



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	195

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/153, A/SPC/134, A/SPC/L.175):**

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

1. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) paid a tribute to Mr. Michelmore and his staff for their devotion and tireless efforts.

2. Many speakers had already refuted the specious arguments of the Israel representative by citing facts about the current tragedy. He intended to present to the Committee certain research he had done on the genesis of that tragedy. It was true that the agenda item before the Committee concerned refugees, and not history, but since the Israel representative had presented the facts selectively to support his case more effectively, he felt obliged to give the full background of the situation. In so doing, he wished, in particular, to prove that political Zionism, contrary to the assertions of the Zionists, was a Central and Eastern European political movement which had nothing to do with semitism, just as the Israelis, most of whom were descended from the Khazars, were not of Semitic origin.

3. To support that theory, he quoted extracts from the Jewish Encyclopaedia. That work stated that the Khazars had come from the steppes of Asia; during the second half of the sixth century A.D., they had moved westward and had carved out a kingdom in the largest part of South Russia long before the foundation of the Russian monarchy by the Varangians. It was probably in the eighth century that the King of the Khazars, his nobles and a large number of his heathen people had converted to Judaism. At the height of their power they had invited to their Kingdom scholars—probably Semites—who had influenced their culture. In their writings, the Khazars had used the Hebrew letters, but the Khazar language, which was not Hebrew, had predominated. Then, towards 965, the Russians had conquered the Kingdom of the Khazars, who had retained

only a few possessions in the Crimea. Many had emigrated to Spain, where they had found refuge with the Arabs.

4. He then referred to a number of historical maps which showed how the Khazar Kingdom, at first situated north of the Caspian Sea, had gradually extended from the Black Sea to the Aral Sea. He said that those maps provided irrefutable evidence, since they had been prepared by historians and cartographers and not by politicians.

5. It might be thought that it was because the Russians had fought against the Khazars that the Soviet Union was today the only great Power which understood the Arabs' struggle. The real reason was that since Zionism had first appeared, the Russian Jews had been under constant pressure to leave their country and settle in Arab territories.

6. The Israel representative liked to refer to his people as descendants of the Semitic Jews of Palestine, but the facts he had just cited showed that the Israelis, many of whom were descendants of the Khazars, were not Semites. While it was true that some Semitic Jews had left Palestine for Babylonia, they represented only a fraction of the Jews who had lived in Palestine, just as, following the Arab occupation of Spain, all Arabs had not left that country; many had remained and had founded families. There was no such thing as Semitic blood; there was a Semitic culture based on a way of life, food, a language, and to a certain extent, a religion. However, the fact that the Israelis had a Semitic religion did not mean that they were Semites, for, he emphasized, the Khazars were not Semites.

7. He then described the relations between the Jews and Nazi Germany. He quoted an article from *The New York Times* of 7 August 1933, in which Mr. Samuel Untermyer, after returning from a meeting at which it had been decided to prosecute an economic boycott of Germany to undermine the Hitler régime, had stated that the boycott was a holy war designed to bring the German people to their senses by destroying their export trade on which their very existence depended. Hitler, who had only just taken power, had been forced to react against a movement which had threatened the country's very existence. He then quoted a passage from the book *Back Door to War; the Roosevelt Foreign Policy, 1933-1941*.¹ by Charles Callan Tansill, a professor at Georgetown University; the latter, referring to a conversation between Mr. Clifton, Mr. Utley and Mr. Schoenfeld, who was at present a member of the United States State Department, wrote that the concentration camp at Dachau was well organized; that the discipline of the inmates was excellent and their health was apparently satisfactory; they were largely Communists and inasmuch as in Germany the officials regarded communism

¹ Chicago, Regnery, 1952.

as Jewish-inspired, that fact had sinister implications for the large Jewish population. The speaker was by no means seeking to condone the inhuman brutalities perpetrated by the Nazi régime; however, he felt that the blockade recommended by the Jews had maddened Hitler.

8. Quoting an article in *The New York Times* of 29 November 1969, he said that Israel was renounced by some American students of Jewish origin who criticized the United States involvement with the Zionist movement. However, President Truman, in introducing the budget for 1947, had affirmed that the United States would not approve any territorial changes which did not correspond to the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned. That had not prevented him, under pressure from the Zionists, and for supposedly humanitarian reasons, from becoming another Balfour and accepting the partition of Palestine without a plebiscite.

9. With regard to the “*fait accompli*” theory concerning Israel, he recalled that General de Gaulle had invoked that concept during his conversations with King Faisal in 1967. However, when the latter had asked General de Gaulle whether he had considered the German occupation of France a *fait accompli*, the President of the French Republic had been at a loss for an answer. The Palestine refugees were supported by all Arab peoples. Just as the Algerian fighters had triumphed in the end, despite their meagre resources, because they had been determined to liberate their country, so the Palestine refugees would ultimately attain their goals, because it was impossible to defeat a people struggling for its own liberation.

10. As the representatives of Lebanon and Kuwait had described the deplorable situation of the refugees, who lived on four cents a day, he would not touch on that subject again; however, since the Israel representative had invoked the Bible to explain his peoples’ attachment to Jerusalem, he wished to note that other Christian and Moslem texts spoke of that city with the same religious reverence.

11. While devotion to the Holy City was entirely understandable, it in no way justified the uprooting of indigenous populations. In particular, the deep ties between the Palestinian population and the land of Palestine must not be forgotten. In the long run, there was no future for the Jews in that country unless they agreed to live as brothers with the Arabs, who would then be able to show them the spirit of chivalry and mercy they had taught to western knights during the Crusades; but Israel must first come to its senses and recognize that Jerusalem was not an earthly Zion. That was the price for peace in the Holy Land.

12. Mr. PLAKA (Albania) said that his delegation had on many occasions condemned the monstrous crime committed by imperialism and international Zionism in depriving the Arab people of Palestine of what was most sacred for a people: its homeland. That was a sinister blot on modern history. The Albanian delegation had also condemned the rule of the imperialist Powers, with the United States at the lead, which were attempting to distract attention in the United Nations from the question of the restoration of the sovereign rights of those people by hypocritically offering them alms. The imperialists were

thus attempting to evade the heavy responsibility they bore for the crime against the Palestinian people. The Albanian delegation had always supported the viewpoint of the heroic Palestinian people and their brother Arab peoples that the point at issue was the restoration of the legitimate sovereign rights of the Palestinian people to their homeland, Palestine, to their Palestinian nationality, and to self-determination.

13. The imperialist colonial Powers had always followed the policy of pillage and aggression with respect to the Arab peoples and countries of the East, because of the strategic importance of the region and its great wealth. That area contains approximately two thirds of the world’s oil resources. Palestine, which occupied a key position in that region, was the victim of that policy pursued by imperialists, old and new. During the past two decades, the imperialist Powers and their tool, Israel, had stepped up their aggression against the Palestinians; by brutal force of arms they had reduced more than 1,300,000 Palestinians to the status of refugees; they had driven them from their homes, expropriated their land, and massacred them. Since the perfidious aggression of June 1967, the aggressors had further intensified the persecutions, tortures and abominable crimes being perpetrated against the innocent population of Palestine. The lawless raids of Israel aircraft and punitive incursions of forces of aggression against the Palestinian people and three sovereign Arab countries had reached a degree of unprecedented criminality.

14. The reason why Israel was able to defy international opinion and commit countless serious provocations was that the imperialist Powers, and first and foremost the United States, were giving it moral and political support, providing it with economic and financial aid and equipping it with the most modern weapons. Only recently, the United States had delivered dozens of jet aircraft to Israel to spread death and destruction in the Arab countries, and had allowed its nationals to perform specialized tasks in the Israel army. At the meeting between Mrs. Meir and Mr. Nixon in September, the United States had made even broader commitments than in the past.

15. In the United Nations, the imperialist Powers, acting deceitfully and cynically, were professing to play a humanitarian role in the Palestine problem. Yet the policy of the United States imperialists was to make Israel their base in that region, so as to suppress the struggle for national and social liberation by the peoples of the Middle East and Africa and impose their yoke on the Arab and African peoples.

16. Albania rejected those diabolical manoeuvres, which it condemned with all its strength and scorn. It was the duty of all freedom-loving Member States which were devoted to the principles of the Charter and the rights of peoples to self-determination to expose and resolutely condemn those manoeuvres and the hateful plans of the imperialist Powers and to intensify their struggle against the real villains in the Palestinian tragedy.

17. Moreover, United States imperialism, which bore the main responsibility for the Palestine tragedy, had for some years been receiving co-operation from the revisionist clique of leaders in the Soviet Union. The United States im-

perialists and the Soviet revisionists each wanted to get hold of the great riches of the Middle East and its strategic position and had sent their fleets to the Mediterranean to threaten the independence of the freedom-loving countries in that region, in pursuance of their policy of world hegemony and respective spheres of influence. Their policy was derogating from the sovereign rights of the Arab States and would sacrifice the interests of the Palestinian people. The aim of the conspiracy between those two Powers was to force the Arab countries to hand over to Israel a large part of their territories and their population and to sacrifice once and for all the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

18. However, the Palestinian people and the Arab peoples would accept no solutions which were made at the White House or the Kremlin and were humiliating to Arab national dignity and they would not let another Munich be imposed on them. The Palestinian people had categorically stated that they would not allow themselves to be bargained away and that they were determined to regain their sovereign rights by armed struggle, which was the only just alternative if victory was to be won. In addition, those people had no illusions about the United Nations, because they knew that the Organization had played into the hands of the two big Powers. In his statement to the Committee, the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization had described the attitude of the Palestinian people in the following terms:

“The Palestinian people, who have resorted to armed struggle in defence of their basic rights, their existence and their nationhood, will not give up until the humanitarian goals of its revolution have been attained.”²

19. Now more than ever the brave Palestinian people were united and organized in a true popular struggle which was of historic significance to their destiny as a nation; by their courageous and successful efforts, they had already dealt heavy blows at the aggressors. The popular struggle of the Palestinian people against the reactionary forces of imperialist-Zionist aggression was a valuable contribution to the great struggle of other peoples for national and social liberation, and it enjoyed the strong support of brother Arab peoples and of all revolutionary peoples throughout the world. The imperialists and revisionists were trying to suppress their heroic struggle by allegedly providing a “political solution” to the problem. However, the Palestinian people had rejected the imperialist-revisionist plot of the “political solution”, together with the infamous Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967.

20. True to their revolutionary policy of support for the peoples struggling for their national and social liberation, the Albanian people and their Government resolutely backed the just cause of the Palestinian people and their armed struggle for their legitimate rights. In his statement to the General Assembly on 26 September 1969 (1767th plenary meeting), the head of the Albanian delegation had assured the gallant Palestinian fighters that in the United Nations he would consistently defend their rights and support their heroic and historically important struggle, and

had paid a tribute to those fighters who had been battling for years for their freedom, their dignity, their honour and their future. He had added that their policy was a brotherly policy towards all the brother Arab peoples and all the enlightened peoples of the world and had praised the humane attitude which they had displayed towards the Israelis.

21. The Albanian people and the Government of the People's Republic of Albania were convinced that the heroic people of Palestine would be victorious in their just popular struggle.

22. Mr. KASSE (Mali) congratulated the Commissioner-General, Mr. Michelmore, and his staff on their achievements in the face of enormous difficulties.

23. He deplored the tragic fate of the Palestinian people and recalled the terms in which Mr. Coulibaly, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mali, had stated the position of his country on that question at the current session of the General Assembly, on 2 October 1969:

“We would express our whole-hearted sympathy and our support to the Arab refugees of Palestine because, like other peoples they, too, have the right to a country, a home and a national existence as a human community. But the reality is that the State of Israel exists and that its creation was organized and recognized by the General Assembly and Security Council of the United Nations, particularly by the permanent members of the Security Council. Moreover, Israel is a Member of the United Nations.” (See 1775th plenary meeting, para. 27.)

24. The Government of Mali, which sincerely advocated a policy of peaceful coexistence between Arabs and Jews, was vehemently opposed to the annexation of Arab territories by Israel. Mali endorsed the view of the Organization of African Unity, which had considered that the attack committed by Israel against an African State in June 1967 constituted aggression; subsequently, the OAU had on several occasions requested Israel to withdraw unconditionally its troops from the occupied Arab territories. Mali's attitude was also motivated by its sincere devotion to the Charter and the Malian delegation therefore emphasized that the United Nations should enforce its resolutions, particularly General Assembly resolutions 181 (II) and 194 (III).

25. Although a continuing effort should be made to support the Agency in its humanitarian work, a political solution had to be found for the refugee problem: the Palestinians should return to the country of their ancestors, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. In that connexion, he deplored the barbarous persecutions inflicted on the population of the occupied Arab territories since the aggression of June 1967—persecutions which were mentioned in paragraph 11 of the Commissioner-General's report (A/7614). Those acts were reminiscent of the Nazi reprisals and particularly the massacre of Oradour-sur-Glane; it was ironical that the victims of the Nazis should have become the persecutors.

26. The community of nations, which had permitted the occurrence of the situation currently prevailing in the

² This statement was made at the 671st meeting of the Committee, the official records of which are published in summary form.

Middle East by accepting the Balfour Declaration, bore a heavy responsibility; it should do everything in its power to achieve a just and equitable solution. Palestine should again become the inalienable fatherland of the Arabs and the Jews; Mali therefore rejected the concept of a monolithic State based on ethnic considerations and religion. The generation born in exile had come of age; they had decided to liberate their country and it would be dangerous not to take that fact into account.

27. The Middle East should now regain stability and peace, through the implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations and in particular Security Council resolutions 237 (1967) and 242 (1967) and General Assembly resolution 2452 (XXIII); to that end, it was to be hoped that the peoples of the region would be able to accept the diversity of their races, their religions and their cultures, instead of letting it destroy them.

28. Mr. CASTALDO (Italy) said that the Committee could not alter the situation of which the Palestinian refugees were the victims—that was the responsibility of other organs. It should, however, help to relieve the sufferings of those victims; that was the point of the question under consideration.

29. He congratulated the Commissioner-General of UNRWA on his report (A/7614), which contained very useful warnings, advice and suggestions. His delegation wished to draw special attention to two aspects mentioned in that document: the humanitarian aspect of the refugee problem and its financial aspect.

30. From the humanitarian viewpoint, the report clearly showed that the help provided by the Agency was a vital necessity for most of the refugees. In that connexion, Italy—which had spiritual, cultural and economic ties with the Middle East—wished to associate itself with the other delegations which had asked for speedy implementation of the resolutions concerning the refugees and appealed to the parties concerned to see that refugees who had clearly chosen not to return to their place of origin were given the necessary assistance for their permanent settlement.

31. With regard to the financial aspect, he noted from paragraph 21 of the report that, unless more funds were made available, the Agency was “certain to run out of cash in the course of 1970”. Italy, for its part, would contribute in 1970, as it had done in previous years, a sum of 100 million lire (\$US 158,600). In 1969, Italy had also made a special contribution of \$80,000 for the construction of 385 prefabricated dwellings to house 2,300 persons. His delegation hoped that the countries which had not so far been in a position to contribute to the financing of UNRWA would now be able to participate in that endeavour of human solidarity, in view of the warning given by Mr. Michelmore. It also thought that the Agency’s serious financial position should be brought to the attention of the public, so that non-governmental organizations and individuals could be encouraged to make further contributions.

32. His delegation suggested that, for information purposes, the Commissioner-General of UNRWA should in future include in his report information showing the development of the health situation from year to year.

33. Lastly, he regretted that the discussion had so far been discouraging in some respects, since much resentment and bitterness had been voiced, but had been glad to hear, piercing through the rhetoric, the expression of a real desire for peace.

34. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) said that his Government had received information from a reliable source attesting to the following points: first, that recent Israel destruction of property in Gaza by dynamiting had included property belonging to and used by UNRWA; second, that Israel terrorism in Gaza had resulted in many casualties, including UNRWA employees and, specifically, the headmaster of an UNRWA school who had been killed; third, that many of the persons arrested or expelled by Israel in the occupied territories were UNRWA employees.

35. He asked the Commissioner-General of UNRWA to inform the Committee whether those acts had been reported to him and what steps UNRWA had taken as a result. If the information he had given was true, the least that UNRWA should have done was to make those facts known, thus bringing the moral pressure of international opinion to bear; failure to expose such acts would encourage Israel.

36. His delegation did not intend to level criticism at the Commissioner-General who had its full confidence, nor at the Agency; it merely wished to stress the grave responsibility which UNRWA should now assume, since it was the only United Nations machinery in the occupied territories.

37. He also drew attention to a letter³ to *The Times* of London in which Mr. Reddaway had reported that the destruction of 144 homes in the refugee camp in Rafah, while the occupants were still in their beds, had resulted in the death of about forty people. Mr. Reddaway had further stated that some weeks later, UNRWA had secured permission on public health grounds to exhume and re-bury the dead; twenty-three bodies had then been found. He regretted that no reference had been made to that tragic incident in the Commissioner-General’s report. The people of the occupied territories expected the United Nations to proclaim the whole truth.

38. He also regretted that even at United Nations Headquarters attempts were being made to distort the truth about the situation of the Palestine refugees. The United Nations guides had been instructed to refrain from speaking about the refugees in order to prevent complaints from pro-Israel elements. That attitude had compelled many guides to avoid the display of UNRWA photographs completely since they were afraid of losing their jobs. On the other hand, they had been encouraged to speak more about the stones which Israel had offered as a gift to the United Nations. If the United Nations wished world public opinion to be in a position to pass judgement on that tragic problem, it should not permit such distortions of the truth.

39. Mr. MICHELMORE (Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine

³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fourth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1969*, document S/9507.

Refugees in the Near East) said that he had taken note of the observations made by the representative of Jordan and would reply to them at the following meeting, after he had obtained the necessary information.

40. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, pointed out to the Israel representative that the Jews in the Soviet Union who had fought against Hitlerite troops were not Zionists, contrary to that representative's assertions. Many Soviet Jews had courageously fought nazism and died in that struggle. Some of those Soviet Jews had received the title of Hero of the Soviet Union, which was the highest military distinction in the country. Examples were Generals Dovator, Tsirlin and Kreizer. Those Jews of Soviet nationality had fought as citizens of the Soviet Union, as members of the Communist Party or of the *Komsomol*; they had been defending their fatherland and communism, and Zionist ideas had been and still were completely alien to them.

41. Mr. EL BOURI (Libya), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that the groundless accusations of the Israel representative, particularly those he had levelled against Libya at the morning meeting, could not conceal the true facts: the Israelis had arrested and expelled thousands of Palestinians and destroyed and confiscated a considerable amount of Arab property in the occupied territories, as had been reported in the international Press, and specifically in such newspapers as *The New York Times*, *The Times* of London and *Le Monde*. The reactions of the world today showed that mankind was becoming aware of the acts committed by Israel in violation of the United Nations Charter.

42. His delegation had already explained on a number of occasions that the Libyan Jews who had emigrated to Israel had left Libya when it had been under the administration of France and the United Kingdom. They had taken all their property with them. Those Jews had been brainwashed by Zionist propaganda; the tricks which the Zionists had used to force Jews in the Arab countries to emigrate were well known, and were clearly exposed in the book *Haganah* by Nurnya M. Mardor⁴ to which the Syrian representative had referred at the 673rd meeting.

43. Mr. TEKOA (Israel), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said he was surprised that the representative of the Soviet Union had not drawn attention to the distortions of Russian history contained in the statement by the representative of Saudi Arabia.

44. He reiterated that there had been units of Jewish partisans in the Ukraine, who had a song which had been a hymn to Zion. Many had subsequently emigrated to Israel where they now formed entire villages.

45. He pointed out that the representative of Kuwait himself had prepared a study for the Fourteenth American Conference on the Middle East in which he had drawn several comparisons between the national Jewish movement and the national Arab movement. In that study Mr. Sayegh had noted in particular that those two movements had

come into being at the turn of the century, that the United Kingdom had granted both of them international recognition during the First World War, that their subsequent disillusionment had prompted them to fight between the two world wars and, lastly, that the two movements had achieved their objectives after the Second World War. The representative of Kuwait had quoted a statement by Mr. Moshe Dayan in which he had said that he understood the Arabs; he hoped that the Arab countries, for their part, would understand Jewish nationalism.

46. With regard to the security measures which Israel was obliged to take in the occupied territories, the delegations of the Arab countries were quoting press articles which supported their arguments. But they should also bear in mind statements such as those made by the former United Kingdom Minister of Labour who had recently said that the Israel occupation was unique in history for the little suffering it caused. Israel had been obliged to take security measures because in spite of the cease-fire called for by the Security Council, the Arab countries were continuing to wage war against Israel with regular and irregular troops. The London *Daily Mail* had, in an article published on 14 January 1969, reported the remarks of a terrorist leader who had said that before their expeditions the terrorists received a simple order, namely to kill Jews. Since June 1967, the terrorists had killed sixty-two Jews and fifty-six Arabs and they were inflicting a growing number of casualties among the Arab population.

47. In those circumstances, Israel had to safeguard the security of the population, in accordance with Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. Indeed, the measures taken by Israel were the least it could do in a situation which the Arab countries described as a war: Israel did not apply capital punishment—it merely expelled certain individuals who were guilty of terrorism. There was nothing it could do but destroy buildings which were used as bases and armouries for the terrorists. If the Arab countries wished to avoid such measures being taken, they should put a stop to the acts committed by their regular and irregular troops.

48. Mr. EL-YAFI (Syria), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, deplored the fact that the Israel representative was constantly repeating charges to which his delegation had replied on a number of occasions. That representative's purpose was to divert attention from the existence of the Palestine people and the guilt of the imperialists and Zionists.

49. His delegation had already proved that Christians and Jews in Syria were treated the same as all other citizens—a fact which had been established in the reports of international humanitarian organizations, and in Mr. Gussing's report. Mr. Tekoah's allegations could not conceal the fact that it was Israel which was persecuting, blowing up buildings and torturing; moreover, Mr. Tekoah himself did not deny the acts committed by Israel against the Palestine Arabs.

50. He requested the Chairman to ask the Israel representative not to keep repeating his false accusations.

51. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that the introduction to his comparative

⁴ New York, The New American Library, Inc., 1964.

study of Arab nationalism and Zionism, produced for a university body in the United States, had been quoted by the representative of Israel, who merely wanted to draw from the study certain superficial similarities between the two movements. In other words, if the representative of Israel was protesting against quotations which betrayed the meaning of the study from which they had been taken, he was not practising what he preached and persisted in acts for which he took others to task. Moreover, the representative of Israel had in no way proved that the extracts which he, the speaker, had quoted earlier betrayed the general sense of the context from which they had been taken. He invited the members of the Committee to refer to the full text to satisfy themselves that he had not omitted a single word. He invited them to read in particular the text by Chaim Weizmann where the latter, examining the difference between the independence of Poles or other peoples and the creation of the Jewish State, observed that the creation of an independent State presupposed the existence of a people aspiring to the status of an independent State.

52. With regard to collective punishments, he recalled that he had quoted General Dayan to prove that the Israel authorities were inflicting collective punishment on Arabs, whose only crime had been the refusal to inform the occupying authorities against their co-religionists. In that connexion, the representative of Israel had claimed that his Government was simply implementing laws dating from before the occupation. However, the emergency laws passed in Jordan by the United Kingdom had been repealed by the Jordanian Government, and even if that were not the case, the obligations incurred by a State under a convention to which it was party took precedence over internal laws. Thus, the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, had the effect of suspending the laws invoked by the representative of Israel, since his country had been party to that convention since 1950. It followed that the emergency laws behind which Israel was seeking to shelter were only a myth.

53. Finally he recalled that during the preceding meeting he had put forward a Palestinian conception of peace, according to which Palestinians were quite prepared to share with others the right to live in Palestine. Such a conception of peace should be compared with that of Israel, which occupied territories belonging to others, driving out the rightful owners or imposing on them their oppressive rule, and was intent only on the creation of an exclusively Jewish State.

54. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, pointed out to the representative of Israel that there had been no Zionist partisan groups in the Soviet Army. The existence in Israel of villages formed by Ukrainian Zionists was of no great significance, as there were also Ukrainian villages in Canada and even in Paraguay. As to the history of the Khazars, on the subject of which, to the surprise of the representative of Israel, he had not reacted, he said that he had little information on the Khazars, although the existence of that people was known from historical chronicles. He referred the representative of Israel to the Jewish Encyclopaedia quoted by the representative of Saudi Arabia, which gave fuller information on the subject.

55. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, expressed his surprise that the representative of the Soviet Union did not know that bands of Zionist partisans had taken part in the fighting against the Nazi armies in Russia, Byelorussian and the Ukraine, and offered to provide him with details of their history together with the music and words of their Zionist songs.

56. He indicated to the representative of Kuwait that it was difficult to take seriously the conception of peace formulated by representatives of States whose Governments persisted in violating the cease-fire and spoke constantly of starting the war afresh and of pursuing it to the point of annihilation of a State which was a Member of the United Nations.

57. The destruction of buildings which served the terrorist organizations as bases or arms depots conformed to the provisions of Act No. 20 signed by King Abdullah. With respect to the so-called discriminatory measures to which the Arab inhabitants of Israel were subjected, he wished that the Arab States would grant to their Jewish nationals the same rights and freedoms enjoyed by the Arabs in Israel. When that happened, there was no doubt that the Secretary-General would amend the report in which he spoke of persecutions suffered by Jews in the Arab States and expressed the hope that they would be authorized to leave those countries.

58. As to the passage that he had quoted from the study by the representative of Kuwait, the fact that it came from the introduction and not from the study itself did not detract from its worth. The point was that the Arab nationalist movement and Zionism were both nationalist movements. He would also quote the following statement made in 1919 by the founder of the Pan-African movement: "The African movement represents for us what the Zionist movement represents for the Jews: centralization of racial effort and recognition of racial roots".

59. Mr. SMIRNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, pointed out to the representative of Israel that in Byelorussia during the Second World War there had been no Zionist partisan groups singing Zionist songs. More than 400,000 partisans had operated in Byelorussia, among whom nearly all nationalities of the Soviet Union had been represented; but they had also included Poles, Czechs, Hungarians and French, as well as Jews. Those partisans were fighting for socialism.

60. Mr. TOMEH (Syria), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, rejected the argument advanced by the representative of Israel according to which the representatives of the Arab States took their quotations out of context and adapted them to their own ends: it was clear from the summary record of the 673rd meeting of the Committee that the passages quoted by the representative of Syria were taken from Zionist books, with the exception of the reference to Mrs. Dorothy Gordon.

61. He said that the representative of Israel had termed Zionism a liberation movement; but that was a value judgement, not one of fact. He quoted passages from pages 88 and 92 of the book *The Edge of the Sword: Israel's War*

of *Independence, 1947-1949* by Netanel Lorch,⁵ in which it was clear that Zionism had by force of arms occupied the territory of other countries. He recalled also the massacre of Deir Yassin, for which Menachem Begin was responsible, as revealed in his book *The Revolt: Story of the Irgun*.⁶ According to a passage from page 164 of that book, the massacre had compelled 635,000 Arabs to leave Palestine, out of 800,000 originally living there. Zionism was no more a national liberation movement than nazism, which had claimed to liberate Czechoslovakia, France and the Soviet Union.

62. With regard to the violations of the cease-fire mentioned by the representative of Israel, he referred to the official documents of the Security Council of 9 to 11 June 1967 and pointed out that the cease-fire meant that the armed forces of the attacker must return to their original positions and not that the attacker must expel the Arabs from the occupied countries in order to replace them with Jews. Moreover, Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations recognized the right of individual or collective self-defence against an invader. Since the Arab territories were still under Israel occupation, the Arabs were doing no more than defending themselves against an invader.

63. Replying to the arguments advanced by the representative of Israel to justify the measures taken in the occupied territories, he pointed out that no military imperatives could justify torture, and cited seventeen cases the existence of which could be proved by witnesses.

64. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), exercising his right of reply, pointed out to the representative of Israel that even if the Zionists had sung hymns as they had fought against nazism, that did not authorize them to occupy Palestine. He drew attention to the dangers inherent in the racial exclusivism and extremist nationalism professed by the Zionists. As to the Palestinian Arabs, they were not anti-Jewish; their national movement was not opposed to the creation of a State where they would live together with the Jewish Khazars.

65. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel), exercising his right of reply, said that he intended to refute the allegations by the representative of Syria concerning the alleged instances of torture. He recalled that some Israelis detained in Syrian prisons had been tortured and had had to be given special treatment in Israel after their release. He then quoted comments made by the Secretary-General of Amnesty International, *The Times* of London of 20 August 1969, the *New Statesman and Nation* of 18 July 1969, and passages from the Monthly Bulletin of the International Committee of the Red Cross of June and August 1969, which all proved that the conditions of detention of prisoners in Israel were satisfactory. He also quoted some observations by Mr. Badr-El-Din Ali, of the University of Louisville, who had said that Israel stood in second place with regard to the implementation of the minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners, including infiltrators. He invited the Arab Governments to open their prisons to representatives of international organizations.

66. Mr. TOMEH (Syria), exercising his right of reply, said that the story of the Israel prisoners at Damascus referred to by the representative of Israel was pure fiction. As to the Arab prisoners in Israel, Mr. Tekoah, instead of appealing to the International Committee of the Red Cross for assistance, would do better to reveal how many of them there were, since thus far, no one had been able to find that out. He recalled that paragraph 2 of Security Council resolution 259 (1968) requested "the Government of Israel to receive the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, to co-operate with him and to facilitate his work" and that, thus far, Israel had persistently refused to comply with that request. He also reminded the Committee of the letter sent by the Secretary-General to the Permanent Representative of Israel on 7 October 1968, after Israel's refusal to comply with the provisions of Security Council resolution 259 (1968), and he drew attention to its conclusion:

"To my regret, I am obliged to conclude that your letter of 4 October does not afford me a basis on which to dispatch the Special Representative in accordance with the clear intention of Security Council resolution 259 [(1968)]".⁷

67. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel), exercising his right of reply, referred, in connexion with the implementation of Security Council resolution 237 (1967) to the explanations set forth in his letter to the Secretary-General of 4 October 1967.⁸ As to the conditions of detention of the prisoners, he invited the Syrian representative to inspect them and to speak to anyone he wished.

68. Mr. TOMEH (Syria), exercising his right of reply, said that he attached no weight whatsoever to the explanations given by the representative of Israel. The fact remained that Security Council resolution 237 (1967) had not been implemented by Israel. He then pointed out that according to the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs, Security Council resolution 237 (1967) and General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V) "do not apply to minorities in the territories of even those States most directly concerned".⁹ Also, rather than accepting Mr. Tekoah's invitation, he would prefer that an investigation should be carried out into the seventeen instances of torture to which he had drawn attention.

69. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel), exercising his right of reply, said that it was nevertheless a fact that the first United Nations humanitarian mission, which had been dispatched in June 1967, had investigated or endeavoured to investigate the situation of the Jews affected by the 1967 hostilities.

70. Mr. TOMEH (Syria) said, in order to terminate the discussion, that the contradictory statements made by the representative of Israel spoke for themselves.

The meeting rose at 8.5 p.m.

⁷ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-third Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1968*, document S/8851, para. 4.

⁸ *Ibid.*, para. 3.

⁹ *Ibid.*, *Supplement for July, August and September 1968*, document S/8699, para. 10 (1).

⁵ New York, Putnam's Sons, 1961.

⁶ New York, Schuman, 1951.