled that the second session of the General Assembly had convened in Paris in 1948 during the first Israeli-Arab war; the Arab inva-

sion of Israel had not yet been repulsed. The General Assembly had envisaged several possibilities such as repatriation, settlement, economic and social rehabilitation and payment of compensation. Repatriation was conditional on the willingness of the refugees "to live in peace with their neighbours".

79. It was worth while to remember that the Soviet Union had not supported that paragraph 11, and, in fact, had voted against the resolution as a whole. At that time, the Soviet position had been very different from its position today. On that occasion the Soviet Union representative, Mr. Malik, had asked why the State of Israel should be blamed for the existence of the Arab refugee problem and had said that in seeking to determine the responsibility for the existence of the problem of refugees, mention should be made of the outside forces which pursued their selfish interests for the monopoly exploitation of the oil wells of the Near and Middle East and the creation of military strategic bases.

80. The lack of willingness to consider any form of peaceful coexistence had been openly proclaimed by official Arab representatives and had become a stark, obdurate fact of life. For example, on 11 October 1949, the Egyptian Foreign Minister had declared that the Arab refugees returned intended to annihilate the State of Israel. At the refugee conference in Homs, in Syria, a resolution adopted on 15 July 1957 had stated that any discussion aimed at a solution of the Palestine problem not based on ensuring the refugees' right to annihilate Israel would be regarded as an act of treason. On 1 September 1961, the late President Nasser had said that if the Arab refugees returned to Israel, Israel would cease to exist. On 29 April 1966 the Lebanese Prime Minister had said that the day of the realization of the Arab hope for the return of the refugees to Palestine meant the liquidation of Israel.

81. The consequences of that policy were well known. The long history of strife and conflict left only one practical sensible approach, namely, the method of resettlement, rehabilitation and reintegration, all provided for by paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III) and subsequent resolutions. It should also be borne in mind that paragraph 11 was only one of 15. Paragraph 5 which was now conveniently ignored was of paramount importance: it called for the final settlement of all outstanding questions (including the refugee question) by negotiations between the parties. In the view of his Government, negotiation constituted the best hope for a solution of that problem and all other Middle East problems.

82. At the previous meeting, his remarks had been directed mainly to Syria. However, many of the subsequent statements had been from representatives of countries waging a political and military war against Israel from a comparatively safe distance. What prompted countries like Kuwait, Morocco and Bahrain to that relentless hostility? The destruction of Israel would bring them no benefit; they were large, prosperous and thriving countries, some of them fabulously rich. Their natural wealth was such that they did not need to toil, to till an arid soil, or to create agriculture and industry out of the desert. For them, oil royalties and loan interests were enough to ensure a leisurely life. Their countries were far away from the zone of military operations and had not experienced the horrors of war, whereas Israel had paid for the upholding of its liberty with the blood of hundreds of its sons.

83. The peoples of Kuwait, Libya, Morocco and Bahrain had not endured those ordeals, although their Governments shared responsibility for bringing them upon the peoples of the Middle East. It was often stated that those States had acted out of Arab solidarity. Did that mean that the principles of the Charter and the solemn obligation to respect sovereignty of other Member States and to preserve peace did not apply when Arab solidarity was invoked?

84. The Arabs claimed that Israel was an extraneous element among them. In other words, Israel's fault lay in the fact that it was not like them and should therefore be exterminated. Was that not a new version of racism, perhaps the most far-reaching and shameless since the days of Hitler? Racism was the enemy of mankind, the negation of humanity, and Israel was now confronted by a new and brutal embodiment of the enemies against which it had struggled throughout its history, in the form of Arab racism.

85. The Jews rejected racism; they knew, through the experience of more than 20 centuries, that racism brought ultimate destruction on those who preached and practised it. That was not what they wished for the Arab peoples. They invited them to awaken from the hallucinations of vengeful wrath and join Israel in the arts of peace and creation.

86. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he wished to bring the attention of the Committee to a radio dispatch from Teheran dated 12 November 1973 which stated that the General Commission of the International Conference of the Red Cross had rejected an Israeli allegation concerning the treatment by Syria of Israeli prisoners of war. The same dispatch stated that the Israeli authorities had submitted documents claiming that 26 soldiers had been shot dead in captivity, whereas the Israeli representative had fixed the number of dead prisoners at 28; *The New York Times* of 10 November 1973 had claimed that 12 Israelis had been shot; and the Prime Minister of Israel had claimed that a few Israeli prisoners had been shot. The Israelis would do well to co-ordinate and prepare their lies as they had done in the past. It was clear from a statement by Mrs. Meir that the Israelis were using Syrian prisoners of war in contravention of the Geneva Convention. That was a serious matter which Israel would regret. Mrs. Meir had also stated that Israel was distressed about its prisoners of war in Syria because of Syria's bad record in regard to its treatment of prisoners. Her allegation had been totally refuted by the most recent report of ICRC whose representatives had been able to visit Israeli prisoners of war twice a month and to talk freely with them. The same report had noted that the Israeli Government had refused to apply the fourth Geneva Convention² in the occupied territories, thus, repudiating an international convention which it had signed and ratified.

87. On 27 October 1973 an article in *Le Monde* had stated that Syrian prisoners of war had been used to guide Israeli soldiers through Syrian minefields during the battle for Mount Hermon. The number of Syrian prisoners of war murdered in that way was not yet known.

² Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.

88. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait) said, in exercise of the right of reply, that at the previous meeting the Israeli representative had dismissed his delegation's reply with a remark indicating his contempt for quotations. The Israeli representative had apparently revised his attitude and had subsequently treated the Committee to a number of quotations. However, the Committee would have noted that when his delegation had quoted from a primary source, it had given the source to enable the veracity of its statement to be checked, whereas the Israeli representative had not indicated the sources it had used. However, his delegation had recognized the source of one of those quotations as paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III). The representative of Israel had merely said that the paragraph referred to negotiations between the parties and had neglected to state that it continued "either directly or through the Palestine Conciliation Commission". The Arab States had co-operated with the Commission, but Israel had not.

89. The Committee had been told by the representative of Israel that the Jews rejected racism. While his delegation was inclined to believe that that was true, it did not believe that the Zionists and the Israelis rejected racism. Zionism was predicated on racial exclusiveness and Israeli society was based on structured racism with the white Jew and the first-class citizen, followed by the Oriental Jew and then by the black Jew to whom the law of return did not apply.

90. The representative of Israel had asked why Kuwait, which was so far from Israel, was so hostile to it. The answer was that Kuwait was hostile to any régime which trampled underfoot human dignity and fundamental rights. By the same token, Kuwait was far from South Africa but was still hostile to it. Kuwait was second to none in enforcing every resolution on South Africa because South Africa showed contempt for the dignity of man, and Kuwait was against Israel for the same reason.

91. In his book *Trial and Error*³ written after the rise of Israel, its first President had said he was certain that the world would judge the Jewish State by what it would do with the Arabs. Mr. Weizmann had been taken at his word and Israel had been judged in terms of what it had done to the Arabs of Palestine.

92. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, assured the representative of Israel that there was a distinct Palestinian people with its own identity. Accordingly, it, as all peoples, had the right to self-determination.

93. The quarrel of the Arab nations was not with Jews but with the exclusivist ideology of Zionism, which, for the past 50 years, had been seeking to gather all the Jews of the world in Israel with a view to territorial and economic expansion into the Arab world. Were Zionism a religious movement, it would have been welcomed in Palestine, the land of pilgrimage, but the Zionist leaders merely used their religion for economic and political ends. The Arab peoples sympathized with the Jews who were the victims of Zionist indoctrination.

94. His oral amendment to draft resolution A/SPC/L.274, was now being circulated (A/SPC/L.278). He proposed in a second amendment

³ New York, Harper and Brothers, 1949.

(A/SPC/L.279) the inclusion in the draft resolution of one more additional paragraph, reading:

“*Appeals to the Federal Republic of Germany to double its annual contribution to the budget of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East considering its deep interest in the Middle East by having extended massive financial aid to Israel for many years.*”

95. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Israeli representative's inclusion of Morocco when speaking of the Arab States hatred of Israel showed ignorance of Moroccan history. While Israel itself obviously hated the Arab world and demanded pity from other nations because of the treatment of the Jews from the time of Dreyfus to that of the Nazis, its representative seemed oblivious of Morocco's traditional tolerance of its Jewish community, which had been recognized by many historians, including Jewish historians. During the Second World War, not only had Moroccan soldiers fought with the allies to free the Jews from Nazi concentration camps, but also its King, Mohammed V, had resisted strong pressure from the Vichy régime to apply its anti-Jewish laws to the Jews in Morocco. Israel, however, did not show such tolerance towards its Arab inhabitants, whom it treated as second-class citizens.

96. Mr. BARROMI (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, expressed his gratitude to the representative of Kuwait for at least quoting the exact text of paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III), among his otherwise fanciful affirmations. That text supported Israel's position on agreement by negotiation. He refused to be drawn into legalistic arguments with the representative of Syria. He regretted to have had to use heart-shaking words: however, murder is not a numbers game. He charged Syria with the murder of 28 prisoners of war.

97. Mr. ALSHAKAR (Bahrain), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said his statement at the previous meeting had not been refuted and indeed could not be refuted by the representative of Israel. The accusation that Bahrain sought to wage war against Israel was obviously untrue, for Bahrain had a population of only 220,000. The Committee would not be fooled by false charges by the representative of Israel, which were merely Zionist propaganda against peaceful Arab States. The representative of Israel had proved by his statement that his country did not comply with United Nations resolutions.

98. Mr. POPOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, rejected utterly and refuted as unfounded the attempt by the representative of Israel to distort the position of the Soviet

Union with regard to the Arab people of Palestine. The remarks quoted by the representative of Israel showed that the merely refugee problem had been created not only by Israel but also by international monopolies and capitalism, and that remained the consistent position of his delegation. The Soviet Union's position had not changed since the Second World War. The USSR had always opposed aggression from the first days of the existence of the Soviet State. It had opposed aggression on the eve of the Second World War. During that war the Soviet Union had fought to protect the peoples of Europe, including the Jews, from Nazi aggressors, and it remained opposed to all acts of aggression today. However, the aggressors in the Middle East and those who ignored the relevant United Nations resolutions were, as everyone knew, not the Palestinian refugees but the Israelis, and the Soviet Union was therefore firmly on the side of the Arab peoples. The crux of the matter was whether Israel would or would not respect the United Nations resolutions and take note of world public opinion.

99. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait) said that paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III) contained the final decision of the United Nations with regard to the Palestinian refugees. Paragraph 5 of the same resolution called for “negotiations conducted either with the Conciliation Commission or directly, with a view to the final settlement of all questions” outstanding between the parties. To date, the Palestinian refugees had not been permitted to participate in those negotiations. The representative of Israel had spoken of “meaningful negotiations”, but had refused to answer his question whether that meant that Israel was now ready to negotiate with the representatives of the Palestinian people concerning the modalities for the implementation of United Nations decisions with regard to the rights of refugees. He would continue to put that question whenever he spoke.

100. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, reminded the Israeli representative that he had quoted from the report of ICRC, from the Israeli Prime Minister's own statement and from *Le Monde*, a most responsible newspaper. He noted that the Israeli representative had not attempted to rebut or discuss the substance of those quotations. Among a long list of 40 to 50 murders by the Zionists, he would mention only the blowing up by Jewish terrorists at Haifa in 1940 of the *S.S. Patria*, which had contained 268 illegal Jewish immigrants, and the assassination of the United Nations mediator, Count Bernadotte, by the Stern Gang in 1948.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.