

and security, not only in the Middle East but also throughout the world. The recent war in that region, which had nearly plunged the world into catastrophe, showed that the United Nations had no longer the right to let such provocation go unpunished.

50. The lies of the mass media propaganda financed by the vast resources of international zionism had so far hidden the true nature of the Palestinian problem, but the international community must no longer be deceived. Israel had always portrayed its blatant aggression in the international press, over which it had almost complete control, as the defence of a small country against a 100 million Arabs resolved to eliminate it. The so-called modern world failed to protest, or at best adopted formal resolutions which Israel cheerfully violated, while the Palestine refugees lived on a meagre charity. It must be realized that those people had been deprived of their land and property but not of their faith and national pride.

51. It was time that the United Nations recognized the errors it had committed under the influence of unscrupulous imperialism and zionism and put an end to the intolerable situation of the Palestine Arab refugees. From the moral and legal point of view, it was the duty of the United Nations to protect the fundamental rights of that people to self-determination and to help it to free itself from colonial domination and at last to live a normal life.

52. Mr. BARJUCH (Colombia) introducing his delegation's amendment (A/SPC/L.275) to draft resolution A/SPC/L.274, said that it hoped that the additional operative paragraph might provide an alternative solution to overcome the deficit in UNRWA's budget, since the generous increase in contributions to the Agency had not kept pace with the effects of inflation and the devaluation of the dollar.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.

886th meeting

Wednesday, 14 November 1973, at 11.45 a.m.

President: Mr. Károly SZARKA (Hungary).

A/SPC/SR.886

AGENDA ITEM 43

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (*continued*) (A/SPC/162, A/SPC/164, A/SPC/L.273-275, A/SPC/L.276/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.277, A/SPC/L.278/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.279/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.280):

- (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 (*concluded*)

1. Mr. ASSUMPCÃO DE ARAUJO (Brazil) paid tribute to the dedication of the Commissioner-General and staff of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, who provided essential services for more than 1.5 million people. His delegation had always supported humanitarian resolutions, while being aware of the political causes and implications of the problem. In accordance with that constructive position, his Government could not fail to join, to the limit of its possibilities, in all relief efforts to improve the living conditions of the Palestinian refugees; thus, the previous year, the Brazilian Ministry for External Relations had obtained from several sources in Brazil donations of medicines which were delivered to the Agency through the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

2. His delegation agreed entirely with the view expressed in paragraph 22 of the report of the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA (A/9231); it would

be tragic if UNRWA was forced, owing to a lack of funds, to reduce its assistance to the refugees for, under the prevailing circumstances, it was absolutely indispensable. Member States had a duty to ensure that the goals of UNRWA's programmes were achieved. For its part, the Brazilian Government pledged a contribution of \$10,000.

3. Mr. HAMMAD (United Arab Emirates) said that UNRWA and the Working Group deserved the full support of the international community. The United Nations had a special responsibility towards the Palestinian refugees and should ensure that the warning given by the Commissioner-General that certain services to the refugees might be reduced did not become a reality.

4. The Committee should not turn its attention from the true nature of the refugee problem, which was essentially political, and concentrate, as it had done to date, on its humanitarian and financial aspects, for that attitude had not contributed at all to the elimination of the factors that had caused and were prolonging the problem. In any case, for his delegation, the term "humanitarian needs" meant the right to nationhood, the right to ancestral homeland, the right to self-determination and the right to live in honour and dignity.

5. The Palestine problem was characterized by three processes: deprivation, the claiming of rights and the making of decisions. The process of deprivation could be described as the application by certain participants in the world arena, for selfish and unjust objectives, of policies which had resulted in the expulsion of the people of Palestine from their homeland and their replacement by Zionist Jews. All knew of the role played by the United Kingdom, the United States of America, the United Nations and, last but not least, the Zionist

movement and its incarnation, Israel, in that respect. The Palestinian Arabs, having been expelled from their homeland and denied repatriation by Israel, were deprived of their homes and property and their right to self-determination or, in other words, of almost all their rights as human beings.

6. During and as a result of that process, the Palestinians had submitted claims to various authorities concerning the lawfulness of the changes imposed on them and of the deprivations they had suffered, in the hope of securing their inherent right to exist as a people and of redressing the injustices inflicted upon them. They claimed the right to existence, the right of return to their homeland, the right to property—all their inalienable rights, including the right of self-determination. One important point in that respect, particularly with regard to the response to those claims point in that respect, particularly with regard to the response to those claims by Israel and other countries, was that there was no central authority capable of using force in support of approval by the world community of any or all of those claims.

7. The process of making decisions emanated from the international community, namely the United Nations, regional organizations, groups of States, non-governmental organizations concerned with justice and, of course, the people of Palestine itself. Their general objectives were to maintain a minimum of public order in the world community; to secure a peaceful and just solution to the Palestine problem; to secure for the people of Palestine, as for the other peoples of the world, its inalienable rights, including the right to self-determination; and to apply the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter and international law regarding the territorial integrity of States and the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force.

8. In order to devise a more rational policy for the solution of the problem, it was necessary to clarify the goals, to study the trends apparent in past decisions and the factors affecting them and to suggest alternatives. With regard to goals, all States had demonstrated, on the occasion of Israel's acts of aggression in 1956, 1967 and 1973, their concern for the maintenance of international peace and security; all, except for Israel and certain other States, wanted a minimum of public order and respect for the decisions of the various organs of the international organizations. Israel's attitude was clear from its representative's statements in the Security Council concerning the Council's decisions.

9. He referred next to the decisions of the international community with respect to the various types of claim. The right of the Palestinian refugees to existence was a natural right. It was, therefore, natural that the United Nations, which had acquiesced in their expulsion as a result of the machinations of certain States, should ensure, through its creation of UNRWA, that assistance was provided to the refugees who had been deprived of the means of subsistence. It was noteworthy that Israel had been the only State to abstain from voting on the resolution on UNRWA adopted at the previous session.

10. The right of return claimed by the Palestinian refugees was in conformity with article 13, paragraph 2, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and had also been proclaimed in paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III) and reaffirmed at

each successive session. Further, the World Conference of Christians for Palestine had formally denounced the idea that the problems of the Middle East could be solved by any national or international policies which contradicted the rights of the Palestinian people, and especially its essential right to return to its country.

11. Having been forcibly expelled and exiled, the Palestinian refugees were deprived of the right to their own property and the income therefrom, a right which was proclaimed in article 17 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and was in conformity with man's instinctive attachment to property. That right had been both explicitly and implicitly recognized by the General Assembly in paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III) and had been reaffirmed year by year. It was well known that, prior to the expiry of the British Mandate, the Palestinians had owned 92 per cent of the land in Palestine as well as houses, offices, factories and other property which had been taken from them by Israel.

12. The principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples was embodied in Articles 1 and 55 of the United Nations Charter and had been reaffirmed in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States and in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. The Palestinians were no exception, and their rights in that respect had further been expressly recognized in various General Assembly resolutions, including resolution 2963 E (XXVII), and in paragraph 5 of the resolution adopted on 29 May 1973 by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU; in addition, the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries had decided in September 1973 to support the struggle to recover the national rights of the Arab people of Palestine and had emphasized that the restitution of those rights was a fundamental prerequisite for a just and lasting peace. Various non-governmental organizations had also recognized those rights, including the World Council of Churches, which in 1969 had called upon the churches of the world to use their influence towards a just solution, involving necessarily the recognition of the rights of the Palestinians, the World Conference of Christians for Palestine and the Second Conference of the Afro-Asian Islamic Organization. Future decision-makers, namely, the participants of the World Youth Assembly, held in New York in July 1970, had submitted a message to the General Assembly at the twenty-fifth session expressing "their solidarity with the struggle of the Palestinian people" and had demanded "the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied territories [and] the restoration of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination . . .".¹ Last and most important was the decision of the people of Palestine themselves, through the resistance movements, to wage a struggle for the restoration of their rights, a struggle which had been recognized by the various aforementioned organizations.

13. If followed from those decisions that the international community recognized and supported the claims of the Palestinians, recognized the indivisibility of those claims; was becoming increasingly aware of the need to satisfy those aspirations; recognized the injus-

¹ *World Youth Assembly*, document 56/WYA/P/10, p. 6.

tice inflicted upon the people of Palestine and was determined to redress it; and acknowledged the link between the establishment of a just and durable peace in the Middle East and the restoration of the rights of the people of Palestine. However, those decisions remained a dead letter because Israel refused to comply with them, in defiance of the will of the international community and the fundamental principles on which it was based and because certain States were unwilling to utilize the machinery available to compel compliance with the decisions taken by the international community.

14. There were three policy alternatives for the future. One would be to continue past practice, namely the adoption of resolutions which were not implemented, a situation which Israel would not fail to interpret as licence to pursue its policies of aggression and expansion. The second would require a change of attitude on the part of certain Powers which could exert pressure to bring about the implementation of those resolutions. The third and final alternative would be the realization of the vision of which the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization had spoken at the 882nd meeting, namely, the establishment of a democratic, secular and pluralistic State in Palestine comprising both Jews and Arabs as equal citizens.

15. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait) said that he had discerned in all statements a conviction which could be couched in the following terms: the question of the Palestine refugees could not be abstracted from the larger question of the Palestinian people, the assistance provided to Palestinian refugees could only be a palliative and the humanitarian attitude of relief was by no means a final answer to the refugee problem.

16. The general debate had touched upon four distinct but interrelated problems: (1) the problem of the Palestinian refugees, which was the item before the Committee; (2) the problem of the Palestinian people, their plight and their destiny; (3) the problem of relations between Israel and the Arab States, commonly referred to as the situation in the Middle East; and (4) the problem of the nature and conduct of the Israeli régime.

17. Although the first and third problems were being debated in United Nations bodies, neither the second nor the fourth appeared on the agenda of any United Nations body. However, the second and the fourth problems were the central ones and the others were only consequences of them.

18. In order fully to comprehend the Palestinian question, a number of facts should be born in mind. First, although other peoples had experienced foreign occupation, subjugation or exile, the Palestinians were the only ones who had lived through all of those and were still experiencing one or another of them. Secondly, the multiple hardships affecting the Palestinian people were the result of the action or the inaction of the organized international community, which had, however, been established to satisfy the aspirations of mankind for justice, equity, peace and respect for human rights. Thirdly, it was during the era of decolonization that the Palestinian people had become the victims of a process of colonization made possible by the deeds and the inaction of the United Nations, which had presided over the process of decolonization elsewhere. In the age of rising expectations, the people of Palestine had been delivered nothing but rising frustrations.

Fourthly, the tragedy of the Palestinian people was not a quirk of fate: it was the inevitable consequence of an ideology and a movement and, later, of the conduct of a State. It was not the work of blind forces of nature, but of a conscious will that was a testimony to man's inhumanity to man. The meeting of 200 Jews at Basel in 1897 to establish the Zionist movement, which was to devote itself to the creation of a *Judenstaat* in a land occupied by non-Jews, had spelt the beginning of the tragedy of the people of Palestine. Fifthly, the Palestinians had remained the victims of that tragedy in spite of solemn promises by the international community for half a century assuring them that such would not be their fate. According to the Balfour Declaration nothing should have been done to prejudice the civil and religious rights of the non-Jewish communities in Palestine². Analogous safeguard clauses had been included in the text of the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine, placing Palestine under British administration, namely in articles 2, 6 and 9 in particular.³ Those safeguard clauses had also been included in the recommendation concerning the partition of Palestine adopted on 29 November 1947 by the General Assembly (resolution 181 A (II)). The United Kingdom Government, the League of Nations and the United Nations each had solemnly promised in turn to guarantee the rights of the Palestinians. What had they done to enforce that guarantee? It was no wonder that the Palestinian people felt that they had been betrayed and that they were the victims not only of the Zionists but also of the international community. What Balfour had stated on 11 August 1919—his remarks were contained in *Documents on British Foreign Policy, 1919-1939*, volume IV, page 345—could be said of the United Nations: the Organization had made no promise concerning the Palestinians which it did not intend to violate.

19. It was no wonder that some Palestinians had drawn the conclusion that they could safeguard their rights more effectively not by staying within the pale of the law, but by going outside it. The last point to be remembered was that the Palestinians had never submitted to the *fait accompli*; they had never surrendered their rights. From 1920 to 1948, until their displacement, they had waged their war of liberation almost continuously. The Peel Commission, sent to Palestine in 1937 by the United Kingdom Government to find out the causes of the disturbances which had broken out there, had concluded that the problems had been caused by the desire of the Palestinians for national independence and the hatred and fear of the establishment of the Jewish national home, and that in all the disorders the two causes had always been inextricably linked together. After 1948 the struggle of the Palestinians for liberation had taken a new form, but they had never surrendered their right nor had they ceased to defend their dignity. Israel could not point to a single group which had ever accepted as legitimate the situation established in Palestine by force.

20. It was lamentable that, contrary to the South African régime, Zionism and Israel had never been the subject of a thorough study, for Israel represented in south-west Asia the same assault on human dignity that *apartheid* represented in southern Africa. He cited as proof an interview with David Ben-Gurion in *The*

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Supplement No. 11*, vol. 11, annex 19.

³ *Ibid.*, annex 20.

Jerusalem Post of 23 June 1969 (weekly overseas edition) in which Mr. Ben-Gurion said that he had told the Prime Minister of the South African Government that if the white settlers had done in South Africa what the Jews had done in Palestine they would have been spared considerable troubles, a point with which the Prime Minister had agreed.

21. In his book *Experiences*⁴, Arnold Toynbee had observed that although the modern era had been marked by higher sensitivity to the value of human life, it had also been characterized by mass movements to destroy human life and dignity. Among those he cited genocide, of which nazism was the supreme illustration, and *apartheid*, as applied by the South African Government. Between those two movements he placed eviction, of which zionism was the supreme illustration.

22. In respect of both the expulsion of the non-Jewish population from Palestine and the importation into Palestine of Jews from foreign countries, Israel was the antithesis of the ideal of the founders of the United Nations and of the spirit of General Assembly resolution 181 (II), which had given birth to the country. Under that resolution, calling for the partition of Palestine, Israel was supposed to permit the Arabs to stay and to safeguard their rights; it was not envisaged as a place for the resettlement of Jews from all over the world. Neither the expulsion of the Palestinian Arabs nor the importation of Jews from foreign countries corresponded to the intentions of the Members of the Organization which had created Israel as a State. In view of the historic nature of the current phase of the life of the Middle East, it was important that those facts should be kept in mind.

23. He wished to make two further remarks. First, it would be futile to try to contrive arrangements between States that failed to take account of the aspirations of the Palestinians and was predicated on an abridgement of their rights, in particular the right to self-determination repeatedly affirmed by the international community. His second remark had to do with the syndrome of self-pity and self-righteous arrogance manifested by the Israeli leaders. At one moment they were proclaiming the suffering the Jews had endured in the past and at another they were boasting about what they had achieved. Self-centred and imbued with a feeling of superiority, Israel must get what it needed, even at the expense of the rights of others, for Israel could not be treated like other States but believed that special rules should be applied to it. Israel could no longer act arrogantly and fool the rest of the world by playing on the theme of self-pity. It now stood isolated as never before. It could no longer count on its superiority in the Middle East for, on the one hand, the inferiority of the other countries in the region was a thing of the past and, on the other hand, it owed its superiority to others.

24. If the situation led Israel to rid itself of the syndrome which characterized it, it might be possible to arrive at a solution that respected the rights of both the Palestinians and the Jews. The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization had suggested in his statement (882nd meeting) what that solution might be—a solution that also he himself had contemplated at the twenty-fifth session (737th meeting). That solution

would make it possible to alter the irreconcilable nature of extreme positions. Indigenous Arabs, both Moslem and Christian, and Jews, whether indigenous or not, should live together in Palestine in a State to which they would all equally belong and which would belong to all of them equally. They should dedicate themselves, not to excluding one another, but to working together as human beings linked by bonds of humanity transcending religious, linguistic, racial and national differences. A State should be created in Palestine in which all those human beings would work together. That solution would symbolize the triumph of humanity over factionalism and the triumph of vision over obstacles that seemed insurmountable. It would enable the Arabs to renew what had always been their tradition of tolerance. It would also enable Jews living outside Israel to renew their tradition of pluralism, in which their salvation lay. All that the Israelis had to lose was something that had never belonged to them.

25. In conclusion, he paid a tribute to the Commissioner-General and his staff for the devotion they had shown in the relief work for the Palestinian refugees. He also paid a tribute to the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA and its Chairman. He had not seen among the draft resolutions circulated any that called for the renewal of that Working Group's mandate. He wished to express his delegation's appreciation to the Working Group for the efforts it had made for the financing of UNRWA.

26. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania), supported by Mr. SALJUQI (Afghanistan), Mr. BEAVOGUI (Guinea) and Mr. N'DIAYE (Senegal), said that the statement by the representative of Kuwait contained elements that were essential for understanding the problem of the Palestine refugees and therefore requested that the statement should be reproduced *in extenso* and circulated to the members of the Committee.

27. The CHAIRMAN recalled that on 21 September 1973, at its 2123rd plenary meeting, the General Assembly had decided to authorize the Special Political Committee to have transcriptions of the debates of specific meetings, if a request was made to that effect. If there were no objections he would take it that the Committee decided to have a transcription made of the statement by the representative of Kuwait.

*It was so decided.*⁵

28. Sir John RENNIE (Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East) said he wished first of all to thank the delegations that had expressed appreciation of the work of UNRWA.

29. He believed that the report (A/9013) and his statement (877th meeting) conveyed the facts of the situation adequately, but he would be glad to furnish additional information to any delegation that required it.

30. He had already made plain how very serious the financial situation of UNRWA was and how drastic the consequences of reductions in its services might be for the refugees and for the host Governments and, he believed, for the situation in the Middle East generally. What he had said had been echoed by a number of

⁴ London, Oxford University Press, 1969.

⁵ The full text of the statement was subsequently circulated in document A/SPC/PV.886.

speakers, and notably by the Chairman of the Working Group (*ibid.*). Like the representative of Kuwait, he had noted that there was no draft resolution about the Working Group and he wondered whether that indicated some disillusionment about the effectiveness of appeals for voluntary contributions, despite the insistence there had been on the continuation of financing in that way. There were, however, amendments to the draft resolution A/SPC/L.274 that seemed to suggest that the General Assembly was going to assume the role of the Working Group in soliciting contributions from individual Governments. It was not for him but for the Committee to express a view on the effectiveness of that approach and on whether it would be successful or not, but the point was no doubt one that the Committee would take into consideration when deciding on the amendments.

31. In that connexion, he referred to the Colombian amendment (A/SPC/L.275) proposing that part of the cost of the Agency should be transferred to the regular budget of the United Nations. As he had already made clear (877th meeting), he believed that, for a variety of reasons, it would be preferable to have the international staff financed by the United Nations. There were good precedents and, at least, leaving aside any objections of principle, that was a means of financing from the regular budget that would be easily regulated. The Colombian proposal was rather open-ended in that it would be a percentage of the total budget of the United Nations. Unless the whole of the budget of UNRWA was examined by the institutions of the United Nations, there would be no control over the amount contributed by the United Nations budget. There would probably be practical and technical difficulties in having the whole of the Agency's budget examined by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee. There would be no such difficulty, of course, in having an administrative budget for the international staff so examined.

32. He sought the Committee's guidance on what course he should follow if voluntary contributions did not provide sufficient funds to maintain the Agency's programmes. He wished to repeat that, in his opinion, decisions of such political consequence ought to be made on a governmental level. So far, while there had been much encouragement for the Agency's work, much concern had been expressed about the financial situation, some generous contributions had already been announced in the Committee and there had been appeals for more contributions, he had not received any guidance on the course he should follow.

33. In those circumstances he proposed to consult the Secretary-General and possibly to make known to the Committee or to the General Assembly in some appropriate manner what contingency plans he intended to make in order to meet such an eventuality.

34. Mr. BARROMI (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the statements of the representatives of Iraq and Algeria at the previous meeting and the statements just made by the representatives of the United Arab Emirates and Kuwait had proved most disappointing. He reiterated that the recent hostilities had started with a premeditated attack by Syria and Egypt, supported by other Arab countries. He wondered whether the time was not ripe for a fresh approach in a spirit of understanding and conciliation.

Unfortunately the representative of Iraq had made no constructive proposal but had merely repeated the usual implausible allegations. For example, according to him the Iraqi Jews who had fled from Iraq had not done so because of such events as the hanging in public of several of their co-religionists, but because of Zionist cajoling. The representative of Iraq worked hard to dub the Jews foreign invaders in their ancient land, pretending that Abraham and Moses never existed and that the splendour of the Kingdoms of David and of Solomon were no doubt a figment of the imagination.

35. He noted that the representative of Kuwait often quoted Theodor Herzl, who had been a visionary and a man of action, like Thomas Jefferson, Giuseppe Mazzini or Benito Juárez. The painstaking effort of the representative of Kuwait to dig into the letters or diaries of Herzl would not detract from the historical role of Herzl and the Zionist movement: the age-long striving for national restoration and independence. There lay the best guarantee of Israel's eternal destiny. The representative of Kuwait had quoted Arnold Toynbee, whose views might not be infallible if he was judged by what he had said of the black races which, according to him, had not contributed to any civilization.⁶ Would the representative of Kuwait subscribe to such a statement?

36. However, he would abstain from polemics and stick to the facts. The facts were that the Arab refugee problem was a result of the aggression launched by the Arab States immediately after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 181 (II), known as the "partition resolution", even before the expiration of the British Mandate. Already on 16 February 1948, the United Nations Palestine Commission had, in its report to the Security Council,⁷ denounced the violation of the United Nations resolution. Disregarding the appeal for co-operation throughout the Middle East which the new State of Israel had issued in its Declaration of Independence of 14 May 1948, the Arabs had spoken of a war of extermination and called on the Palestinians to take refuge in the neighbouring countries. The Arabs themselves and others had made no secret of those facts. Since then, as the Research Group for European Migration Problems had stated in its bulletin for January-March 1957, the Arab countries had not tried to come to the help of the refugees or to absorb them in order to use such a situation for political ends.

37. With regard to the right of the Palestinians to self-determination, he pointed out that the vicissitudes of history had brought two peoples in subsequent times to the land of the Bible. The Jews had created in their ancestral homelands a great civilization, while the Arabs had only conquered the same territory by the sword in the 7th century A.D., not by right but by might, until they were defeated by new conquerors. In 1948, at the end of the British Mandate, they had again attempted to seize that territory by force, in defiance of the United Nations. Wars and strife had ensued. In 1973, after more fighting, should the task of the United Nations be to give a blessing to terrorist organizations, or to proposals to tear away parts of Israel's territory and to destroy it slice by slice? Between Iraq and the Mediterranean Sea there was ample room for both Is-

⁶ *A Study of History* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1962), vol. 1, p. 233.

⁷ *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, Special Supplement No. 2, document S/676.*

rael and an Arab State in full dignity and self-determination. In Israel itself the Jewish majority and the Arab minority coexisted peacefully in the framework of a democratic régime. The political and human problems, which were leftovers of the past, as well as the question of secure and recognized borders could be solved there and then.

38. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said he thought the Israeli delegation was careless in its use of quotations. In that connexion he noted that the Israeli representative, having heard him quote Arnold Toynbee, had quite unreasonably concluded that he approved of everything that author had said. Furthermore, the Israeli representative had accused him of distorting the sense of the passages he quoted without bringing any proof in support. He would, if the Chairman saw no objection, circulate to members of the Committee the full text of the passages from which he had drawn his quotations.

39. With regard to the offer of peace made in the Declaration of Independence of the State of Israel of 14 May 1948, mentioned by the representative of Israel, he would remind that representative that at that date the Israelis, who were past masters in the art of making false promises, had already driven out 300,000 Palestinians.

40. The Israeli representative had referred to Palestine as "the ancestral land of the Jewish people", but long before the Hebrew people had settled there, Palestine had been inhabited by other peoples, and after the Diaspora, the Jewish presence in Palestine had been in the form of small groups only and had been intermittent. A large proportion of modern Jews were descended from converts to Judaism. Palestinians on the other hand were the product of a mixture of various ethnic groups, including Hebrews, who had lived in Palestine. The Arab conquerors of the 7th century were only one of those ethnic elements, and the only Arab feature that Palestinians, like the Moroccans, Algerians and others, had in common was the language.

41. He would ask the Israeli representative, who had blamed the Arab conquerors of the 7th century for having established themselves by force, whether the Zionist colonists had come armed with an olive branch.

42. The future, as the Arabs wanted it, was founded on the coexistence of Jews and Arabs in a country that they held in common, whereas the Israeli ideal was that of an alien occupier dominating the indigenous inhabitants. He would ask which of those two situations would come closer to the ideal of the United Nations.

43. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq) said that he wished to exercise the right of reply because of the constant lies being uttered by the Israeli representative. First of all, the Arab armies had invaded the State of Israel when it was founded because six months before the end of the British Mandate Jewish terrorist organizations, the Haganah and the Irgun, were occupying towns and villages. In a work published in 1964, *Rebirth and Destiny of Israel*,⁸ David Ben-Gurion had said that at the birth of Israel, its territory had been almost cleared of Arabs, an expression which was reminiscent of the word *judenrein* which Hitler favoured. In fact, before the first Arab soldier had entered Israel, the number of Palestinian refugees had already amounted to 300,000.

44. Despite the claims made by Israel, and as was borne out by the broadcast communiqués recorded at the time and preserved in the British Museum, the Arab countries had encouraged the Palestinians to remain in their own country. They had fled because of the massacres of which many of them had been the victims.

45. The Israeli representative had taken him to task for not making any constructive proposals. Yet he had asked the Jewish rulers for a change of attitude and heart, calling on them to renounce the "Law of Return", racism and the exclusive right they claimed to decide who could live in Palestine.

46. With regard to the immigration of Iraqi Jews, he pointed out that Israel was particularly vindictive against Iraq because it had become obsessed with the idea that that country should accept the Palestinians in exchange for Iraqi Jews. As for the "hangings", he would point out that those concerned had been spies, and that there were numerous precedents for such cases to which Israel had not objected, for example the sentencing and execution of the Rosenbergs, who were Jewish citizens whom the Government of the United States of America had believed to be guilty of espionage. Nor did Israel show indignation at the hangings which had taken place in South Africa, a country with which it maintained excellent relations.

47. He would point out that he had not said that Iraqi Jews had been persuaded to leave, but that they had been forced to do so through threats and acts of terror. Only such acts could have made them leave, for, as Iraqi Jews who had emigrated to Israel had confirmed, Jews and Arabs lived peacefully side by side in Iraq. Those immigrants regretted that they had left a comfortable life in Iraq to live in wretched conditions in Israel reserved by the Zionist State for Sephardic Jews, on whom were imposed all the hard tasks necessitated by the development of the country and whose children were even deprived of an education.

48. Mr. BARROMI (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that Iraq, which displayed executioners on television, could hardly speak of human rights. It was indeed ludicrous to assert that Jews had bombed their own synagogues and confiscated their own property. The history of Iraqi persecution was amply documented. In his researches the Iraqi representative might have discovered that in a 1950 copy of the *New York Herald Tribune*, Mr. Kenneth Bilby had said that the Arab exodus had been encouraged by many Arab leaders such as the pro-Nazi Mufti of Jerusalem and by the Arab Higher Committee for Palestine.

49. With regard to battles and conquests which took place before Israel's independence on 14 May 1948, he referred to his previous statement which had stressed that from November 1947 until the end of the British Mandate the Arab States, in co-operation with some Arab leaders in Palestine, plunged the country in chaos and turmoil and that Arab armies followed this up by outright invasion, in some places even before the expiration of the Mandate.

50. Mr. TALEB (Algeria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Israeli representative had not refuted the facts adduced by the Algerian delegation in its statement at the previous meeting. One truth in particular had stood out clearly despite Zionist propaganda: the collusion between the racist and minority

⁸ New York, Philosophical Library, 1954.

régime of Israel, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. He would confine himself to quoting the declaration on the struggle for national liberation, made at the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, that

“the case of Palestine, where Zionist settler-colonialism has taken the form of a systematic uprooting of the Palestinian people from their homeland and represents a very serious threat to their survival as a nation, is exactly the same as the situation in southern Africa, where racist segregationist minorities use the same method of colonial domination and exploitation pursuant to the requirements of a single imperialist strategy” (see A/9330).

51. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, wished to point out to the representative of Israel that Iraq had long been a member of the Commission on Human Rights and that the number of votes

it received when it was a candidate amply refuted the Israeli representative's allegations. With regard to the bombs placed in the synagogues, a distinction should be drawn between Jews and Zionists. Zionism thrived on anti-Semitism, as had been shown by certain non-Zionist Jews, in particular Mr. A. Rabinovich, professor at Montreal University, who had said that Ben-Gurion had had the idea of sending Jews into Arab countries to cause provocation there. Zionism would like to represent world Jewry, but it had neither the right nor the ability to do so.

52. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had ended its general debate on the question of UNRWA. In accordance with the decision taken at the preceding meeting, it would at the afternoon meeting the same day resume its debate on the question of *apartheid*. Draft resolutions on the question of UNRWA would be voted on subsequently.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

887th meeting

Wednesday, 14 November 1973, at 3.20 p.m.

President: Mr. Károly SZARKA (Hungary).

A/SPC/SR.887

AGENDA ITEM 42

Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa (continued)* (A/9160, A/9188, A/SPC/160, A/SPC/161, A/SPC/L.269, A/SPC/L.271, A/SPC/L.281, A/SPC/L.282/Rev.1, A/SPC/L.283):

- (a) Reports of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/9022, A/9168, A/9169 and Corr.1, A/9180);
- (b) Reports of the Secretary-General (A/9165, A/9235)

1. Mr. RYDBECK (Sweden), Chairman of the Committee of Trustees of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, introducing the report of the Committee of Trustees (A/9235, annex), said that the responsibility of that Committee was to decide on the grants to be made to appropriate bodies for humanitarian and legal assistance to the victims of *apartheid* and racial discrimination in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia, to encourage contributions to the Fund and to facilitate co-ordination of the activities of voluntary agencies engaged in such assistance. It was deplorable that the Fund was still needed, but until other United Nations bodies found a solution to the problem in South Africa, it was a positive demonstration of Member States' deep concern over the situation.

2. The Committee of Trustees took seriously its duty to assure that the grants were used strictly for humanitarian purposes and required adequate reports, accounts and audited statements from the organizations concerned. He had again visited some of them during the past year and had satisfied himself that the grants were used for the purposes intended. The Committee was gratified by the growing awareness that the

repression in southern Africa called for increased humanitarian assistance. During the past year there had been several new contributors and some contributions had increased. The Committee of Trustees wished to express its appreciation to donor Governments and to those which had pledged contributions. It appealed to the richer States to continue to increase their contributions and welcomed even small contributions from States with financial difficulties as evidence of their support.

3. Although a number of political prisoners had recently completed their sentences, many of them had been subjected to banning and house-arrest orders or deported to impoverished reserves or resettlement camps. There had also been several new trials during the past year, and the costs of legal assistance had risen substantially. Many African workers had been persecuted as the result of the strikes which had culminated in the Carletonville massacre in September 1973. Many students, white and black, had been served with banning orders for their activities against *apartheid*, and scores of African students had been expelled from colleges and could not obtain admission to any other educational institution in South Africa.

4. In Namibia hundreds of persons had been arrested because of their opposition to the Bantustan scheme, and many students who had been expelled for demonstrating in support of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971 could only continue their education through expensive correspondence courses. Families of Namibians imprisoned on Robben Island needed assistance, especially to enable them to travel the long distance to visit the prisoners.

5. In Southern Rhodesia the illegal régime was increasing repression against the members of the African

* Resumed from the 875th meeting.