

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 450th  
MEETING**

Tuesday, 9 November 1965,  
at 3.20 p.m.



**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 35:</i>	
<i>Reports of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (continued) . . . . .</i>	1

*Chairman:* Mr. Carlet R. AUGUSTE (Haiti).

AGENDA ITEM 35

Reports of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (continued) (A/5813, A/6013; A/SPC/103-106, A/SPC/L.112/Rev.1, L.113)

1. Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (United States of America) said that the humanitarian work of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees was one of the most noteworthy accomplishments of the United Nations. The serious financial problems facing the Agency should not be allowed to overshadow what had been done or to make people forget what would have been the fate of the refugees without UNRWA. His delegation therefore wished to thank the Commissioner-General for his dedication, and to express its recognition of the very significant role which the four host countries had played and must continue to play in promoting the welfare of the refugees.

2. As long ago as 1957, the General Assembly had stressed the critical financial position of the Agency, and it had repeatedly urged Governments to contribute or to increase their support. In general the response had been disappointing, with the result that the same few countries had been obliged to carry the overwhelming burden. Despite the contributions of those countries, the Agency had nevertheless had each year to spend more than the resources available to it. Since, however, the number of refugees had increased and the cost of rations and services had risen, the already long-standing deficit had grown larger and larger. The Agency had made efforts to economize, and had also resorted to its working capital. But that reserve was being rapidly reduced, and it was clear that the financial situation was now very serious.

3. The Commissioner-General of the Agency had outlined a number of alternatives for dealing with the situation. It was to be hoped that his appeal would be heeded and that there would be no necessity to provide him with the guidelines he should follow "in preventing the insolvency" of the Agency, as he put it in paragraph 36 of his report (A/6013).

4. The problem of the rectification of the relief rolls was still far from being solved. While recognizing the difficulties in carrying out the rectification, his delegation felt that all who were interested in the refugees' welfare must co-operate to ensure that all of the Agency's resources were used in the most effective manner possible for the benefit of the truly needy, an objective which did not call for bargaining.

5. Reference had also been made to the problem of third-generation refugees. His delegation believed that the first task was to take care of the refugees already on the rolls or now eligible for inscription. As a practical matter, it was unrealistic to advocate the inclusion of third-generation refugees when the Agency had not long since been obliged by budgetary limitations to place a ceiling on the number of second-generation children receiving rations. His delegation therefore believed that the Commissioner-General would be well advised to concentrate his efforts on that category of refugees. It was also clear that the Agency could not at the present time even contemplate providing services to "other claimants" (*ibid.*, para. 20). His delegation shared the fear of the French representative that expansion of the rolls could harm the present beneficiaries.

6. A new element had recently appeared in the Palestine question. On 23 April 1965 the Gaza authorities had issued a decree regarding military service for able-bodied men in the Gaza Strip. It was his delegation's understanding that a substantial number of Palestinians from Gaza were at present in military training under the auspices of the Palestine Liberation Organization, which was apparently dedicated to the destruction of a Member State. His delegation considered that it was inadmissible for a United Nations agency to give support either directly or indirectly to such an organization. It therefore believed that measures must be taken to ensure that the men undergoing such military training did not receive rations from the Relief and Works Agency, and hoped that further word on that subject would be received from the Agency in the immediate future.

7. As to the broader aspects of the refugee problem, there seemed to have been no progress towards a solution. However, the United States was convinced that the search for a solution must not be abandoned and that the principles set forth in past resolutions of the General Assembly should be adhered to. Logically, the solution should be such that the Relief and Works Agency would no longer be necessary. It was imperative that in one way or another the means should be found for arriving at a peaceful settlement

of the problem, and the United States was prepared to play its part. Meanwhile, the Assembly must not lose sight of the refugees' plight. The United States would continue to make substantial contributions to the Agency. There could be no question of abandoning the refugees or of liquidating the organization for refugee relief. His delegation trusted that all Members of the United Nations would face up to their humanitarian responsibilities and that the severe financial problems threatening the Agency would be eased through a common effort. It was in that spirit that it had submitted the draft resolution before the Committee (A/SPC/L.113).

8. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) thanked the Commissioner-General of the Relief and Works Agency and his colleagues for the dedication they had displayed in carrying out their difficult task.

9. The Commissioner-General had submitted a remarkably clear and objective report. The fact that the situation of the refugees was steadily worsening, as indicated in the report, could not but arouse the gravest concern. The Agency's financial situation was so precarious that there was reason to be seriously worried about the future of the refugees and to fear the worst. The situation was particularly tragic as the refugees owned property the income from which could amply meet their needs. Before the occupation of their country, the Arabs of Palestine had owned 94 per cent of the land. According to estimates made in 1947, the annual income from the refugees' property had amounted to \$128.2 million or \$173,135,000 in present-day dollars. Yet the annual budget of the Agency ran at less than 22.5 per cent of the annual income from that property.

10. There would therefore seem to be an urgent need to entrust the refugees' property to a custodian appointed by the United Nations. However, since Israel refused to accept that provisional solution, the refugees could only rely—until such time as Israel came to its senses—on the generosity of Member States and the support of the United Nations. Thanks should be given to the countries and organizations which, through their generous gifts, had helped the refugees to have the minimum necessary for survival. The United Nations, for its part, should explore every possible means of providing the Agency with the necessary additional funds, for the Organization's particular responsibility in regard to the present situation of the refugees must not be lost from sight. Furthermore, it must be hoped that the Assembly would extend the Agency's mandate for a period long enough for it to be able to plan its activities rationally. A period of five years seemed reasonable for that purpose.

11. The Commissioner-General stated in his report that the international community was confronted with a long-term problem in providing for the needs of the refugees and that, in the absence of a political solution as envisaged in resolution 194 (III), the plight of the refugees was likely to continue. For the question of the refugees was closely linked with the political problem of Palestine. So long as the latter remained unsolved, therefore, there could be no question, in particular, of depriving the refugees' children of the

care of the international organizations, no matter to what generation they belonged.

12. Unfortunately, no progress had been made towards a just solution of the political problem, and the day would come when there was nothing left to the refugees but desperate solutions. For the moment, they were organizing themselves and, through the Palestine Liberation Organization, claiming the restoration of their rights. The Commissioner-General was therefore right in saying that the refugee problem had not grown any less complex or less dangerous to the peace and stability of the region. That meant that the United Nations could not continue to be content with palliatives.

13. Other speakers had shed full light on the Palestine problem, which Israel was seeking to obscure in order to minimize the realities of a criminal colonial action. For his delegation considered that the Palestine problem was by its very nature a colonial one. The colonization of Palestine had been carried out in accordance with a pre-established plan with the overt or covert assistance of a colonial Power and international finance. That conspiracy had ended in the conquest of the land of Palestine and the replacement of its indigenous population, both Moslems and Christians, by a colony of foreigners. The situation was similar to the one in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, except that the cruelty was more unrestrained, the injustice more flagrant and the cynicism more revolting. Whereas in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia the indigenous populations had, in spite of everything, remained in their country, the Palestinian people had been driven from their homeland. The Palestine refugees were deprived of the moral comfort and sense of dignity afforded by the awareness of living on one's native soil and of supporting one's family on the fruits of one's labour and property. Moreover, in Palestine the true situation was more ambiguous than in Southern Rhodesia and South Africa because the masters of the country tried to camouflage that situation. Lastly, as was the case in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, the State of Israel had based its existence on the idea of race and its intolerance led it to defy morality and law. Israel, like its friends in Pretoria and Salisbury, persisted in ignoring United Nations decisions and the elementary principles of international morality. Such defiance of the United Nations was particularly serious as it came from a Member State which owed its existence to the Organization.

14. For seventeen years the Palestine refugees had been calling for the implementation of the resolutions concerning their return to their homes. That heartfelt longing had been confirmed by the Commissioner-General in his last report, by Mr. Tannous (437th meeting), the accredited representative of the Palestinian people and Deputy Chairman of the delegation of the Palestine Liberation Organization, and by Mr. Al-Ghouri (442nd meeting) and Mr. Nakhleh (446th meeting), speaking on behalf of the Arab Higher Committee for Palestine. However, Israel continued to refuse categorically to implement the United Nations resolutions. It had not even complied with the resolution (181 (II)) concerning the partition of Palestine and one third of the area it occupied at present

should be returned, under the Partition plan, to the territory reserved for the Palestine Arabs.

15. The United Nations was in duty bound to put an end to that state of affairs. It could no longer tolerate Israel's defiance without risking seeing its prestige impaired. It must, then, induce Israel, as it was trying to do in the case of its friends in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, to comply with the United Nations decisions. It was in the interests of peace to recognize the infeasible rights of oppressed peoples and it was in the interests of all to have recourse to peaceful means and negotiation to achieve lasting solutions. Israel said that it was prepared to negotiate with the neighbouring States. However, what was at issue was not a dispute between sovereign States, but a colonial problem of primary concern to no one but the people directly involved. Consequently, if Israel really wished to put an end to the tragic situation in Palestine and the dangerous tension threatening peace and security in the Middle East, it must enter into negotiations with the representatives of the Palestinian people themselves. It must also show goodwill, and as proof of that the least that one could ask for was compliance with the United Nations resolutions.

16. The definitive solution of the refugee problem was contingent on the solution of the political problem. On Israel alone depended a gradual lessening of the grave tension threatening the peace and security of the Middle East. The means to achieve that end were well known: complete implementation of the United Nations decisions and negotiations with the representatives of the Arab people of Palestine with a view to determining the ways and means of achieving a lasting solution to the Palestine problem. If, on the contrary, Israel continued to harbour expansionist designs and to place the fait accompli above international morality, it would bear in the eyes of the world the burden of responsibility for anything that might happen. The Arab people of Palestine would never renounce their rights. The events of the last ten years had shown that nothing could crush the fierce determination of oppressed peoples, a fact which countries much more powerful than Israel had come to realize. Those events should therefore induce Israel to adopt a more realistic policy in the interests of peace.

17. Mr. BLATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the tragic situation of the Palestine refugees was not to be regarded merely as a violation of the fundamental principles of law and justice, but as a source of grave international tension. That was confirmed by the Commissioner-General in paragraph 6 of his report (A/6013), where he stated that the problem of the Palestine refugees had not grown any less complex or less dangerous to the peace and stability of the region. It was the duty of the United Nations to heed his voice and those of the representatives of the Arab countries and the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization. It could not be said that the United Nations had ignored the fate of the refugees. In December 1948 it had taken a firm stand, particularly in paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III), and year after year since then had adopted resolutions reaffirming the right of the

Palestine refugees to return to their homeland and to receive compensation. Unfortunately, during those seventeen years, the Assembly's decisions had been sabotaged and there was no indication that the rights of the Arab population could be restored to it. The reasons must be sought in the divergences between United Nations decisions on the one hand and the true situation and the plans of certain States on the other—in other words, in political factors. At previous sessions of the General Assembly the Soviet delegation had often drawn attention to the fact that the problem of the Arab refugees was the result of imperialist policy in the Near East. The representatives of the Arab countries had confirmed, by the many facts they had adduced, that the Israel Government was continuing to flout the General Assembly resolutions and to disregard the obligations it had assumed under the Charter, so that those resolutions remained a dead letter. They understood also that Israel was not acting in isolation, but was supported by other States seeking to use the problem of the Palestine refugees to exert pressure on the countries of the Near and Middle East and to maintain a source of international tension in those countries. The Israel representative had even gone so far as to state that paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III) was one that was impossible to implement and that the legitimate requests of the refugees were demands which were not within the Organization's competence and were incompatible with the principle of State sovereignty. Since the Israel representative, the better to distract the Committee from its real task, wished to bring up the debate which had taken place in 1947, he would himself remark that even at that time many States, including the Soviet Union, had tried to safeguard the interests of the Arab population of Palestine. Moreover, the Soviet Union had always opposed any unilateral solution of the Palestine problem which failed to take into account the national aspirations of both the Jewish and the Arab communities.

18. The preoccupations of the States in question were reflected, in particular, in the first paragraph of section C, chapter 3, of resolution 181 (II). There could be no question of the refugees living indefinitely on international charity. What was necessary was to restore the Arab refugees to their legitimate rights, which had been recognized by the United Nations. Their aspirations had met with understanding not only in the United Nations but also at international meetings such as the Bandung Conference, which had supported the rights of the Palestine Arabs, or the Cairo Conference, which had firmly declared itself in favour of a solution of the problem. For their part, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries attached great importance to the question. Quite recently the Soviet Government and the Government of the United Arab Republic had condemned imperialist policies in the Near East. On that occasion the Soviet Union had proclaimed its full support for the struggle of the Arab peoples against those policies and for the inalienable right of the Palestine Arabs. There was no doubt that the solution of the problem of the Palestine Arab refugees as envisaged in the United Nations resolutions and particularly in paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III), commanded wide international support. The Soviet delegation praised the efforts of

a number of Member States, particularly the Arab countries, to secure implementation of the relevant General Assembly resolutions, and was convinced that a settlement of the problem would contribute to peace and security in the Near East.

19. Mr. ZAIN (Malaysia) address his delegation's most cordial welcome to the Commissioner-General. Without wishing to dwell on the harsh realities of the refugees' daily life, he had to state that seventeen years after the events which had brought about that tragic situation, no solution was in sight. The Organization's responsibility in the matter was inescapable, since the problem had been created by the United Nations decision to partition the Arab's homeland against their wishes, and it should fulfil its solemn pledges, in particular the pledge contained in General Assembly resolution 194 (III), paragraph 11. The Committee would be deluding itself if it sought to confine the discussion to the practical and administrative issues raised by the Commissioner-General—important though they were—without dealing with the substance of the problem which, in the words of the Prime Minister of Malaysia, was "the full restoration of the legitimate rights of the Arab people to their homeland and their inalienable right of self-determination".

20. The United Nations had the duty to heed the appeals made to it, before it was too late. Year after year, successive Commissioners-General had drawn the Committee's attention to the sense of frustration, bitterness and betrayal felt by the refugees. Mr. Al-Ghouri, spokesman for the Palestine Arab delegation, and Mr. Tannous, representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, had declared that the Arab people of Palestine wanted to go home and live in freedom in their homeland. It was surprising that after so many years the Palestine refugees, like the oppressed millions of South Africa, still had faith in the United Nations. It was to be feared, however, that if the United Nations continued with its evasions, procrastinations and power calculations, it would at length be too late to remedy matters.

21. Turning to the two immediate problems, the renewal of the Agency's mandate and the financing of its activities, he said that the Commissioner-General and his staff certainly deserved praise for the remarkable results they had achieved with limited resources. For that reason, his delegation approved the proposal to extend the Agency's mandate for a term of five years. It also believed that the observations of the host countries (A/SPC/106) should be taken fully into account. The Commissioner-General had repeatedly drawn attention to the inadequacy of the services provided and to the harsh conditions under which the refugees lived. He had also pointed out that a further curtailment of the Agency's services would evoke strong reactions from the refugees and the host countries and would also have wide political consequences. The problem was essentially a financial one. The deficit was continuing to rise, and UNRWA would be unable to meet it in 1966 with its working capital. The Agency was to be congratulated on having reduced its administration and internal service costs by some \$750,000. Nevertheless, the necessary funds had to be raised. The Committee

could ask the Secretary-General to urge Member States at least to maintain their contributions at the current level and urge States which had never contributed to do so in future, since a joint effort by all Member States was needed. He also supported the proposal made by the Moroccan representative at the 445th meeting. Such measures could not, however, constitute a long-term solution to the problem of financing. The Committee must ensure a degree of financial stability and independence for the Agency, so that it could carry out its task. His delegation believed that the proposal to appoint a custodian to administer the property of the Palestine refugees was in conformity with international law and practice and could provide a solution to the financial problem. In any event, the Committee should make its position clear, in order that the United Nations might discharge its responsibility in accordance with justice and with the resolutions it had adopted. His delegation would support any proposal in that direction which would enable the United Nations to fulfil its solemn pledges to the Palestine refugees and ensure respect for their inalienable right to live in freedom in their homeland.

22. Mr. JIDDOU (Mauritania) congratulated the Commissioner-General on the clarity of his statement and the conscientiousness with which he fulfilled his arduous responsibilities. He thanked the host countries for their generous attitude towards the tragedy of the Palestine refugees. He had been moved by paragraph 6 of the Commissioner-General's report (A/6013), describing the state of mind of the refugees, who wished to return to their homes in accordance with the decisions of the United Nations. Taking advantage of the upheavals that had shaken the world during the Second World War, Zionism and its allies had organized an odious conspiracy against an innocent people. In order to disguise its crime, Israel had propounded the idea of Arab anti-Semitism; but the Saudi Arabian representative (442nd meeting) had demolished that myth by showing that Jewish refugees from Europe were predominantly of Slavic origin.

23. He wished at that point to dispel a misunderstanding. Mauritania would not oppose a Jewish State if it were established in a land that had been acquired lawfully. What Mauritania condemned was a minority's confiscation of the majority's property by force and in contempt of human rights. The Jewish immigrants could not have more right to Palestine than the Palestinian refugees, and a *de facto* situation based on an unjust principle could not constitute an acquired right. In the present situation there were two parties, one of which asked that the resolutions adopted by the United Nations in the matter should be implemented, while the other persisted in not implementing them. It was the duty of States to support the demands of those who were suffering and who for seventeen years had been claiming the enjoyment of an acknowledged right. Therefore, Mauritania denounced Israel with a conscience that was all the more clear because it had always condemned the persecution of the Jews at the hands of the Nazis. It seemed as if the sufferings undergone by the Jews had inclined them towards hatred; having despoiled the refugees of their property, the Jews were pre-

pared to deprive them of a ration which the Commissioner-General had called inadequate, and even to eliminate them as a community. The faith which in spite of everything the refugees still had in the United Nations should not be destroyed, and they should not continue to hope in vain. Israel had gone further than the South African Government and the minority Government of Rhodesia, for it had not hesitated to expel the indigenous population.

24. Some Powers, it appeared, had taken advantage of Zionist action in order to rid themselves of the persecuted Jews, who could no longer become loyal citizens, and to repair the injustice committed against them. It was deplorable that the United Nations should have lent itself to such a machination, which was likely to endanger peace. The General Assembly should therefore declare unmistakably that the Palestine refugees who so requested should be repatriated without any conditions or prerequisites. That was the solution most completely in keeping with justice and with the rights of the Palestinian people that had been recognized by the United Nations, and it was the only solution which would enable the Organization to free itself from a financial burden which became heavier year by year. In the meantime, it should provide all possible assistance for the refugees and frustrate the attempts made to disperse them. The Agency should therefore be given sufficient funds to pursue its humanitarian work on behalf of the refugees and to provide them with adequate rations. Moreover, the Committee should take into account the conclusions contained in paragraph 72 of the document submitted by the host countries (A/SPC/106). For that reason, he firmly supported the proposal to renew the Agency's mandate for a term of five years, as the Commissioner-General requested. The proposal to appoint a custodian to administer the refugee's property in Palestine should also be adopted. Those responsibilities should be assumed by the United Nations since it had been the cause of the problem.

25. Mr. NEKROUF (Morocco), commenting on the statement of the representative of Ireland (448th meeting), said he would like to confirm and explain the context in which he had quoted the words of His Holiness Pope Paul VI, at the 445th meeting. In the first part of his statement at that meeting he had proposed various steps designed to arrest and reverse the process of deterioration of the already precarious situation of the refugees. He had then pointed out that, under international law, the refugees preserved all their rights to their lands and possessions usurped by the Jewish occupants. Then he had examined the historical claims alleged by Israel in an attempt to justify that usurpation, and had shown, by stressing the colonialist character of the Zionist undertaking, that those claims were without any foundation whatsoever. Finally, he had voiced his fears for the future and had denounced the Zionist doctrine, which constituted a real threat to world peace and security. Since the situation had worsened with the passing of time, he had repeated that the Powers concerned and the United Nations should intervene at the earliest possible moment to restore to nearly 2 million refugees the exercise of their rights.

26. That was the context in which the principle stated by His Holiness Pope Paul VI should be placed, namely, that "relations between the peoples should be regulated by reason, by justice, by law, by negotiation; not by force nor by violence nor by war, neither by fear nor by fraud" (1347th plenary meeting, para. 27). He had emphasized the word "negotiation" from that quotation, giving it the high significance conferred upon it by its author. It was clear, however, that there could be no question of negotiating the sacred principles of the possessions, the dignity and the sovereignty of a people. If negotiation was to take place, it could take place only in the light of principles which, during the past decades, had governed the transformation of the relations between the colonial Powers and the former colonial peoples. It would not be a matter of bargaining, but the result of a decision by the Palestine refugees. Only negotiations designed to restore to the Palestinians their full rights and sovereignty, and making it possible to avoid the legitimate resort to force to implement the law, could command the support of all men of goodwill.

27. Mr. TANNOUS (speaking in accordance with the decision of the Committee on 20 October 1965, as one of the persons constituting the delegation of the Palestine Liberation Organization, without implying recognition of that organization) pointed out that the United Nations had been dealing with the Palestine problem for nearly twenty years and that no progress had been made towards a solution. How could it have been otherwise, since the Committee had been concerned solely with the consideration of the report of the Commissioner-General and the determination of the daily amounts to be granted to the refugees to prevent them from starving to death? Such a passive attitude on the part of the United Nations was tantamount to a tacit approval of the injustice of which the Palestine refugees were the victims. Apparently the United Nations believed that time would help to solve the problem. However, in the case of Palestine, time was on the contrary a very dangerous element, as the Commissioner-General had rightly pointed out in the introduction to his report.

28. It had been said that the Committee was not a historical society and that it was not competent to pass judgement on the past. He did not see why the United Nations should not be qualified to pass judgement on the Palestine problem today, when it had done so in 1947. The existing situation was merely the consequence of past events, and the past could not be accepted as an accomplished fact without at the same time renouncing all idea of a future.

29. The Zionist invaders did not want to admit that their terrorist bands were responsible for the Palestine refugee problem. They therefore threw back the responsibility for the current situation on the Arab Governments, which on 15 May 1948 had sent troops into Palestine—as though the exodus of refugees had begun at that time. The Zionists had explained the flight of the Arabs by fallacious arguments. They had said, for instance, that the Palestine Arabs had left the country of their own free will, or that they had been encouraged by their leaders to leave Palestine, or that their exodus had resulted from the war be-

tween the Arab States and Israel. Those allegations had received the widest publicity in the Jewish and pro-Jewish Press. They had been repeated by the representatives of Israel at every session of the United Nations General Assembly. They had served as a pretext for refusing to recognize the right of the Arab refugees to return to their homes. But all those allegations were entirely false. The Arabs of Palestine had been driven out of their homes, their farms, their places of work, their mosques, their churches and their schools. The methods used by the Zionists were similar to those of the Nazis. It would be impossible to enumerate all the atrocities committed by the Jewish terrorists. The book A Study of History, by the English historian Arnold Toynbee,<sup>1/</sup> revealed the truth of what had taken place from 15 May to 31 December 1948, particularly concerning the crimes committed by the terrorists, the massacre of men, women and children perpetrated at Deir Yassin and the deliberate expulsion of the Arab population from the districts conquered by the Jewish forces. There had also been the bombing of two hotels in Jerusalem, attacks on a number of villages, the attempted assassination of the High Commissioner for Palestine and his wife, the assassination of Lord Moyne, the British Minister of State, in Cairo, and the hurling of bombs and explosives into Arab towns and villages.

30. The conclusions to be drawn from Arnold Toynbee's account were as follows: first, the crimes committed by the Zionist Jews against the Arabs of Palestine were comparable to the crimes committed against the Jews by the Nazis; secondly, those crimes had caused the mass flight of the Arab population; thirdly, the exodus had begun on 9 April 1948, the

date of the massacre of Deir Yassin, while the British troops were still in occupation in Palestine and five weeks before the Arab soldiers had entered Palestine; fourthly, after the British had left, the Israel authorities had deliberately proceeded to expel the Arab population; fifthly, the crimes prior to 15 May 1948 had been committed by Jewish terrorist bands, and those perpetrated after that date had been the responsibility of the State of Israel. Not only did Arnold Toynbee condemn the expulsion of the Arabs from Palestine, but that expulsion seemed to him all the less excusable since the Jews, who had been subjected to so many persecutions, should have drawn a lesson from that experience and refrained from imitating their persecutors.

31. Another valuable piece of evidence was to be found in the book A Soldier with the Arabs, by Sir John Bagot Glubb,<sup>2/</sup> who had commanded the Arab Legion in Jordan until 1956. The book showed that the atrocities and massacres described in it had been planned months and perhaps years before, the object being to sow panic among the Arab population and force the Arabs to abandon their homes. The Jews had wanted Palestine emptied of its Arab population, knowing that their State, in accordance with the recommendations of resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947 on partition, would have to comprise as many Arabs as Jews. They had also been anxious to seize Arab houses and lands in order to make ready for the arrival of new Jewish immigrants.

*Because of electric power failure, the rest of Mr. Tannous' statement was postponed until the following day's meeting.*

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.

<sup>1/</sup> London, Oxford University Press, 1954.

<sup>2/</sup> London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1957.