



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 36:	
United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (<i>continued</i>):	
(a) Report of the Commissioner-General;	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General	175

Chairman: Mr. Eugeniusz KULAGA (Poland).

AGENDA ITEM 36

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine
Refugees in the Near East (*continued*) (A/7577, A/7614,
A/7665, A/SPC/133, A/SPC/134, A/SPC/175):

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

1. Mr. KHALAF (Iraq) said that the report of the Commissioner-General (A/7614) was yet another reminder of the great injustice inflicted twenty-two years before on the Arab people of Palestine. At that time, the General Assembly, through the pressure, intrigues and manipulation of votes by the Zionists and the United States, had recommended the partition of Palestine in violation of the United Nations Charter. The sequence of events was well known. Recalling those events, Mr. Dean Acheson, who was then the United States Under-Secretary of State, had said in his book *Present at the Creation; My Years at the State Department*,¹ "... to transform [Arab Palestine] into a Jewish State . . . would vastly exacerbate the . . . problem and imperil not only American but all Western interests in the Near East". Unfortunately, Mr. Acheson had kept his opposition to President Truman's intentions concerning the creation of the State of Israel quiet for too long. A Jewish American writer Mr. Alfred Lillenthal, author of the article "*Israel's Flag is not Mine*", published in the *Reader's Digest* of September 1949 had urged influential personalities who had harboured doubts as to the course upon which the United States had embarked in 1947 to speak up and take part in the great debate on the Middle East during the 1970s.

2. Despite their twenty years of suffering, the Palestinians' aim was still the establishment of a democratic, secular State—a pluralistic State—for all its people; that had been proclaimed by the Palestine Liberation Organization, the representative of which had told the Committee that a few days before that it was the only way of achieving just and lasting peace. In contrast, the representative of Israel had protested a few days earlier because the refugees had become wards of the United Nations and, to add insult to

injury, had said that in 1948 they had left "Israel territory" of their own free will. Could the Israel representative call "Israel territory" what Mr. Acheson himself had called "Arab Palestine"? As to the Israel representative's reference to Israel's contribution to the improvement of the refugee situation, its hypocrisy was flagrant, when it was remembered that those refugees were the rightful owners of Palestine and its riches.

3. Until the Palestine Arabs could exercise the rights of all peoples, the United Nations was duty bound to see that they could lead a decent and honourable existence; in fulfilling that duty, it should be able to count on the support of the countries which had a special responsibility for the situation. The Commissioner-General and his staff should be praised for the efforts they had made in that respect. However, the problem of the Palestine refugees was not a matter of international charity and relief. The fact that efforts were being made to minimize the political, legal and constitutional aspects of the problem was one of the reasons why UNRWA was having difficulty in obtaining the required funds. In the circumstances, suggestions about the resettlement of the refugees and development of the region through negotiations with some Governments were tantamount to a manoeuvre to perpetuate the usurpation of Palestine.

4. Israel was deceiving itself if it thought that the Palestinians would give up their struggle to achieve their aspirations. When the representative of Israel called the Arab freedom fighters terrorists, he should remember the atrocities committed by the Irgun Zvai Leumi and the Stern Gang, the assassination of Count Bernadotte, the execution of British soldiers and the blowing up of the King David Hotel at Jerusalem, which had caused the death of forty-one people. The Israel representative had also said that the Arabs had been waging war against Israel for twenty years. In fact, it was the Zionists who had started three wars against the Arabs during that period to force them to accept the *fait accompli*. In a statement reported by the *Jewish Chronicle* of 3 October 1969, Mr. Dayan had said that Israel was preparing for a new war. As to the negotiations which the Israelis insisted upon, there would be, in Mr. Dayan's own words in his book *Diary of the Sinai Campaign*,² "victors and vanquished seated together". In the meantime, Israeli planes were attacking Arab towns and collective punishment was being inflicted on civilians to break the will of the Palestinian people, which, as Mrs. Meir had told *The Sunday Times* of London on 15 June 1969, "did not exist".

5. There was evidence to show that Israel repression was unable to reduce the resistance of Palestinians. In an article

¹ New York, W. W. Norton, 1969.

² New York, Harper and Row, 1966.

published in *The Times* of London on 20 November 1969, Miss Vivian Craddock Williams had said that each Israel raid increased the fighting spirit of the Palestinians and that there was nothing else they could do. In a letter to the same paper, written after a visit to Israel a few weeks before, Mr. Christopher Walker, had said that Palestine fighters captured by the Israelis had been tortured because they had behaved in a defiant manner.

6. Very few impartial observers had been allowed into the occupied territories. Unfortunately, not enough was known about the situation there. Mr. Anthony Nutting, a United Kingdom Member of Parliament, had been banned from entering them. News from Israel and the occupied territories was filtered by the Israel correspondents in most Western countries. In view of that situation, the United Nations Office of Public Information should make a particular effort to make known the situation and aspirations of the Palestinians.

7. The Western information media presented the Israel-Arab conflict in a biased manner which not only did injustice to the Arab cause but also gave the peoples of the world an unfavourable idea of Western justice. There were several reasons for that partiality. First, there was a powerful Zionist propaganda machine in many Western countries which, as Mr. Christopher Mayhew, a Labour Member of the United Kingdom Parliament, had said in a letter to *The Times* of London on 30 June 1969, had no equivalent on the Arab side. Second, the Western information media were controlled by the Zionists and their supporters. In that connexion, the French Defence Minister, Mr. Michel Debré, had said, according to *Le Monde* of 25 January 1969, that internal and external pressure groups representing public and private Israel interests had been manifesting themselves in the French information media. Third, the Zionists were using the accusation of anti-Semitism to frighten anyone who challenged their opinions, as was shown recently when the *The Times* of London was accused in the House of Commons of being anti-Semitic and pro-Nazi because it had published an article by Mr. Hodgkin on the situation in the occupied territories.

8. Zionist pressure on information media was particularly strong in the United States. The magazine *Life* had been the target for Zionist accusations for carrying some factual information on the situation in the Middle East. An article in the *American Jewish World* of St. Paul, Minnesota, had said that that "well-informed" magazine was just as guilty of anti-Semitism as the "ignorant" negro extremists. Mr. George Cueter had written a letter asking Mr. Jemail, editorialist of the New York *Daily News* to ask the public in that paper's daily inquiry "The Inquiring Photographer", whether it thought that in the United States the Arab point of view, with regard to the Middle East conflict, was fairly presented in newspapers and magazines and on radio and television; Mr. Jemail had replied that the editor of *The Daily News* had not agreed to the question. The preceding week, *The New York Times* had given lengthy coverage to a meeting held in New York by the Zionist Organization of America, although it had not even mentioned the deliberations of the Special Political Committee. On the occasion of that Zionist meeting, the President of the United States had sent a letter to the President of the Zionist Organization of

America to assure him that his administration had assigned the highest priority to achieving peace in the Middle East and the President of the Zionist Organization of America had reciprocated by appealing to Jews in the United States to support Mr. Nixon's Viet-Nam policies.

9. With regard to the discussions on the Middle East, the Palestinians could not be asked to suffer in silence while awaiting the results of discussions which were leading nowhere and while the Israelis were increasing their attacks and atrocities. It had been said that the United States might bring pressure to bear on Israel to stop those atrocities. But the United States was arming Israel and could not be expected to influence it in that respect, in view of the bombing of Viet-Nam villages and the massacre of Song My.

10. He had referred to the sufferings of the Viet-Nam people because the cause of freedom and justice was the same everywhere. The Arabs therefore appealed to Member States, and in particular those with whom they had waged so many battles in support of the national struggle for liberation in Africa and Asia, to join with them in their fight against the most brutal colonial onslaught in the history of mankind. The Arabs, for their part, undertook to continue their struggle for their land and their future, with the Palestinian freedom fighters in the forefront.

11. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the report (A/7614) of the Commissioner-General showed that UNRWA was doing much to alleviate the sorry plight of the Palestine refugees. The activities of the Agency were worthy of the appraisal given by the delegations of the Arab countries. The Soviet delegation had no doubt about the accuracy of that appraisal, and had no objection to the Agency's humanitarian activities. However, his delegation wished to stress that the Agency's activities, which involved helping refugees as such, did not attack the real problem, which was not to determine whether refugees were receiving the bare necessities, but rather, when and how they would be able to return to their homeland.

12. The real problem, which was not within the Agency's purview, was political rather than humanitarian. It was reflected in the report of the Commissioner-General, particularly in paragraphs 7, 11 and 12. Those paragraphs of the report simply alluded to the substance of the problem, which could be attributed to the policy of aggression which Israel's leaders had been pursuing for over twenty years against the Arab peoples and which had forced an entire people—the Palestinian Arabs—into exile. Those exiles had been joined by new refugees who had fled the territories occupied by Israel following Israel's aggression in 1967. The Palestinian Arabs were waging a courageous struggle for national liberation, a struggle against imperialism. Like all other peoples in the world, the Palestinian Arabs—including 1.4 million persons living in a foreign land against their will—had the right to live on their own land, to exercise self-determination and to develop and sustain their national culture.

13. He recalled the United Nations attitude towards the refugee problem resulting from the fundamental political issue. He quoted paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III) affirming the unconditional right of

refugees to return to their homeland, a right which had been confirmed in all subsequent resolutions, including General Assembly resolution 2452 (XXIII). Moreover, Security Council resolution 237 (1967), whose provisions were binding upon Member States, called upon the Government of Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations had taken place and to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who had fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities. Those General Assembly and Security Council resolutions constituted a political and legal basis for a settlement of the Palestine refugee problem. The Soviet Union had unswervingly supported those decisions and, together with the overwhelming majority of Member States, advocated their implementation.

14. If those resolutions remained dead letters, it was because the Israel Government refused to implement them and sought to impart an aura of legality to its policy on the basis of two arguments. The first argument claimed that the repatriation of Palestine refugees would endanger the security of Israel. In reality, by claiming a supposed national superiority over another people, Israel had assumed the right to exile the Palestinian people from their homeland and to prevent their return, actions which ran counter to the principles of international law and the principles enshrined in the Charter. It was impossible to speak of chosen people or rejected people. The second argument, set forth in a note verbale dated 14 August 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Israel, (see A/7665) claimed that the majority of persons that crossed from the West Bank to Jordan after the end of the June 1967 hostilities could not be regarded as displaced persons who had fled the Israel-occupied areas; they were persons who had left the area of their own will, in an orderly fashion, and without being obliged to do so. Did the Israel leaders believe that they could evade their responsibilities by such verbal trickery?

15. The Members of the United Nations knew the truth: the Commissioner-General's report described the miserable situation of the refugees, particularly those who had been driven out of their homes following the June 1967 military operations, and the representatives of Jordan, Yemen, the United Arab Republic and other Arab States had described the fate of Palestinian Arabs who had been victims of the 1967 Israel aggression. Moreover, every day objective, authoritatively confirmed news reports were issued describing the crimes of the Israel occupiers—arrests and evictions of Arabs and the large-scale destruction of their homes and cultural buildings. The Israel authorities were forcing the indigenous Arab population to leave the land which belonged to them in the occupied territories, thereby swelling the number of persons fleeing to refugee camps. Even pro-Israel newspapers reported the recent exodus of Arabs from the Gaza Strip, the Sinai Peninsula and the West Bank of the Jordan. *The New York Times* of 13 October 1969 had reported the destruction of several dozen houses on the West Bank of the Jordan and the fact that approximately 200 Arab families had been forced to request permission to leave that same area because of reprisals carried out by the Israel authorities.

16. The Israel authorities were not hiding the fact that they were pursuing a policy of so-called "collective punish-

ment" against all who sympathized with the Arab resisters' struggle for liberation. That policy of forced exile, arrests and destruction for the purpose of implanting Israel colonies more firmly in the occupied territories was a violation of the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949, a Convention ratified by Israel in 1950. He recalled articles, 27, 29 and 33 of the Convention, all of which were criteria for assessing Israel's actions in respect of the civilian Arab population in the occupied Arab territories. Did not the Israelis—some of whom had managed to escape death in Hitler's concentration camps—realize that Israel's actions were analogous to Nazi policy? The arguments advanced by the Israel Government justified nothing and revealed even more clearly Israel's aggressive anti-humanitarian policy.

17. The absence of any progress towards a settlement of the Palestine refugee problem could not but arouse the concern and protests of the refugees themselves, their fellow Arabs and all who cherished peace in the Middle East and wished to see the prestige of the United Nations maintained and enhanced.

18. The Soviet Union firmly supported the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arabs and believed it was essential for the United Nations to take energetic steps to ensure that Israel complied immediately and fully with United Nations resolutions on the Palestinian Arab refugees. His delegation hoped that the examination of that important and burning issue during the current session of the General Assembly would contribute to the search for a just solution.

19. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom) said that at a time when a generation of children was growing up in privation and when nearly half a million people faced the bitterness of another winter in despair, the annual debate of the Committee had become a reproach and a shame. It was true that the achievements of the Agency were admirable and that the Commissioner-General and his staff had operated in conditions of hardship, hampered by inadequate resources, and deserved the Committee's respect and gratitude. They proved the effectiveness of international endeavour. In particular, there was reason to welcome the Commissioner-General's assurance that the Agency's operations in Lebanon had been continued and that the assistance which the Agency provided was going entirely to needy persons.

20. However, little satisfaction could be derived from the extent of international support for the Agency or from the number of nations prepared to contribute to it. For its part, the United Kingdom had thus far contributed over \$100 million to the Agency, not counting contributions from private sources and considerable bilateral aid, and its contribution for the current year would again be substantial. His delegation thus felt that it had the right to call upon other countries, particularly more than fifty countries which regularly voted for the continuation of the Agency's mandate but made no financial contributions at all. Perhaps a contribution could be expected for the first time from the Soviet Union, in view of the impassioned statement just made by its representative; that would be a positive sign of

its concern for the refugees. It was imperative to give the Agency the means to continue its vital task.

21. It was difficult to listen to the current debate without feeling a sense of failure and without turning from the problem of temporary relief to the overriding question of permanent settlement. The world could not be content with keeping 1.5 million people alive; it must try to make their lives worth living and to give them the hope that they would once again be able to have homes of their own and some prospect of employment and the means to bring up their children in dignity. The Palestine refugees were the victims of an intolerable injustice which must never be accepted or condoned. It was depressing to note that there had been practically no progress towards a permanent settlement. The principles stated in General Assembly resolution 194 (III) and the provisions of Security Council resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V)—unanimously adopted resolutions which were directly related to the question of the refugees—had not been forgotten. Everyone had hoped that the refugees would be allowed to return to their homes. Such a step could have transformed the whole situation. His delegation understood the present preoccupations with internal security, which were inevitable. It had been shocked to learn that very day that innocent civilians had been wounded at Athens by Arab terrorists. However, his delegation wished to reiterate that there was greater danger in keeping people in forced exile than in allowing them to go home. That had been proved. As he had said in 1968, anyone who opposed help to the refugees was an enemy of a just settlement.

22. Ever since the war of 1967 and ever since the unanimous adoption of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), the United Kingdom Government had been stating that it was urgent to act to remedy a situation which was deteriorating dangerously month by month. The continuing delay was a grave threat to peace and had intensified the suffering and the bitterness of the refugees. Since the adoption of resolution 242 (1967), it had been accepted that the settlement must be a comprehensive one, whereas there had at one time been talk of withdrawal as a precondition of settlement and it had been said that peace must await settlement of the refugee problem. The resolution was indivisible; withdrawal could not come without peace being assured and peace could not be won without withdrawal. Similarly, there could be no peace without settlement of the refugee problem and no settlement of the refugee problem without peace. Yet the need to achieve a comprehensive settlement must not be used as an argument for failing to make any start at all and to undertake the preparatory work which would have to be done before final decisions could be taken.

23. The working out of a just solution must not be further delayed. It was no easy matter, as Mr. Johnson, the United States representative knew, for it was he who had made one of the most determined attempts to work out such a settlement. Mr. Jarring had already been given the task of assisting efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement in accordance with the provisions and the principles of the resolution, which included a just settlement of the refugee problem. He would soon be resuming his endeavours and it was to be hoped that he would be able to pursue them with the full support of all.

24. Among the questions to be solved, including the basic questions of the withdrawal of troops and a guaranteed permanent peace, there was none more complex or more urgent than that of the refugees. The representative of Yugoslavia had spoken for all the members of the Committee when at the 672nd meetings he had said that it was their duty to redress the injustice that had been committed. There was no question that the unanimous adoption of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and the request to the Secretary-General to designate a Special Representative to promote agreement had been justified. The purpose and the method had been rightly decided by the Security Council in November 1967. Not only must the Agency, which had been set up to assist the refugees, be given moral and financial support but efforts to work out a just settlement in accordance with the purposes declared and approved by all must be renewed.

25. Mr. TEKOA (Israel), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, noted that little or nothing had been said during the present debate with regard to the abominable crime committed the day before by Arab terrorists in Athens, who had wounded fifteen civilians. The Palestine Popular Struggle Front had claimed responsibility for that act. The Arab Governments were organizing a campaign of murder, which they called a "war of attrition", yet they were complaining that Israel was destroying abandoned houses that were being used as bases by the terrorists. The refugee camps themselves had been turned into such bases. The Arab Governments were demanding the uncontrolled return of the refugees and were trying to transform the examination of the report of the Commissioner-General into a general debate on the problems of the Middle East.

26. Why was nothing done to put an end to terrorism and to prevent the Arab States from trying to destroy a Member State of the United Nations, which, as the representative of Iraq had just confirmed once again, was their recognized objective? It was strange to hear the representative of a State that was violating the fundamental principles of the United Nations preaching morality to the members of the Committee. Iraq's actions were causing a constant flow of refugees, and its accusations were making a mockery of the debate. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, for its part, was continuing to support the aggressive and extremist policy of the Arab States and to accuse Israel. Judging by the statements made by Mr. Malik in the Security Council, that had not always been the case, for in 1949 the Soviet Union had maintained that Israel could not be blamed for all the problems that needed to be solved, especially the refugee problem. If the Soviet Union was concerned about the problem, it could easily dissuade the Arabs from pursuing the war; if it had changed its attitude, the facts nevertheless remained unchanged.

27. The Security Council had confirmed that the problem could not be solved without the establishment of a just and lasting peace; the sooner the Arab States agreed to negotiate with Israel, the sooner the refugee problem would be solved. The Soviet Union should persuade the Arab countries to negotiate for peace rather than encourage them in their belligerent attitude. The comparison between Israel and the Nazis was an insult, particularly considering that the Nazis had once claimed that the Jews were Soviet agents. On 21 May 1948 Mr. Gromyko had said that the

Soviet Union could not help being surprised at the position of the Arab States. The Soviet Union could not possibly be unaware of the fact that the Arabs had refused and continued to refuse to put an end to the struggle. In those circumstances, Israel had the right and the duty to defend itself against the aggressors, whether they were regular troops or terrorists. That right to self-defence was recognized by the Charter. The Soviet Union wanted to rewrite history and support extremism; that was demonstrated by its support of the Arab States and their terrorist campaigns. Only those who were motivated by the basest instincts could glorify those assassinations and regard them as chivalrous. When Hitler had wanted to justify the assassination of Jews, he had spoken of the purification of the race. In 1969, President Nasser had tried to justify his actions by speaking of the purification of the land. The Soviet Union should take a definite stand in favour of peace.

28. Mr. KHALAF (Iraq), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that, as might have been expected, the representative of Israel was, as usual, distorting the truth. It was the Israelis who were guilty of the actions of which they accused the Arabs. It was they who had bombed Syria, Jordan and Egypt from aircraft furnished by the United States; it was they who had invaded the territories of their neighbours. The representative of Israel was constantly referring to the treatment of Jews in Iraq, yet those Jews were treated fairly. The other statements made by the Israel representative at the present meeting could only be regarded with contempt. It was the Jews who were the invaders, the occupiers and the oppressors.

29. The passages which the Iraqi delegation had quoted were from statements made by impartial persons. The problems encountered by Jews in the Arab countries were due to Zionism and not to anti-Semitism. Israel persisted in speaking on behalf of the Jews of the entire world. The secretary-general of Israel's Ministry of Foreign Affairs had written and proclaimed that it was common knowledge that a minister plenipotentiary, such as Mr. Tekoah, had two roles: that of minister plenipotentiary, to the country where he was stationed and that of special envoy to the Jews of that country. The Soviet Union was helping the Arab countries because they were fighting for their future. The United States was also providing aid, but, unfortunately, to the aggressors. Israel had objected to the comparison between Israel and Nazi atrocities; he would like to remind the Committee in that connexion of the statement made by the American socialist, Norman Thomas, to the effect that the Arabs could without exaggeration complain that the Jews were practising Hitlerism in reverse.

30. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), exercising his right of reply, observed that the statement of the representative of Israel to the effect that Israel had acted in self-defence in June 1967 was obviously a political flight of fancy. It was Israel which had attacked the Arab States, and it was Israel which had since occupied Arab territories. In that connexion he recalled the recent declaration in which the Governments and the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union had affirmed their

solidarity with the Arab peoples who were struggling for their sovereignty and their freedom.

31. The representative of Israel had also said that in the past the Soviet Union had declared that the problem of the Palestine refugees could be solved only if peace was restored in the Middle East; yet peace could not be restored unless Israel withdrew from the occupied territories and stated its intention to comply with Security Council resolution 242 (1967), something which for the past two and a half years it had been refusing to do.

32. In reply to an observation by the representative of the United Kingdom, he reminded the latter that in the preceding year his delegation had already stated its position on the matter. The Soviet Union was assisting the Arab refugees independently of UNRWA; it was doing so within the framework of its bilateral assistance to the Arab States—the victims of aggression—and, in addition, social organizations in the Soviet Union were helping the refugees.

33. Mr. EL-ERIAN (United Arab Republic) said that once again the representative of Israel had seen fit to distort the message sent by President Nasser to the Minister of Defence of the United Arab Republic. That tactic was not new, and the representative of Israel had demonstrated at the 675th meeting, how he could distort statements that had just been made, even when they were still fresh in the minds of those who had made them. The Israel delegation had also used that tactic on 9 September 1969 at the 1507th meeting of the Security Council during the discussion of the burning of the Al Aqsa Mosque and the sacrilegious treatment of it by the Israel authorities. Moreover, the Arab world had never espoused theories based on racial considerations, whereas Israel had done so. The day before, when the representative of Israel had had the audacity to speak of peace, the representative of the United Arab Republic and the representative of the Soviet Union had asked him questions which he had been unable to answer and which he would never answer frankly.

34. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that no matter how much the representative of Israel talked about murders perpetrated by the Arabs, the fact remained that they were acts of war, a war which the Jewish immigrants from eastern and central Europe had launched in Palestine in 1922. The Israel representative spoke of the defensive war waged by Israel since 1948. Did he not remember who had introduced violence into Palestine between 1922 and 1948? Had not Count Bernadotte and Lord Moyne, to say nothing of British soldiers, been killed by Israel organizations such as the Irgun Zvai Leumi, the Haganah and the Stern Gang? The war waged by Israel had been not a defensive war but a war of aggression, whereas the struggle of the Palestine Arabs was a struggle for liberation. The representative of Israel was asking the Soviet Union to urge the Arab States to make peace; yet if certain Western States wished to see peace in the Middle East, why did they not decide right now to stop furnishing Israel with arms?

35. The heart of the problem was the liberation of Palestine by Palestine Arabs, who would pursue their struggle even if the Arab States disapproved of some of their actions. If, as the representative of Israel said, the

Soviet Union had changed its policy since recognizing the State of Israel, it had only acknowledged its mistake, something which the Western countries, under continuous pressure from the Zionists, had never done. No State had the right to impose on the Palestine Arabs a settlement which did not take into account that principle of the Charter acknowledging their right of self-determination.

36. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that he had quoted a passage from the letter addressed by President Nasser to the Egyptian Minister of Defence on 23 August 1969, a letter whose text not only had been broadcast but also had been published by the official press agency of the Government of the United Arab Republic. Moreover, on 5 July 1967 President Nasser had made a similar statement which had been broadcast by the official broadcasting services of Cairo. As for the notion of the purification of the land, it was to Moscow that President Nasser had first spoken on that subject.

37. Replying to the representative of the Soviet Union, he said that in his statements he had mentioned the year 1948 and not the year 1967, as the date of the beginning of the Arab-Israel conflict. If the representative of the Soviet Union preferred to limit himself to an analysis of the events of 1967, the speaker would recall some facts concerning them: it was the Arab States which, encouraged by the Soviet Union, had engaged in terrorist manoeuvres between the beginning of the 1960s and the first months of 1967. It was the leaders of the Arab States who, in the spring of 1967, had announced that they were preparing to launch their final attack against Israel, had amassed troops and arms along Israel's borders, had closed the Strait of Tiran, had bombed Israel villages situated not far from the

Egyptian border and had tried to isolate the port of Elath from the rest of Israel's territory.

38. With regard to Israel's attitude towards the resolution (242 (1967)) adopted on 22 November 1967 by the Security Council, the representative of the Soviet Union should refer to the statement made by the representative of Israel to the Security Council on 1 May 1968 (1418th meeting), or to the statements made by the Israel Minister for Foreign Affairs to the General Assembly on 8 October 1968 (1686th plenary meeting) and 19 September 1969 (1757th plenary meeting). The resolution adopted on 22 November 1967 by the Security Council dealt with the question of an agreement between the Arab States and Israel to ensure a just and lasting peace. Yet neither the representatives of the Arab States nor the representatives of the Soviet Union had so far spoken in the Committee of the necessity of working for the establishment of a just and lasting peace between Israel and the Arab States. He would like to invite the representative of the Soviet Union to meditate on that other quotation from the Bible about those who had ears and heard not, those who had eyes and saw not, for it was high time to listen to what was being said and look at what was being done with regard to the situation in the Middle East.

39. Mr. KHALIL (United Arab Republic) reserved the right of his delegation to intervene later in the debate.

40. Mr. BARABANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would reply to the representative of Israel at the end of the afternoon meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.