



CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 36: United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East: (a) Report of the Commissioner-General; (b) Report of the Secretary-General Report of the Special Political Committee . . . . .	1
--	---

*President:* Miss Angie E. BROOKS (Liberia).

**AGENDA ITEM 36**

**United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine  
Refugees in the Near East:**

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

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE  
(A/7839)

1. Mr. AKONGO (Uganda), Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee: I present on behalf of the Special Political Committee its report on agenda item 36 [A/7839]. The Committee recommends three draft resolutions for adoption by the General Assembly and these are set out in paragraph 13 of its report.

*Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Special Political Committee.*

2. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Somalia on a point of order.

3. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): Before the General Assembly proceeds to a vote on the draft resolutions contained in paragraph 13 of the report of the Special Political Committee [A/7839], I should like to refer to the question of the majority required for the adoption of draft resolution B.

4. In the view of my delegation, draft resolution B does not deal with any of the matters listed in Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter and therefore requires only a simple majority for adoption. I would therefore request the President to put the following motion to the vote before we vote upon that draft resolution:

“Draft resolution B recommended by the Special Political Committee (A/7839, para. 13) comes within the category of ‘other questions’ referred to in Article 18, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the United Nations, on which decisions shall be made by a majority of the

Members present and voting. Therefore, the voting on draft resolution B will be in accordance with rule 87 of the rules of procedure.”

5. The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform the representative of Somalia that we shall deal with his motion when we come to vote on draft resolution B. I shall now call on the representatives who wish to explain their vote.

6. Mr. ROUAMPA (Upper Volta) (*translated from French*): The nature of my explanation of vote will certainly be linked with the suggestion which the representative Somalia has just made. My delegation which, at the time the vote was taken in Committee on the three draft resolutions (A, B and C) that are before us [A/7838, para. 13], did not have occasion to take part in the discussion, would like to explain in this plenary meeting the principles which will govern the vote it will cast on these three draft resolutions.

7. In his statement at the 1568th meeting on 26 September 1967, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Upper Volta said:

“As to the question of the Middle East, my delegation strongly urges the parties to that conflict to work out rational solutions to the following problems: the recognition of Israel’s right to exist; the reintegration of the refugees . . .” [1568th meeting, para. 111.]

8. Likewise, at the 1781st meeting, on 7 October last, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Upper Volta said:

“In the Middle East the situation is deteriorating from day to day. It is to be feared that the violations of the cease-fire line on both sides, which are moreover inevitable in the present circumstances, are leading the parties to a new and violent confrontation; hence the need to find a just and lasting solution to this conflict.

“My delegation is of the opinion that the Security Council resolution [242 (1967)], of 22 November 1967 is an adequate basis for settlement of the conflict in the Middle East and that the differences to which its interpretation may give rise . . . should not lead the parties to reject it. Starting with the idea that all the States in the region have the right to exist and that the territorial integrity of each must be respected, many compromises can be found for the other problems.” [1781st meeting, paras. 61 and 62.]

9. My delegation thought it appropriate to begin with these two quotations, because it believes that these few words place the question with which we are now dealing, namely the report of the Special Political Committee on the

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East [A/7834], in its proper context. There are thus four principles which will determine the vote of my delegation.

10. First, the Government of Upper Volta recognizes the State of Israel, a sovereign State, a Member of our Organization. It also recognizes the legitimate rights of the peoples of Palestine. Resolutions set out these rights. Among the draft resolutions on which the Assembly will have to take a decision in a few moments are the draft submitted by the United States and draft resolution C, submitted in the same spirit by a number of countries, including several Scandinavian countries.

11. Secondly, draft resolution B deals only with the rights of the people of Palestine, without referring to the equally inalienable rights of Israel.

12. Thirdly, the fate of the refugees, which has always been a matter of concern to my Government, will hardly be alleviated by the adoption of a resolution the purpose of which is to refer to the Security Council a problem which is undoubtedly serious and has its origin directly in the Middle East conflict but which is the subject of a number of negotiations, talks and contacts at the international level.

13. Fourthly, my Government considers that an equitable solution of the refugee problem is necessarily linked with an equitable solution of the Middle East conflict. It is in this context that it might be possible to find a solution to the refugee problem on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967.

14. It is in the light of these explanatory considerations that my delegation will at the appropriate time cast its vote on each of the three draft resolutions which have been submitted to us.

15. In conclusion, my delegation understands and sympathizes with the anxieties and the appalling plight of the refugees in this region, although it has never been in a position or had the necessary international and diplomatic influence to propose a solution to this problem. However, it reaffirms that faced with a problem such as that of the Palestine refugees in the Near East, it could not agree to the consideration of a number of highly political issues on which other meetings of a different kind might be arranged.

16. Mr. DUSOMU JOHNSON (Liberia): I had proposed to speak on the three draft resolutions that have been recommended to the General Assembly by the Special Political Committee [A/7839, para. 13] and I am ready to vote on them as they appear in the report submitted by the Rapporteur. When the representative of Somalia asks that we set aside one of those draft resolutions that emerged from the discussion in the Special Political Committee, I am in a quandary as to what he is referring to as "other questions". This matter is specifically concerned with the refugee question as posed by the item on the agenda. If we remove draft resolution B and say that it is a new item or some special or other item, we might as well say that all three of the draft resolutions that have been recommended are other items. Since we have been dealing with this question in the General Assembly, we have never in my

experience talked about a simple majority when discussing the report of the Special Political Committee on this item in the plenary Assembly.

17. Madam President, unless you overrule me, I shall proceed to speak, as I had intended to do, on the three draft resolutions that have been submitted to the Assembly by the Special Political Committee. However, it is my candid opinion that one of those draft resolutions cannot be removed by saying that it refers to other items when it refers specifically to an item allocated to the Special Political Committee by the General Assembly. I await your ruling, Madam President, before I address myself to the draft resolutions before us.

18. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Liberia may speak.

19. Mr. DUSOMU JOHNSON (Liberia): The General Assembly has before it three draft resolutions which the Special Political Committee has recommended for its approval. In the explanation of my delegation's vote, I want to assure the Assembly that whatever position we may take is motivated by our inveterate sympathy for the refugees who for 20 long years have been subjected to the most abject state of existence by the play and interplay of world politics and the intransigence of the parties at war.

20. It is unfortunate that we have not been able to establish the necessary atmosphere in which the Palestinians and the Israelis could sit at a round table with Mr. Jarring, the Representative of the Secretary-General, and the four Powers, in renewed efforts to negotiate a permanent settlement of their dispute. In my opinion, this would not be very difficult if the great Powers were to use their influence towards the implementation of the United Nations resolution which divided Palestine between the Jews and the Arabs. Both have the right to exist. The Palestinians must develop their side of the dividing line and thus take their place in the United Nations with their Jewish cousins now in Israel.

21. As we study the three draft resolutions before us, our thoughts should centre on relieving the plight of the refugees. Politics or no politics, pride or no pride, we should not be pleased to see our friends and relatives living in the squalor of camp life and used as the pawns of some form of political unity.

22. If we are to settle this problem to the satisfaction of all concerned, we should not allow ourselves to be deluded by arguments of Israeli expansionism or of Zionism, or by arguments of prescriptive right and effective occupation resulting from the conquest, captivity and exile of the Jews. Like the island of Manhattan Israel could expand upwards to the sky, in skyscrapers. Zionism is a political nomenclature, like the Arab League, and will change the moment we establish peace in that area.

23. The Palestine refugee problem is a serious humanitarian and political problem, but it is not insurmountable; and this Assembly must not embark on any course that would befuddle and arrest our progress towards the humanitarian solution proposed in draft resolutions A and C which are now before the Assembly. They were designed

to lessen the financial burden of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA.

24. My delegation is fully conscious of the feelings of those primarily concerned with this issue, but the more we talk the more I am encouraged by the pressure of opinions expressed during this session's debate that everyone desires a peaceful solution and that we are all, to a man, anxious to ameliorate the disabilities of the Arab refugees and to give them a better life by the means provided in the Charter of the United Nations, which enjoins all Members to settle their disputes by peaceful negotiation. And if justice, truth and unselfish reasoning be the price of peace, or the underpinning of peace, in our time we should be optimistic that the renewed efforts of the big Powers will bring us new and more encouraging signs in the days ahead.

25. In the affairs of men, in the social aggregate, nothing is immutable. If our Arab friends would only agree to sit down and talk things over on their merits and demerits rather than in ethnic perspectives—and if they want me to, I will be their intermediary—all the resolutions on the Middle East would soon be implemented.

26. The United Nations is for peace for all men, regardless of race, creed or colour; it seeks to ensure a hate-free world. We must not by our reticence or apathy or selfish national interests consciously or unconsciously undermine the prestige and effectiveness of the only institution in which the world's hope for survival is embodied.

27. We have carefully studied the United States draft resolution submitted to the Special Political Committee which is before the Assembly as draft resolution A. It seeks to provide the necessary financial assistance which the Commissioner-General said in his report [A/7614] the Agency is badly in need of to maintain the refugees. We have also studied draft resolution C, in all its ramifications. These two drafts complement one another. Either of them meets the requirements we anticipate for the Agency and the refugees, new and old. My delegation will therefore vote for both of them.

28. I come to draft resolution B—on which we have been asked to accept some kind of manipulation, which has not occurred throughout these years here—submitted by Afghanistan, Indonesia, Malaysia, Pakistan, Senegal and Somalia. This draft resolution will forestall the *détente* we seek in the Middle East through Mr. Jarring and the big Powers. From the result of the voting in the Committee stage—50 votes in favour, 22 against and 38 abstentions—it is evident that the draft resolution has already divided us, which no resolution should do if it is to be meaningful.

29. It is, as we see it, very ambiguous; it will establish a precedent whose effects we cannot now predict. It seeks to impose the will of a few on the sovereign right of a Member State of this Organization. We the small States, which have no atomic protection, should be shy of any action or precedent designed to impair the sovereignty of any Member of this Organization, lest tomorrow we become victims of our own precedent.

30. To protect the sovereignty of our State we should vote against the Somalia motion, because draft resolution B is a

substantive question and we should vote against any attempt to make it a simple majority question here. What is proposed is a farce and if we agree to this today we may as well do so in respect of all resolutions that come before us on which opinion may be divided. It could work against any Member of this Organization. We must protect our independence. We should vote against this motion with all the force that characterizes men of thought, and by doing so, prevent the attempt to interfere in the sovereignty and territorial integrity of any Member State of the United Nations.

31. Israel is a sovereign State and a Member of this Organization. The essential factors of a State are territory, population, organization, government and sovereignty. The real essence of a State is its sovereignty. Viewed internally, this means that a State has complete authority over all the individuals that compose it. Viewed externally, it means that a State is completely independent of control by any other State. Absolute authority internally and absolute independence externally are the distinctive characteristics of a State. The sovereign will expressed and enforced in any State constitutes law. Israel having met those requirements and having since 1948 been accepted as a full-fledged Member of the United Nations, no outside force can impose any authority within its territory without its expressed consent.

32. Besides the many defects of the six-Power or Somali draft resolution B, the second preambular paragraph assumes something which the United Nations has not decided. It would be a travesty of the principles of justice for this Assembly to countenance a resolution predicated upon pure assumption. Before the Assembly can become gravely concerned, it must first adjudicate a complaint, and that is not the case here.

33. To ensure unity in this Organization and in order that the hopes of our Arab brethren in the camps should not be frustrated, I would sincerely appeal to the delegation of Somalia and the other delegations that sponsored draft resolution B to withdraw it or not to press it to a vote, otherwise I shall have the painful responsibility of voting against it.

34. The issue that draft resolution B assumes to resolve has been committed to Mr. Jarring under Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 and the four Powers are meeting on it now to give the Representative of the Secretary-General the necessary guidelines. By voting against this draft resolution we shall be giving Mr. Jarring and the four Powers a chance to work out a definite solution. I implore the Members of this Assembly to give them a chance. I do not know what course the Members will take, but, as for me and my house, I shall vote against the six-Power draft resolution so as to give Mr. Jarring and others a chance to resolve the problems as they are now trying to do.

35. If I have subordinated lucidity to brevity, I humbly crave the indulgence of the Assembly and ask it to take the will for the deed and give me credit for all that I may have left unsaid.

36. Mr. MOLEFHE (Botswana): My delegation wishes to explain its votes on the draft resolutions before us

[A/7839, para. 13], first, as we did not participate in the debate and, secondly, as I wish to reiterate the position of my Government on the relevant issues of these draft resolutions relating to the Middle East situation in general and to UNRWA in particular.

37. To begin with, my Government recognizes the existence of Israel as an autonomous and sovereign State, equal in every respect to any other in its membership of this Organization. Any draft resolution or part thereof which seeks directly or indirectly to question the reality, the existence and the statehood of Israel is itself unrealistic. However, such thoughts and statements demand the serious attention and consideration of this Organization because of the negative emphasis implicit in them and they are patently destructive of the highest ideals and promises held out by the Charter of this Organization.

38. Naturally one can appreciate the intensity of feeling in matters of this kind, but the bitterness that has characterized the debate on this item, the charges and counter-charges, have all combined not to clear the atmosphere but to leave it charged with ill will and destruction, confusing and complicating the attempts which are at present being made to find helpful means towards a just and lasting peace in the area.

39. My delegation will support the generally humanitarian draft resolutions which seek to relieve human suffering. Where Israel has failed to carry out its obligations, we find fault with it, but the general import of these draft resolutions is to relieve human suffering and my delegation will vote for draft resolutions A and C.

40. As regards draft resolution B, my delegation accords it precision in terms of the statements made during the debate. While the first paragraph speaks of the people of Palestine to the exclusion of Israel, the second and third paragraphs acknowledge the existence of the State of Israel in the requests directed to the Security Council. There is an ambiguity of statement there which my delegation cannot take lightly. For the reasons given, my delegation will vote against this draft resolution as we did in the Committee stage.

41. Mr. OHIN (Togo) (*translated from French*): I am taking the floor simply to draw attention to a procedural question. We have before us a report [A/7839] containing three draft resolutions which must be put to the vote as a whole and I see no particular reason why any one of the three draft resolutions should be put to the vote separately. I am moreover convinced that no matter what procedure is followed, the vote which will take place will in no way change the positions adopted by delegations in Committee. I hope that the President will bear that fact in mind when she decides how we are to vote this morning.

42. The PRESIDENT: A question has been raised in connexion with the three draft resolutions submitted to the Assembly under the present item. The representative of Somalia has presented a motion concerning draft resolution B. From the records before me it appears that the precedent has been that a two-thirds majority has been applied to draft resolutions with wording identical to that of the present draft resolution B. However, the Assembly is

the master of its own procedure. We now have before us the motion submitted by the representative of Somalia that a simple majority should apply in the vote on draft resolution B.

43. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): With your permission, Madam President, I should like to address myself to the motion by the representative of Somalia. If you prefer, I shall do so when we come to the vote on draft resolution B. However, if there will be no opportunity to do so at that time, I should like to do it now.

44. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel may proceed.

45. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): My delegation was surprised at the suggestion made by the representative of Somalia this morning that the decision which the General Assembly is required to take on draft resolution B [A/7839, para. 13] should not be considered a decision on an important question and should therefore not require a two-thirds majority, which Article 18 of the Charter lays down for decisions on important questions. I am sure that the deeper significance of this suggestion will not be lost on all the Governments here represented and on all those who are interested in the Arab refugee problem.

46. It is the view of the delegation of Israel that the decision concerns an important question and requires a two-thirds majority. That view is based on principle and practice alike, as clarified in the statement we have just had the honour of hearing from the President of the General Assembly.

47. The practice of the General Assembly in the application of Article 18 indicates that a determining criterion on what is "an important question" lies in the substance of the matter under discussion and in the actual decision which the General Assembly is called upon to take. In the General Assembly, ever since the question of Palestine or the situation in the Middle East or the question of the Palestine refugees has been on the agenda, the matter has always, I repeat always, been treated as important. Every resolution on these questions which has ever been adopted has been adopted by a majority in excess of two thirds. There is no instance, not a single instance, of a resolution or a part of a resolution on these matters ever having been adopted by a simple majority, or of it ever having been argued in plenary meetings that a simple majority would be sufficient. There have been several instances in which a draft resolution was adopted by the Special Political Committee by a simple majority and the proposal not pressed to a vote in a subsequent plenary meeting. The last such instance occurred at the 1640th plenary meeting on 19 December 1967, when a draft resolution adopted in the Committee by the supporters of the Arab position was withdrawn in the plenary meeting. Even more significant is the precedent of what happened at the 1086th plenary meeting on 20 December 1961. Then the vote on one paragraph of a resolution relating to the refugee item was 44 in favour and 29 against, with 25 abstentions, and on another paragraph it was 40 in favour and 37 against, with 21 abstentions. As regards both votes the President ruled that the paragraphs in question had not been adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority. That ruling was not

challenged. The President was the late Mr. Mongi Slim of Tunisia.

48. The text of the draft resolution to which I am referring today, with its reference to inalienable rights and the possibility of action by the Security Council, reinforces all that I have said. Indeed, the very fact that the draft resolution referred specifically to the Security Council means that in the eyes of its sponsors it had to do with the maintenance of international peace and security, one of the questions particularly and specifically mentioned in Article 18 of the Charter as requiring a two-thirds majority. This is further reinforced by the interpretations given to the draft resolution by its sponsors and supporters and by official and semi-official reactions to the vote in the Special Political Committee voiced in the Arab States. On 28 November 1969 during discussions in the Special Political Committee the sponsor of draft resolution B and of the motion before us on the question of a two-thirds majority, the representative of Somalia, speaking of the rights of the Palestinian people, denied the rights of the Jewish people even to immigrate into Palestine. Is that an unimportant question? On 4 December 1969 the representative of Pakistan, another of the sponsors, described Israel as "a racist settler minority". Is the use of such a term with regard to a sovereign State to be regarded as a matter of little importance? The representative of Kuwait, on 3 December 1969, stated in the Committee that Israel "has no right to exist". He referred to Israel as "the constitutional State which had no right to be there". Is the denial of the right of a Member State of the United Nations to exist an unimportant question?

49. The sole Arab spokesman who commented on the vote in the Special Political Committee after it had been taken was a refugee spokesman who declared that the result of the vote constituted "an endorsement of our struggle for liberation". Is a draft resolution thus interpreted to be considered as unimportant? This was echoed by the Government press and radio in the Arab capitals. Thus Radio Damascus broadcast, on 7 December 1969:

"The conclusion to be drawn from the adoption of the resolution is that the intensification of the struggle by the Palestinian people and the Arab people in general is likely to produce the most favourable result."

Is the view that the adoption of the draft resolution calls for an intensification of warfare against a Member State to be regarded as an unimportant question?

50. To vote for the motion presented this morning by the representative of Somalia that the draft resolution is unimportant and does not require a two-thirds majority is to vote against all precedents. It is to vote against an unchallenged ruling of a previous President of the Assembly, the late Mr. Mongi Slim of Tunisia. It is to vote against the clarification which we heard today from the President of the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly. It is to vote encouragement to those who want to increase hostility and bloodshed in the area.

51. My delegation, therefore, together with many others in this Assembly, strongly opposes and will vote against the motion presented by the representative of Somalia.

52. Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America): It appears to my delegation clear, on the face of it, that the questions raised in draft resolution B are important questions, and it would seem to me very difficult to imagine that the General Assembly, in the light of the discussion that we had in the Special Political Committee, could question that, in general, this is an important question. But beyond that there seem to me to be three linked items in documents that we must pay attention to.

53. By Article 24 of the Charter, the Members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Under Article 18 (2), recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security shall be decided by a two-thirds vote. In our own rules of procedure it is stated, in rule 85, that recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security require a two-thirds vote.

54. Paragraph 3 of draft resolution B uses the language:

*"Requests the Security Council to take effective measures in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter . . ."*

55. If the Security Council is to take effective measures, it seems to me quite clear that we are in the domain of the maintenance of international peace and security.

56. For these reasons, if the proposal of the representative of Somalia is put to a vote, my delegation will oppose it.

57. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolutions recommended by the Special Political Committee in paragraph 13 of its report [A/7839]. We shall first vote on draft resolution A.

*Draft resolution A was adopted by 110 votes to none, with 1 abstention [resolution 2535 A (XXIV)].*

58. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now turn to draft resolution B. We have before us a proposal [A/L.584] that the vote on this draft resolution requires only a simple majority. Are there any more speakers with respect to that motion?

59. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): Madam President, my delegation would request that the vote on the Somali procedural motion be by roll call.

60. The PRESIDENT: By way of clarification, what the Assembly is now going to do is to vote on a proposal by Somalia which would in effect change the precedent that has existed in the Assembly before.

61. Mr. ALO (Nigeria): My delegation is confused at this stage. I thought that we were going to vote on the motion that has been put forward by the delegation of Somalia. I did not realize that we were being called upon to vote against a precedent established by the Assembly. May I have an explanation?

62. The PRESIDENT: The explanation is this, that according to the record, as I have said, a two-thirds

majority has applied. But the Assembly is the master of its own procedure and a proposal has now been made that a simple majority should apply. It is that proposal by the delegation of Somalia that we are now going to vote on. A roll-call vote has been requested.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*Ghana, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia

*Against:* Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Rwanda, South Africa, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Gabon, Gambia

*Abstaining:* Guyana, Honduras, Italy, Kenya, Laos, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Thailand, Venezuela, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Ethiopia, France

*The motion was adopted by 50 votes to 46, with 21 abstentions.*

63. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will turn now to draft resolution B.

64. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): We have just voted on the motion which stated that draft resolution B does not come within the category of other questions referred to in Article 18, paragraph 3. Neither the sponsor of the motion nor any other Member around this table says that the question is not important. Certainly it is very important; but it does not come within the categories listed in the Article of the Charter.

65. The General Assembly is about to vote on draft resolution B embodied in the report of the Special Political Committee. My delegation will vote in favour of that draft resolution and expresses the hope that it will have the support of the overwhelming majority of this august body.

66. The operative part of this draft resolution embodies three important paragraphs. Paragraph 1 "reaffirms the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine". This is simply a statement of fact and no Member should have any difficulty in recognizing this fact. It is recognized by the

United Nations, as is clear from the jurisprudence of our Organization. Not even the leaders of Zionism ever denied the fact that there is something called "the people of Palestine". It was only when Israel became conceited that Mrs. Meir, the Prime Minister, said "the people of Palestine do not exist".

67. In the face of such a pronouncement, the least that the United Nations can do is to remind Israel that the Palestinian people still exist; that there is still a Palestine problem; that the people of Palestine have inalienable rights.

68. I might remind the General Assembly that the Secretary-General said in his statement last year:

"...we are dealing here with nothing less than a twenty-year-old tragedy for a group of people who considerably outnumber the whole population of a number of the States which are Members of the United Nations."<sup>1</sup>

69. The United Nations has the duty, and indeed the obligation, to speak and to reaffirm the existing rights of the Palestinian people. Paragraph 1 of the draft resolution simply asserts this fact. The United Nations should not permit itself to be drowned in a sea of falsehoods and distortions by Mr. Tekoah.

70. Paragraph 2 emphasizes the reported Israeli policies and practices aiming at arbitrary measures, particularly collective punishment. This again is a statement of fact. This paragraph also draws the attention of the Security Council to this fact and to the need for implementation of the resolution, calling upon Israel to take effective and immediate steps for the return without delay of the inhabitants who have fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities.

71. Paragraph 3 requests the Security Council to take effective measures to ensure the implementation of these resolutions.

72. Thus, Madam President, as you can see, the present draft resolution is the least that the General Assembly can adopt as a reaction to the negative attitude of Israel and to the increasing evidence of Israeli arbitrary measures in the occupied areas.

73. The people of the Arab world are waiting to see what stand the United States will take on this draft resolution. We all hope that it will reconsider its stand. We want the United States to be guided by the great values enshrined in its Constitution, let alone the United Nations Charter to which it is a party. The United States of Jefferson and Washington, which played a leading role in ensuring the inherent and elementary human rights of peoples, certainly cannot make the people of Palestine an exception to the rule. This attitude conflicts with its moral obligations towards the people of Palestine. The United States is under an obligation to reaffirm a right which was affirmed time and again in the past. The United States cannot, on the one

<sup>1</sup> This statement was made at the 612th meeting of the Special Political Committee, the official records of which are published in summary form.

hand, arbitrarily and illegally deprive the people of a substantial part of their land and, on the other hand, facilitate Israeli usurpation of the remaining part of Palestine.

74. By voting against this draft resolution, which aims at affirming elementary and inherent human rights, the United States introduces an element of contradiction. On the one hand, it tells us that it wishes to put all its political and moral weight behind the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which calls for, among other things, a just settlement of the problem of the people of Palestine. On the other hand, by voting against this draft resolution, the United States denies that there is such a thing as the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine. And while Mrs. Meir of Israel does not admit the fact that there is such a thing as the people of Palestine, the United States, by voting against the resolution, tells us that the Palestinian people have no rights.

75. Before concluding, I should like to appeal to all the small Powers which have struggled hard to secure their inalienable elementary human rights to support this draft resolution. The people of Palestine look to them for support. Recognition of their rights is a step towards a peaceful solution in our troubled area. We hope that the Members of this august body will not help to prolong the Palestinian agony and will not, by inaction, invite more bloodshed, more struggle and more wars. The only way to end wars is by eliminating their causes.

76. We, the people of Asia and Africa, know this from our tragic experience. Certainly, small countries have a better understanding of such situations. They have fought for their rights; they have helped in the liberation movements of other peoples; they see the problem as it is. Support for this draft resolution embodies by itself a message of peace and understanding. This is all that the people of Palestine want. This is all that they hope the international community will support.

77. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (United Arab Republic): I ask the Assembly's indulgence to hear me just for one minute.

78. We have heard the words "peace" and "peace-seeking" mentioned several times this morning in this Assembly. Let me say that peace we want, we seek, we need, we wish to see realized. But peace, like liberty, can be a word in the name of which many crimes can be committed or can be excused. It is because we want peace that we are here in the halls of the United Nations, soliciting and asking for support. It is because we want peace that we are asking for the adoption of draft resolutions. People who want war, like those who waged the war against us on 5 June 1967, do not come to the halls of the United Nations to ask for the understanding and the support of their fellow citizens of the world, nor to ask that the Articles of the Charter should be implemented, nor that one of the Councils of the United Nations should include a question in its agenda.

79. If it is not peace that we want, then our appeals or endeavours in the United Nations and its bodies are meaningless. Because we want peace built on justice to enable us to work for progress, we come to the United Nations. Because of this we appeal to all Members of this

Assembly to realize that to refuse to recognize that the people of Palestine have rights is the negation of a State and is a handicap to the efforts of those whose duty in the Security Council it is to seek the implementation of the Council resolution which we have accepted.

80. I think I have spoken for more than one minute, but I just do not want to hear the word "peace" misused or used as a pretext for the continuation of the war of subjugation and colonialism and the occupation that is going on today in the Middle East.

81. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) (*translated from French*): I should like to have permission briefly to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution B, on which the Assembly is preparing to take a decision. It will be remembered that my delegation had expressed reservations in the Special Political Committee [686th meeting] on paragraphs 1 and 3 of the draft resolution which had been submitted by the delegation of Somalia, in other words the present draft resolution B. In view of the sponsors' refusal to agree to a separate vote on certain paragraphs, my delegation felt obliged to vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

82. It feels bound to reiterate its reservations, since it believes that this draft resolution, far from promoting a peaceful settlement of the situation in the Middle East, for which resolution 242 (1967) of November 1967 laid the foundations, constitutes to some extent an encouragement to intransigence on both sides.

83. My delegation, however, after careful consideration of the situation and in accordance with the instructions of our Government, has decided to abstain when the draft resolution is put to the vote. It considers, by doing so, that it is not encouraging intransigence, no matter where it originates, nor giving the impression that it is taking a decision in favour of one side or the other, since the Ivory Coast maintains friendly and trustful relations with both Israel and the Arab countries. Hence, in the present circumstances, an abstention seems to it the most appropriate stand. It will therefore abstain when draft resolution B is put to the vote.

84. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to the vote on draft resolution B.

85. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait): May I request that the vote on draft resolution B recommended by the Committee be by roll call?

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*Honduras, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria,

Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Guinea

*Against:* Israel, Liberia, Malawi, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Rwanda, Swaziland, United States of America, Uruguay, Bolivia, Botswana, Canada, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Gabon, Gambia, Guatemala

*Abstaining:* Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Laos, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guyana

*Draft resolution B was adopted by 48 votes to 22, with 47 abstentions [resolution 2535 B (XXIV)]\**

86. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

87. Mr. TEKOA (Israel): The Israel delegation voted against resolution B as we did in the Special Political Committee. This text was born of belligerence against a State Member of the United Nations. It was sponsored by delegations almost all of which deny Israel's right to sovereignty or do not recognize Israel. It was not motivated, as were the other two resolutions, A and C, by a desire to alleviate the plight of refugees: its purpose was clearly to aggravate and complicate the Middle East conflict.

88. It is therefore not surprising that, unlike resolution A and presumably resolution C, it received the support only of a minority of Member States, nearly all of them Arab delegations and their regular Soviet and Moslem supporters. A majority of States Members of the United Nations dissociated themselves from this one-sided and harmful text. The resolution must therefore be considered only for what it is: an expression of the known views of the Arab States and those who joined them in the vote. It is devoid of any moral or political effect and this is particularly clear in the light of the procedural manipulations, supported only by a minority of Members, contrary to the Charter and precedent, to which the Assembly was subjected today.

89. My delegation has taken note of the fact that while resolution 2452 (XXIII), which concerned the question of persons displaced in the wake of the 1967 hostilities, was supported on 19 December 1968 by 100 States, the resolution adopted on this question today received less than half that number of votes. This indicates a greater awareness of the gravity and inadmissibility of Arab warfare continued against Israel in violation of the cease-fire and the limitations which this warfare imposes on the possibilities of facilitating the return of persons displaced in 1967.

\* The delegation of Cambodia subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

90. There is another aspect of the vote which requires attention. Here is a text unacceptable to the majority of States, a text recognized and described by many delegations in the course of the debate as detrimental to the refugees, a draft which hampers peace-making efforts and increases hostility in the region. Yet, because of the mechanics of voting this text is now recorded as having been formally adopted.

91. This confirms the generally held view that Israel's rights or interests cannot be secured in discussions and votes by others, whether within the General Assembly and the Security Council or by the two Powers or the four Powers. In such discussions considerations extraneous to the merits of the situation not only tend to frustrate equitable conclusions ensuring Israel's rights under the Charter but even prevent, as in the present instance, the defeat of proposals regarded by the majority of States as unacceptable and damaging.

92. For Israel the conclusion is therefore clear: the settlement of the Middle East conflict, the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the area, the securing for all nations of their right to live free from aggression and violence will come not from what others do but through Israel's efforts to defend its rights and to seek, together with its neighbours, understanding and agreement. It is not through public and acrimonious debates, it is not through discussions conducted by outside Powers, but through patient and temperate dialogue between Israel and the Arab States that peace will be attained in the Middle East.

93. Mr. KHALAF (Iraq): My delegation for obvious reasons voted in favour of resolution B, which to a certain extent confirms the rights of the people of Palestine, their inalienable rights.

94. Before this vote started there were some manoeuvres to try to obstruct the results of the vote. I refer in particular to the insistence by some on a two-thirds majority. For us, the procedural vote was a substantive vote because it could have changed the picture. That is why the Israeli representative wanted and insisted on a two-thirds majority vote. Now in his statement he has explained why the Israelis do not consider this resolution to be effective and important: it is because they lost on the resolution here.

95. The fact is that this resolution did receive a two-thirds majority—and the Israeli representative wanted a two-thirds majority. For all practical purposes, and for Israeli purposes too, this resolution did get a two-thirds majority.

96. The representative of Israel refers to what he considers to be a fact: namely, that Israeli policies are not decided by resolutions or negotiations, whether bilateral or four-Power. Well, the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine, which are based on the Charter of the United Nations, are not decided, or licensed indeed, by any negotiations or any resolutions.

97. Speaking about resolutions—and the representative of Israel referred to some resolutions which had been adopted unanimously—we know how the Israelis reacted to them. One of those resolutions which was adopted unanimously



was the resolution which spoke precisely of the persons displaced after the 1967 war. What did Israel do to implement that resolution? Trying to minimize the resolution, the Israeli representative takes the position that the adoption of the present resolution—by the majority which it received—would lessen the importance of former resolutions which spoke of the right of these recently displaced persons to return to their homes.

98. The representative of Israel referred in that connexion to draft resolution C. If my memory serves me well, the Israel representative voted in the Committee in favour of that draft resolution and I think most probably the Israel representative will vote in favour of it today too. In paragraph 1 of that draft resolution there is a reaffirmation of a former resolution, resolution 2252 (ES-V). Now that resolution was precisely the one which spoke of the duties and responsibilities of Israel to facilitate the return of the newly displaced persons.

99. While I am on this subject and so that there will be no misunderstanding, my delegation would like to have draft resolution C put to the vote by roll call. Then we shall see who votes for it, who believes in the right of these people to return to their homes.

100. The representative of Israel keeps talking about a minority resolution. I do not know how many of us remember that the State of Israel was created by 33 votes. In the light of the 126 votes in the United Nations now, does he consider that a majority resolution or a minority resolution?

101. Let me come back to the voting of certain States. I have in mind particularly the delegation of the United States of America. Every time during the last 20 years when a resolution of or action by the United Nations on this question has been involved, we have been constrained to believe, indeed we are convinced, that the American establishment is against us. The American establishment is against the Arab people. Starting from the Balfour Declaration and the creation of the State of Israel, through the manipulations of American statesmen and up to the present time, whenever there is a discussion relating to the rights of the Arab people of Palestine the representatives of the American establishment show their real faces and are against us. The reason I say the "American establishment" is that the American people are different. They know from experience what it is to ask for self-determination. They know from experience what it is to be under foreign oppression and domination. That, indeed, is the picture as seen by us. I wish the representatives of the United States would stop playing with words and playing with peoples.

102. Look for example, at the voting today. How did the four Powers which supposedly have been talking—or not talking—off and on for the last month vote? The Soviet delegation voted for this draft resolution because the Soviet Union believes in the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine. The French delegation and the British delegation abstained for reasons we do not understand. We do not like the way they voted, but they did abstain; they did not vote against. What did the United States representative do? He not only voted against, but he had tried during the last three or four days to collect all sorts of votes and to do all

sorts of manoeuvring so that this resolution would be rejected and in this respect I am referring to statements made here and outside the General Assembly.

103. My delegation cannot help stating again what it stated in the Special Political Committee when this question was discussed. We believe that freedom is one cause, indivisible and inseparable. What we ask for our people and for our kith and kin in Palestine, we ask for others: we ask for the Rhodesians; we ask for the people of South Africa; we ask for the people of South West Africa. As I said, we Arabs yield to none in the efforts we make in the General Assembly or in other bodies as far as the struggle for the liberty of peoples all over the world is concerned.

104. Is it not an anachronism to see the representative of South Africa abstaining on this resolution and to see some of our friends from Africa and Latin America voting against us? Is it a good picture in our common struggle for the freedom of the world, including Africa and Asia, to see the way the representative of South Africa voted? Of course, I do not want him to regret his vote; but I want my friends to regret their votes and to see to it that the next time matters of this kind are before us, justice will win. What they ask for themselves they should also ask for others.

105. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Indeed I feel sorry for our colleague from Israel and that is not said with any sarcasm or cynicism. I feel sorry because, after all, he is a human being and is trying to do his best mechanically, as at times most of us have to do in order to defend certain cases in the United Nations. That is why the United Nations is languishing. We take assumed positions on many subjects, on many items, and we do not seem to have learned anything from the history of the League of Nations.

106. However, I should like, if I may, to draw the attention of our colleagues, including Mr. Tekoah, to the fact that the Mandate in Palestine was predicated on preparing the indigenous people, whether of Arab or another ethnological origin, for independence.

107. The Mandate mentioned the Palestine people; it did not mention the Israeli people. Furthermore, even the Mandate was imposed in our area. It was colonialism in disguise. It was bred from a secret pact signed in 1916 called the Sykes-Picot agreement. Of course, I do not have to go into the history: every one of you knows what has happened since 1919.

108. Should the people of Palestine, regardless of whether they are Arabs, Jews, Chinese or what have you, be denied their inalienable right as a people? That is the question. They have an inalienable right and that is the gist of resolution B, which has just been adopted.

109. Perhaps there is some confusion in dealing with this question. Mr. Tekoah mentioned that the Moslem States rallied to the cause of the Palestinian refugees. What is wrong with that, when they see that an injustice has been perpetrated on the Palestinian refugees? What about the Western countries that have been rallying since 1947 to the cause of Israel? We think there is a great deal of wrong in that, because, after all, the authors of the Palestine problem were Western Europeans. Russia dropped out of the

international pacts and the secret pacts in 1917, so it cannot be counted as being a party to perpetrating an injustice on the people of our region. Of all the countries, the United States, as my brother from Iraq said, has been sponsoring the cause of Israel since 1947 and Israel still complains: the United States, a mighty Power which sponsored the creation of Israel, and illicitly so. I was at Lake Success and I say illicitly so, by pressure. I do not have to go into the details. Sometimes I wonder whether the United States is an Israeli protectorate or whether Israel is a protectorate of the United States. That is their business, to support Israel and to be against us. A week or so before the convoking of the Rabat conference<sup>2</sup> they spoke, through Mr. Rogers the Secretary of State, of trying to have peace between one Arab State and Israel. Then this morning's papers and also some radio stations mentioned that the United States is trying to dampen the spirit and foil any decision that may be taken at Rabat. We are faced here by the mass media of information that has a world impact.

110. And here comes our colleague, Mr. Tekoah, defending an unjust case—ably so, very ably, because he orates and he uses language that may impress others. But how many times do we find that language is not enough to bring about justice—to his own people as well as to the Palestinian refugees?

111. Before I conclude, I must draw the attention of the United Nations to the fact that the Palestinians, even before the Zionists came to Palestine, had their own political, social and cultural personality. In my region I could tell a Palestinian from the way he spoke Arabic. Even during the Ottoman rule, Palestine was a sanjak of the empire that had a people all its own. Secondly, the Western Powers for interests of their own sold them down the Thames and the Potomac. Thirdly, the United Nations illicitly created Israel by pressure. We are not sacrosanct as an Organization. Fourthly, the Palestinians have proved themselves a separate people. If Mr. Tekoah does not admit that, I think the communiqués of Israel show who is trying to regain the homeland. Fifthly, once and for all, this is not a question between certain Arab States and Israel. There is a dispute with regard to the occupied land. The core of the question is the Palestinian people, whether or not they are Arab.

112. If Mr. Tekoah and his Government want peace, let them send emissaries or third parties to the Palestinians and if the Palestinians would agree to forfeit their right to their land, I do not think there would be any dispute whatsoever. If they do not forfeit their right to their land, the United Nations, if it goes against the principles of the Charter as well as the covenants on human rights [*see resolution 2200 (XXI)*], should dissolve and disintegrate. In the two covenants, the first article reads:

“All peoples have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right, they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.”

113. That is what the Palestinians are endeavouring to do. Therefore, it stands to reason that Mr. Tekoah and his

<sup>2</sup> Fifth Arab Summit Conference, held at Rabat from 21 to 23 December 1969.

Government should find the ways and means. How? Either do away with all the Palestinians, which I think they do not intend to do—they are not that inhuman—or see whether they can work out a solution whereby the Palestinians will regain their land and the Jews will live with them as brothers, not as an exclusive society, but driven by religious sentiment to revere the Holy Land. Then I think there would be peace. Then I think the injustice would no longer be remembered, even by those who were robbed of their land. Then and only then will peace prevail in the Middle East.

114. Let me say once again that no Arab Government either has the right, or dares, to impose its will on the Palestinian people, just as no Power has the right to impose its will on the valiant Viet-Nameese people. I shall not go into a discussion of North or South Viet-Nam, but the Viet-Nameese people know what their rights are.

115. Let the United States and all other great Powers heed the lessons of history: that if they are drunk with power, one day they will tread the same downward path as have others who have been drunk with power and that their fall will be great.

116. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait): My delegation voted proudly in the affirmative on resolution B recommended by the Special Political Committee. The heart of that recommendation, which is now a resolution of the General Assembly, is paragraph 1, which “*Reaffirms* the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine”.

117. I should like here to say that in reaffirming the rights of the people of Palestine this Assembly did not bestow anything on the people of Palestine that that people did not fully possess before that vote. But this Assembly did bestow something positive on the United Nations itself by its vote: it saved the integrity of the United Nations from being compromised by the efforts that were exerted to defeat a draft resolution affirming the inalienable rights of a people.

118. Today, 10 December 1969, is the anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is well that we recall that on this date 21 years ago the Assembly lived up to its proclamation of human rights and did not compromise the assertion in that Declaration that everyone should enjoy the rights announced therein.

119. In voting for the resolution—and particularly for paragraph 1—we understood the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine to be precisely those defined in the Charter, Article 1, paragraph 2, as well as Article 55, which proclaim the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples. As will be recalled, it was emphasized at San Francisco some quarter of a century ago, that the word “principle” is used here in the singular because self-determination and the equality of rights of people are two sides of the same coin.

120. Today, by voting for the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine, we saved the United Nations from committing a grotesque inversion of the Orwellian witticism that all people are equal but some are more equal than others. Had we not adopted this resolution we would have

assumed that all peoples are equal but some are less equal than others. We have saved the integrity of the United Nations from such a grotesque misconstruction of facts.

121. An attempt has been made to cast doubt on the authenticity and formal validity of the resolution adopted today, through the use of arithmetical acrobatics, by saying that it was a minority vote. It was a majority vote and more than a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting supported the resolution. When the representative of Israel says that, being a so-called minority resolution, it is devoid of any moral or political effect, it will be recalled that his country has forfeited its right to pass judgement on the moral effects of United Nations resolutions by consistently considering as devoid of moral effect even those which were adopted unanimously by various organs of the United Nations.

122. Finally, I should like to state that the United States in particular, by voting against the inalienable rights of a people, by voting against calling the attention of the Security Council to conditions arising out of the non-implementation of resolutions has disqualified itself from the ability to play any constructive role in any consultations—two-Power, four-Power, or multi-Power—regarding a settlement of the problems connected with and arising out of the tragedy of the people of Palestine.

123. Mr. TESFAEGZY (Ethiopia): Lest there be any misunderstanding of our position with regard to the Middle East problem, which has bedevilled the United Nations for over 20 years, I should particularly like to explain the vote which my delegation cast on resolution B.

124. In our statements of policy in plenary meetings during the last three sessions of the General Assembly, we have taken great pains to explain our position and general attitude with regard to the whole range of problems of the Middle East situation. We have stated in particular that if the United Nations were to find a solution to this seemingly intractable problem, it would have to seek interrelated solutions.

125. We have felt for some time that raising the different problems piecemeal, without recognizing their interrelationship, would render the task of finding a solution more difficult, especially at a time when the Security Council, and particularly the Big Four, are searching for a solution within the framework of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, which, in our opinion, approaches the Middle East problem in a balanced fashion. Also at a time when there seems to be a tacit understanding that the problem of the Middle East should not be raised in the General Assembly until the efforts of the Big Four and the Security Council have run their course, we have felt that pronouncing ourselves on one particular aspect of the Middle East problem would not give a correct picture of our position. For that reason alone, we abstained in the vote on resolution B.

126. On the other hand, our vote does not mean that we do not recognize that the Palestine refugees have rights. On the contrary, we have indicated through our statements and our votes in the past that the right of the Palestine refugees to return to their homeland should be recognized. With

particular regard to the question of the Palestine refugees, I wish to recall what was stated by my Foreign Minister at the 1579th plenary meeting, at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly:

“... the wrong and the injustice inflicted upon the Arab Palestinian refugees should be redressed; not only should their right to a just compensation for the property which they lost be recognized, but also they should have the right to return to their homeland if they so choose.”  
[1579th meeting, para. 160.]

127. Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): The delegation of Chile would like to state very briefly the reasons for its vote.

128. Although resolution B clearly goes beyond the scope of agenda item 36 which is now under discussion, it undeniably takes up a problem which has been dealt with by the General Assembly in previous years under the same item 36. It is a fact that this real and serious problem, which jeopardizes the human rights of many thousands of individuals, has remained unsolved in spite of a number of resolutions adopted by the United Nations in that connexion.

129. Chile believes that this problem must be solved and that it is the duty of the State of Israel and of the Arab States concerned, all of which are Members of this Organization, to make every effort to find a human, just and reasonable solution in the spirit of the principles governing the United Nations. We feel that resolution B pursues this objective, but in terms which we cannot accept, for it prejudices *de facto* situations which are generally acknowledged and introduces a new concept, the political implications of which are not clear.

130. For these reasons, the delegation of Chile abstained from voting.

131. Mr. SALAZAR SANTOS (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): In the Special Political Committee, my delegation found itself obliged to vote against the draft resolution which has now been submitted to the General Assembly as resolution “B”. Consequently, it has also voted against it in the General Assembly, but it wishes to repeat the reasons for its decision.

132. We said at that time, and would like to repeat now, that although my delegation agrees that the Government of Israel should be urged to adopt the measures referred to in resolutions 2252 (ES-V) of 4 July 1967 and 2452 A (XXIII) of 19 December 1968, which were approved by the General Assembly, it does not consider that this is the proper forum to deal with certain issues raised in this draft resolution, which are not relevant to the subject which the Committee studied so carefully.

133. My delegation fears that a resolution of this kind might disturb or endanger the actions for peace, that is, for a permanent solution of the Middle East conflict, which are being undertaken within the orbit of the United Nations.

134. Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America): My delegation regrets deeply that it found it necessary to vote

against resolution B. That resolution presented several problems for us, but our chief difficulties lay and still lie in paragraphs 1 and 3.

135. Paragraph 1 is very vague and is open to differing interpretations. Several interpretations of the resolution and of the significance of the vote upon it which we cannot accept have already been made in the Special Political Committee and here today. Those interpretations come from very different and indeed opposite viewpoints. The goal that the United States seeks and that the Security Council is seeking is a just and enduring peace in the area. We believe that this paragraph of the resolution, as worded, would only serve to drive the parties to the conflict in the Middle East still further apart and, therefore, needlessly complicate the search for peace.

136. We oppose paragraph 3 for related but different reasons. This paragraph requests the Security Council in very strong language to take action against only one side in the dispute. Secretary of State Rogers made an important statement on the Middle East last night. I commend it to the attention of all distinguished delegates. In it Secretary Rogers underlined

“the strenuous efforts of the Government of the United States, along with other permanent members of the Security Council, to bring about the peace which all of us pray for in this troubled area are the things that concern us most at this time.”

137. We believe that the line of action implied in paragraph 3, far from facilitating, would only make more difficult this search for peace. As Mr. Rogers stated: “There can be no lasting peace without a just settlement of the problem of those Palestinians whom the wars of 1948 and 1967 have made homeless.” He went on to say:

“The problem posed by the refugees will become increasingly serious if their future is not resolved. There is a new consciousness among the young Palestinians who have grown up since 1948 which need to be channelled away from bitterness and frustration towards hope and justice.”<sup>3</sup>

138. I would add this. The Government of the United States will yield to no Government represented in this Assembly in its respect for and observance of “human rights and . . . fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion”. This includes the human rights of Palestinians.

139. Mr. AUBAME (Gabon) (*translated from French*): The leader of the delegation of Gabon said in substance that we are in favour of practical and realistic solutions. He also said that our Government considers the Middle East problem to be a grave, distressing and even tragic problem. Unfortunately, we have just heard that in the eyes of some delegations it is an ordinary question, I was going even to use the word banal.

140. I confess that this way of looking at the matter is somewhat surprising, when everyone knows how many resolutions we have adopted in this Assembly in our

endeavours to put an end to the situation prevailing in the Middle East. In the Special Political Committee [*686th meeting*] my delegation, in explaining its vote, expressed our Government's concern that an over-all solution should be found to the Middle East problem within the framework of resolution 242 (1967) which was adopted by the Security Council on 22 November 1967. It does not seem to me, therefore, that resolution B, which has just been put to the vote, is likely to promote a settlement of the Middle East problem as a whole. This is why, once again, my delegation did not vote in favour of it.

141. Before concluding, I should like to say also that we have just added a resolution to so many others, thus lengthening the list of resolutions adopted on the Middle East, and that this resolution, like the others, will perhaps not be implemented at all.

142. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet delegation had the opportunity to explain in detail the reasons for its vote on all three draft resolutions before they were put to the vote in the Special Political Committee. Now, in connexion with the vote which has just been taken, we should like to say a few words in explanation of our vote here. The Soviet delegation has just voted in favour of resolutions A and B and intends to vote in favour of resolution C. Resolutions A and C are designed to deal with the humanitarian aspects of the problem arising out of the Palestinian refugees' present situation. We believe that these two resolutions may be useful, although they do not provide a solution of the refugee problem itself. Of course, in voting in favour of resolutions A and C, the Soviet delegation was acting on the assumption that they do not impose any financial obligations on States Members of the United Nations; in this connexion, the Soviet Union will continue to provide bilateral assistance through State channels and through Soviet voluntary organizations, to the Arab States victims of Israeli aggression and to their peoples.

143. Resolution B, which has just been adopted by the General Assembly, is designed to implement earlier unanimously adopted resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, and to confirm the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine who, as is pointed out in the recent joint statement of the parties and Governments of six socialist countries, are waging a heroic struggle for their national liberation. This seems to us sufficient reason for supporting the resolution and its just purposes, and the Soviet delegation naturally voted in favour of it.

144. Mr. STENBAEK HANSEN (Denmark): I wish to reiterate the reasons why my delegation abstained in the vote on resolution B. We did so for two main reasons. First, we have strong objections and reservations to part of the preamble and also to the operative part of that resolution. Secondly, we think that the decisions to be taken on the item actually dealt with by the General Assembly, that is, the report of the Commissioner General on the work of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, have been amply covered by the two other resolutions; we voted in favour of the first and sponsored the second in the Special Political Committee so intend to vote for it here in the Assembly.

<sup>3</sup> *Department of State Bulletin*, vol. LXII, No. 1593, p. 7.

145. The position of Denmark on the question of the return of those persons who have fled the areas where they lived before the hostilities of the summer of 1967 was expressed by our positive vote on the resolutions adopted by the Security Council and by the General Assembly, mentioned in the third and fourth preambular paragraphs of resolution B. That position remains unchanged. As for the political aspects connected with the refugee problem, there exists, as stated in the Special Political Committee at the beginning of the debate on this item in the Committee, a tradition that representatives could present their Governments' general views during the debate. This was indeed done to a great extent. However, it does not mean that the debate on UNRWA in the Special Political Committee is the right forum to adopt resolutions on political problems concerning the situation in the Middle East. The basis of the handling of this problem remains Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967 and it would be wrong, in my delegation's view, to interfere with the procedure developing on the basis of that Security Council resolution.

146. One word more: during the debate voices have been heard which raised implications with respect to the existence of the State of Israel. In the view of my Government, no question can legitimately be raised here or elsewhere with respect to the right of Israel to exist as an independent and sovereign state and a fully entitled and equal Member of the United Nations.

147. Mr. FARACE (Italy): I shall explain very briefly the votes which we have cast or which we intend to cast in the debate today. Resolutions A and C have our full support. They are uncontroversial; they contain that effective humanitarian element we seek and which we wish to see enforced.

148. Resolution B appears to have a wider scope and essentially a political character. We may understand the motives that have prompted the sponsors to give such a character to the resolution, but we think that when complex political problems are to be examined clarity and precision of formulation is of the utmost importance. We feel that the resolution has not met those requirements. On the contrary, it raises in our mind several doubts as to the interpretation that should be given to its provisions. Paragraph 1, for instance, seems to us ambiguous and in our assessment lends itself to differences of interpretation that should have been avoided because they might contribute to maintaining that atmosphere of crisis which characterizes the situation in the Middle East. Moreover, such ambiguities have prevented us from reaching precise conclusions about the meaning of paragraph 1 in relation to Security Council resolution 242 (1967), a resolution which, in our opinion, opens the way to a just and lasting solution of the Middle East problems.

149. As it has been impossible for us to understand, on account of what I have just said, the precise scope of the possible implications of paragraph 1, we also had doubts on how to assess the question in the context of Article 18 of the Charter. We were not able, therefore, to take a definite and final position on this question, which, I repeat, would not have been in our opinion justified by the uncertainty of the elements under consideration.

150. Mr. DRACOULIS (Greece): I should like very briefly to refer to and explain my delegation's vote on the resolutions that we have dealt with this morning. Although my delegation has already explained its vote before the Special Political Committee, we desire to repeat our reasons before this Assembly also so that no room for doubt is left to any delegation as to the actual trend of thought that has motivated our decision, and thus have it straight for the record of the General Assembly.

151. As regards resolution B, my delegation chose to abstain for reasons pertaining exclusively to the contents of paragraph 3. In this context, my delegation would like to put on record once more the fact that our abstention does not imply a change of policy on the refugee problem and that our delegation does not for one instant desist from its adherence to Security Council resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly resolutions 2252 (ES-V) and 2452 (XXIII).

152. In the view of my delegation, however, the reference of the question of the Palestinian refugees to the Security Council, as stipulated in paragraph 3 of the resolution, will not help in furthering the cause of the refugees at this juncture of hopeful augury of the resumption of the four-Power negotiations and of renewed efforts for Ambassador Jarring's mediation.

153. It was therefore solely in that spirit and in viewing the question *in toto* that, through the merits of a "package-deal" solution, my country abstained from voting on the said resolution.

154. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of Israel to exercise his right of reply.

155. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): The representatives of Iraq and Kuwait made references to the arithmetic results of the vote on resolution B in an attempt to misinterpret the significance of the vote. For the record, I should like to state that it is known by all Member States of the United Nations that, were past precedent, the rulings of the late Mr. Mongi Slim, President of the General Assembly in 1961, the clarifications given today by the President of the present session of the General Assembly, not being disregarded by procedural manipulations contrary to the Charter of the United Nations—manipulations supported by only a minority of the Member States—the results of the vote in respect of the two-thirds majority on resolution B would have been different and the one-sided draft, detrimental to the refugees and to the cause of peace in the Middle East, would have been rejected by this Assembly. In any event, the Member States of the United Nations understand that irresponsible belligerent texts such as resolution B serve the interests of the Arab peoples as little as do irresponsible and belligerent actions by the Arab States against Israel.

156. The PRESIDENT; Finally, I shall put to the vote draft resolution C. A roll-call vote has been requested.

*A vote was taken by roll call.*

*Japan, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Ma-

laysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Laos, Malawi, Portugal.

*Draft resolution C was adopted by 108 votes to none, with 3 abstentions [resolution 2535 C (XXIV)].\**

157. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (United Arab Republic): The Assembly has now concluded its consideration of the report of the Special Political Committee concerning the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East [A/7839]. I should like to make a short statement.

158. In his intervention, the representative of Israel referred to the resolution which was sponsored in the Committee by Afghanistan and some other countries and

\* The delegation of Cambodia subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

which has now been adopted by the Assembly. He said that it had been adopted by Soviet and Moslem States.

159. We in Egypt are indeed proud of being a Moslem State. We are proud of our contribution to the religion of Islam; we are proud of our contribution to the religion of Christianity; we are proud of our contribution to the religion of Judaism. I recommend that those who have not already done so read the excellent book by Sigmund Freud about Moses and monotheism, where the thesis that Moses himself was an Egyptian is brilliantly set forth.

160. I would suggest, however, that to speak about nations, about States, as being Moslem or Soviet, to make religious references, to use certain adjectives for countries that propose or vote for resolutions is not the kind of thing that should be done in the United Nations.

161. I do not really know why the representative of Israel found it important to take exception to the resolution and to state that it had been adopted by a minority or a majority, by Moslems or Christians. He has told us plainly that Israel depends on its own power of defence—that is, on violence—and does not think that the Middle East question can be settled by resolutions of the General Assembly or by resolutions of the Security Council or by the endeavours of the four permanent members of the Security Council, or even by the efforts of the two super-Powers.

162. Since he said that, I do not really know why he found it important to single out this resolution as one not to be taken very seriously. His Foreign Minister indeed stated in the General Assembly, at another meeting, that even if a certain resolution received 120 votes, against the one vote of Israel, Israel would not heed it.

163. In conclusion, I would say that my delegation takes seriously the reference of the problem to the Security Council. We voted in favour of resolution B so that the problem could be brought to the Security Council the problem of Israel's defiance of all resolutions adopted by that august body.

*The meeting rose at 1.55 p.m.*