



Chairman: Mr. Abdul Samad GHAUS
(Afghanistan).

AGENDA ITEM 35

**United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine
Refugees in the Near East: report of the Commissioner-
General (continued) (A/8013, A/8040, A/8084 and
Add.1, A/SPC/140, A/SPC/141, A/SPC/L.196, A/SPC/
L.197, A/SPC/L.198, A/SPC/L.199)**

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the general debate was concluded and the Committee would proceed to consider the draft resolutions before it. He announced that the Iranian delegation wished to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.197 and that Mali had become a co-sponsor of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.198 and A/SPC/L.199.

2. Mr. THYNESS (Norway) said that he had hoped to introduce at the current meeting a draft resolution concerning the establishment of a working group to study all aspects regarding the financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and to propose immediate solutions. Shortage of time had prevented him from completing all his consultations, but he expected the text to be ready by the following morning.

3. Mr. PAL (Pakistan) introduced draft resolution A/SPC/L.199 and said that its purpose was to alleviate the sufferings of the Palestine people. The Committee was well acquainted with that aspect of the problem and with its dimensions. He recalled that the General Assembly, in its resolution 194 (III), had resolved that the refugees wishing to return to their homes should be permitted to do so, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return. That resolution had never been implemented, despite the efforts of the United Nations and the appeals of Member States. If it had been, if the refugees had been allowed to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbours the Committee would not have had to concern itself with the question.

4. On behalf of the sponsors, he urged the adoption of the draft resolution, in order to alleviate the sufferings of the refugees and bring peace to the Middle East by forcing the Government of Israel, which, together with some others, was responsible for the size of the problem, to restore to the people of Palestine their dignity, prestige and property.

5. Mr. FARAH (Somalia), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/L.198, said that the aims of that draft resolution were clear. At its twenty-fourth session, the General

Assembly had adopted a resolution (2535 B (XXIV)) recognizing that the problem of the Palestine Arab refugees arose from the denial of their inalienable rights, and reaffirming the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine. Those facts, with which the United Nations had been dealing for twenty-five years, were undeniable; to recall them did not constitute an innovation. The refugees were in a position which would be intolerable for any people and which was even more so in their case because their rights were not recognized and they had no means of exercising them.

6. Commenting on the details of the draft resolution, he said that there was nothing new in the preamble, which merely recalled the rights of the people of Palestine, to whom the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations applied in the same way as to all other peoples. There could be no peace in the Middle East until the political problems were solved.

7. In his delegation's view, the provisions of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution could not be controverted. Surely no one could deny that the people of Palestine were entitled to equal rights and self-determination, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

8. The provisions of paragraph 2 echoed those of General Assembly resolution 2649 (XXV), adopted on 30 November 1970. It was not enough to provide relief for the Palestine refugees, they must also be given the means to further their own social, political and economic development.

9. He hoped that draft resolution A/SPC/L.198 would be adopted, thus bringing closer the time when justice would be done to the people of Palestine.

10. Mr. CHALIKULIMA (Zambia) said that he was deeply moved by the situation of the refugees. He thanked all those who had taken a constructive part in the debate and sought to alleviate the sufferings of the refugees, particularly the representative of Norway. Whether from the financial or the political standpoint, the problem was of direct concern to the United Nations; for the sufferings of one of its members affected the whole family of man.

11. He also thanked the sponsors of draft resolutions A/SPC/L.198 and A/SPC/L.199. He appealed to a number of Member States, and in particular to the countries of the Afro-Asian and non-aligned group, to support those two draft resolutions in the spirit of the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries held at Lusaka. Some delegations had reservations concerning operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/L.198, primarily because it recognized that the people of Palestine were entitled to self-determina-

tion. His own delegation had no difficulty in supporting the draft resolutions.

12. Mr. AHMED (India), supported by Mr. ZADOR (Hungary), requested that, in view of the importance of the discussion at the 740th meeting on the previous day, the record of the debate should be reproduced *in extenso*.

13. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would request the Secretary of the Committee to make arrangements for the full text of the debate¹ at the 740th meeting of the Committee to be issued *in extenso*.

It was so decided.

14. Mr. TEKOA (Israel) recalled that in his statement at the 737th meeting—which had been interrupted several times—he had said it was no secret that the Arab delegations were preparing draft resolutions reflecting the view that only Arab rights should be respected; such draft resolutions would not only be contrary to the principle of equality of States and nations but would also undermine the possibility of reaching agreement on a just and lasting peace, as called for by the United Nations. He had also expressed the hope that the Arab Governments and all Member States would carefully consider whether, at the present crucial stage of the Middle East situation, the fragile hope for peace should be endangered by disregard for the rights of one of the parties to the conflict.

15. Two of the draft resolutions submitted to the Committee by delegations which sided with the Arabs in their war against Israel and which, almost without exception, denied Israel the right to sovereign existence, were phrased in that belligerent and destructive manner.

16. Draft resolution A/SPC/L.198 carried extremism to the point of distorting the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations and implying that the Jewish people of Palestine was not a people. In fact, there were two peoples in Palestine, the Jews and the Arabs, and not “a” people of Palestine. The draft resolution disregarded the rights of the Jewish people to self-determination, freedom and political independence and jeopardized the efforts that were being made, on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), to restore peace between Israel and the Arab States. The adoption of draft resolutions of that kind might create a situation in the Middle East in which the parties to the conflict would find it difficult to reach an understanding. He emphasized the responsibilities of the sponsors of the draft resolution, and said he was sure that members of the Committee would consider the effect which the adoption of such a draft resolution would have on the search for a settlement of the Middle East question. One of the sponsors of the text, the representative of Somalia, had recently described Israel as a mosquito on the tail of the Arab tiger. It was true that Israel was a small country. Now that the Jewish people had finally regained its rights, after centuries of tribulation, the Committee surely did not propose that it should again be subjected to discrimination and denial of its rights.

17. Mr. TOMEH (Syria), commenting on draft resolution A/SPC/L.199, said that the first two preambular paragraphs

referred to previous Security Council or General Assembly resolutions submitted by Latin American countries, by the Scandinavian countries or by countries in Western Europe, all of which recognized Israel and maintained diplomatic relations with it. Those resolutions, each of which had commanded a large majority, were evidence of the wishes of the international community. For instance, only Israel had voted against General Assembly resolution 2452 A (XXIII), which called upon the Government of Israel to take effective and immediate steps for the return without delay of the inhabitants who had fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities. That being the case, what objection could there be to the fact that the draft resolution recalled those decisions? The reports of the Commissioner-General submitted since the 1967 hostilities also stressed the sufferings of the newly displaced persons, thus indicating how necessary it was to adopt that humanitarian draft resolution, which contained nothing new.

18. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/L.198, he recalled that General Assembly resolution 2535 B (XXIV) had been adopted by a two-thirds majority of Member States; yet not all of them were hostile to Israel.

19. The representative of Israel was going too far in maintaining that the two draft resolutions did not take the rights of his country into account. The problem to which the Committee must address itself was the denial of the fundamental rights of the Arab population. Why had the United Nations, and before it the League of Nations, concerned itself with that question for so many years, without anything to show for its efforts? Lord Balfour, the man who had initiated that tragedy, provided the answer to that question; in 1919, he had stated that the great Powers were committed to Zionism and did not propose even to go through the form of consulting the wishes of the inhabitants of Palestine. Thus, it was the denial of the rights of the Arab population of Palestine which was at the root of the problem now before the Committee. He hoped that the other delegations would give due consideration to that aspect of the question which continued to jeopardize peace in the Middle East.

20. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) said that the intelligence services and sense of logic of the Israeli delegation were both defective. It was true that someone—not he himself—had observed, in the delegates’ lounge, that Israel’s arrogance could be compared to that of a mosquito resting on a tiger, the tiger in the present case being the United States.

21. As to denying the existence of a people, it was Israel which maintained that the people of Palestine did not exist. It certainly did exist and it had the same rights as the rest of mankind. The sooner Israel recognized its existence, the sooner peace could be restored in the Middle East.

22. Mr. EL-SHIBIB (Iraq) said that he was very disturbed, irrespective of any political considerations, by the deterioration of the situation of the Palestinian refugees. The Secretary-General’s appeal and the Commissioner-General’s statement in the preceding meeting had further stressed the vital importance of the matter.

23. He commended the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.199, who had shown deep understanding of the

¹ Subsequently circulated as document A/SPC/PV.740.

problem and had sought to deal radically with it and to make relief measures unnecessary and irrelevant.

24. Despite the resolutions adopted by the United Nations, it was a plain fact that the Israeli Government refused to let those who had fled since 1948 return to their homes. To explain that refusal, the Israeli Government cited security reasons. However, absolute security did not exist; moreover, anyone who laid the foundations of insecurity could not subsequently complain that he did not feel secure. An aggressor would never feel secure against the victims of his aggression nor an occupier against those whose territory he was occupying.

25. His delegation agreed with the representative of Somalia, who had said when introducing draft resolution A/SPC/L.198 that it did not constitute an innovation. He had rightly recalled the recent adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 2649 (XXV), by an impressive majority.

26. Israel had warned the Committee that, if it adopted a draft resolution recognizing the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine, especially their right to self-determination, it would be hindering agreement between the parties. That was obviously a manoeuvre. In a press release of 3 December 1970 (SG/SM/1394), the Secretary-General stated that while on a visit to Cairo, on 23 May 1967, he had suggested to President Nasser the appointment of a United Nations Special Representative in the Middle East to act as a go-between and moderator during that period of unusually dangerous tension. President Nasser had agreed to that suggestion, but since it had proved to be unacceptable to Israel, there had been no point in going ahead with it. In his opinion, that statement by the Secretary-General clearly revealed the true intentions of the Government of Israel.

27. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that he understood the Israeli representative's discomfiture at draft resolutions A/SPC/L.198 and A/SPC/L.199, and also the fact that he had had difficulties in countering those texts with objective arguments. The representative of Israel maintained that the adoption of draft resolution A/SPC/L.198 would have serious effects on the search for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. His statement could have been believed if Israel had been doing all in its power to establish peace based on justice and had shown even the intention of withdrawing from the occupied territories and allowing the Palestinians to return to their homes. Actually, peace was being delayed and would continue to be delayed, whether or not that draft resolution was adopted, because of Israel's refusal to accept the premises laid down by the United Nations.

28. According to the representative of Israel the adoption of a draft resolution calling for the implementation of the provisions of the Charter would be an obstacle to peace. Draft resolution A/SPC/L.198, which reaffirmed the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples by applying it to the people of Palestine, was precisely in conformity with Article 1, paragraph 2 of the Charter, which stated that one of the purposes of the United Nations was "to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate

measures to strengthen universal peace". The San Francisco Conference had clearly indicated that respect for that principle was a prerequisite for peace. The representative of Israel was now maintaining that the application of that principle to the Palestinian people was an obstacle to peace. He himself preferred to adhere to the provisions of the Charter.

29. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that he might modify Shakespeare's phrase and offer a kingdom in exchange for a little truth. The representative of Kuwait was analysing what he had not said and was misinterpreting it. His basic argument was not that draft resolution A/SPC/L.198 made the establishment of peace more difficult. That was true, but for a fundamental reason which the representative of Kuwait had not mentioned, namely, that the draft deliberately disregarded and denied the rights of a sovereign State Member of the United Nations, and the rights of the Jewish people, which was one of the two peoples of Palestine, and aimed at replacing the Jewish State with a so-called secular Palestinian State.

30. If there had still been any doubts in that regard, the representatives of Syria and Iraq had dispelled them and had stated clearly the purpose of draft resolution A/SPC/L.198: it was intended to deal radically with the Middle East problem. Were they thinking of meting out to the Jews the kind of treatment inflicted on those who had been hanged in the streets of Baghdad, or of destroying Israel to build a new political entity upon its ruins, or did they envisage the "final solution" thought up by Hitler? Was that what the United Nations would approve for 1971, which, in the minds of all, should be the year of peace? The Committee was supposed to be dealing with the humanitarian aspects of the problem, and now a representative was saying that that was not important and that the problem should be settled radically.

31. The representative of Syria had suggested going back to the root of the problem, namely, the Balfour Declaration of 1917, and reopening the question; and so much the worse for Israel if draft resolution A/SPC/L.198 denied the right of one of the peoples of Palestine to live in independence, under the pretext that Israel's very existence jeopardized the rights of the Arabs. Agreement was possible between the Arabs and the Jews; the United Nations should encourage it and should reject that destructive proposal, which would greatly detract from its ideals and make possible continued discrimination against the Jewish people and continued denial of its fundamental rights.

32. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that the record of the meeting should show that he had not misinterpreted the Israeli representative's statement. There were not two peoples living in Palestine but rather one people "of" Palestine, the majority of which was not "in" Palestine, and one people "in" Palestine, the majority of which was not the people "of" Palestine.

33. Mr. TOMEH (Syria), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that the representative of Israel was creating imaginary obstacles. In introducing draft resolution A/SPC/L.198 he had never said that it was "so much the

worse” for Israel, but that the rights of the population of Palestine, Arabs, Jews and Christians alike, should be respected equally.

34. He noted the Israeli representative’s illogicality in permitting himself to go back to the dawn of history while denying the Arabs the right to go back to the roots of the problem fifty years earlier. As was said in Plato’s *Dialogues*, he was proceeding from the infinite to the finite without stopping at the intermediate.

35. The representative of Israel had referred to the inhuman treatment received by Jews in Arab countries, but what of the sufferings endured by the Palestinian people at the hands of the Israelis—and not of the Jews—in the occupied territories? In an article published in October 1970, *The Sunday Times* of London has referred to violations of the pertinent Geneva Convention reported by the Red Cross. The Committee therefore had to choose between believing the representative of Israel and believing the Red Cross.

36. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel), referring to the Kuwaiti representative’s statement that there was one people “of” Palestine the majority of which did not live in Palestine, recalled that of the million Arabs who in 1948 had been living in the region known geographically as Palestine, 80 per cent were still within the boundaries of the Palestine Mandate while the others had taken refuge in the Arab countries. That was a further instance of distortion of the facts by the Arab delegations.

37. In his first statement, he had pointed out that the Palestine Arab refugees were a population group which had moved a few dozen kilometres, as a result of the hostilities provoked by the Arab countries in contempt of the United Nations, and had settled among other Palestine Arabs. That Palestine population had, since 1948, as citizens of Israel or of Jordan, been exercising its right of self-determination. There were at present two independent States in Palestine, namely Israel and Jordan. The Arab population of Palestine which was within the boundaries of the State of Israel was exercising its right of self-determination; its members could be elected to Parliament, and so on. The great majority of Palestinians, however, lived within the boundaries of the Arab State of Palestine, where they were exercising their right of self-determination and had greater representation in Parliament and in the Jordanian Government than nationals of Bedouin origin.

38. It would be difficult for him to reply to all the attacks of the fourteen Arab countries which were leagued against him and to make himself heard if they wished to prevent him from speaking. He pointed out that, for the Arabs and the Jews of Palestine, the problem was to find a basis for agreement and to restore peace between independent States.

39. Mr. EL-SHIBIB (Iraq) assured the representative of Israel that no one in the Committee could prevent him from speaking; however, it was for the representatives of the Arab countries to show what his alleged facts and truths really were. The representative of Israel maintained that the refugees had merely “moved” a few dozen kilometres, whereas in fact they had been forcibly expelled from their homes and farms.

40. He could pass over the charges levelled at his Government, but if a large number of Jews had left Iraq it was essentially because of Zionist propaganda and Zionist claims on the Middle East. His Government was keeping the country’s frontiers open to any Jew of Iraqi origin who decided to come back.

41. The representative of Israel equated recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinians with advocacy of eliminating the Jews, but what were the Zionists doing to the Palestine Arabs? Every possible means had been used to compel them to leave their homes; in the occupied territories, the Israeli forces were levelling villages to the ground and imposing collective punishment, and yet more than a million Palestinians were still in the country, which proved that Israel had failed in its policy of terror.

42. Mr. Tekoah had referred to a “final solution” and to Nazi practices; it was hard to see by what tricks of the imagination he could make such a comparison, but, since the subject of nazism had been raised, it should be pointed out that it was the Israelis who were the persecutors in Palestine and that the victims hated their executioners.

43. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, noted that the representative of Israel seemed to believe that he could replace the truth by semantic acrobatics or by juggling figures. Since the Committee was discussing the people of Palestine, he introduced Jordan, which was situated to the east of Palestine, into the debate, hoping in that way to prove that the Palestinian people was indeed living in Palestine. At the same time, he contended that the Palestinians were either citizens of Israel or citizens of Jordan and therefore exercising their right of self-determination. He forgot, however, the million Palestinians who were living under the heel of the Israeli army of occupation in Gaza and in the occupied territories of Syria and Jordan as well as the hundreds of thousands who were living outside Palestine.

44. He wished to state once again that there was one Palestinian people which was either living outside Palestine or unable to exercise its inalienable rights. Mr. Tekoah had not mentioned the fact that there was a people in Palestine which was not the people of Palestine. He seemed to believe that the fact of being Jewish automatically made a person Palestinian, but what connexion was there between the Jews of the present time and the Hebrews who had formerly lived in Palestine?

45. Mr. TOMEH (Syria) wondered how anyone could prevent Mr. Tekoah from making himself heard since his voice was heard far beyond New York and the Arabs were heard only at the United Nations. He challenged the Israeli representative’s assertion that a million Arabs were living within the boundaries of Palestine. Menachem Begin, a former member of the Israeli Cabinet, stated in his book *The Revolt—Story of the Irgun*, published for the first time in 1951: “Of about 800,000 Arabs who lived on the present territory of the State of Israel only some 165,000 are still there.” Consequently, more than 600,000 had fled Israel. In 1943, moreover, the Minister of the United States in Cairo had said, in a cable to his Secretary of State, that the Zionist leaders of the Jewish Agency had openly stated their determination that Palestine should become a Jewish

state at the end of the war, regardless of the opposition of the million Arabs living in the country. He would not mention the Arabs who had been outside Israel and were now in the occupied territories.

46. Draft resolution A/SPC/L.199 reaffirmed General Assembly resolutions 2252 (ES-V), 2542 A (XXIII) and 2535 B (XXIV), all of which called upon Israel to permit the immediate return of the inhabitants who had fled since the outbreak of hostilities. If Israel wished to demonstrate its good faith and its respect for law, it could easily do so; it had only to apply the General Assembly resolutions. Mr. Abba Eban had, however, stated a month earlier to *The New York Times* that Israel would not consider itself bound by any resolution adopted by the General Assembly. Consequently, whatever decision the United Nations took regarding draft resolution A/SPC/L.199, Israel would not respect it. Why, therefore, should the Committee waste its time on futile discussion?

47. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that he wished to inform the representative of Syria that Israel had done everything it considered possible, in view of the state of war which the Arab States were maintaining against it, to enable the displaced persons to return to their homes. Under an agreement concluded between the Governments of Israel and Jordan in 1967, 14,000 displaced persons had returned to their homes by the end of that year. Since that time, similar measures had been taken to reunite families and to deal with hardship cases. By the end of August 1970, approximately 34,000 persons had returned home. Those measures were still being applied, and more than 1,000 permits to return had been issued in October 1970. Israel could not increase that number, however, because of the state of war maintained by the Arab States. He hoped that conditions would improve and that agreements for a just and lasting peace could be concluded in the very near future. Indeed, it was because he hoped for an agreement which would settle the future of both the persons displaced in 1967 and the refugees of 1948 that he urged the Committee to weigh carefully the draft resolutions before it so as not to introduce a new cause of misunderstanding, friction and hostility into the Middle East situation.

48. While draft resolution A/SPC/L.199 asked Israel to let the displaced persons return to their homes, draft resolution A/SPC/L.198 denied Israel the right to exist and denied the Jewish people of Palestine the right of self-determination. It was time that the representative of Syria took a more realistic and more carefully thought out position. Either one appealed to a Government which one recognized, and with which one wished to negotiate, or one refused to recognize that Government and the people which it represented, and did not ask it for anything. Was the Committee going to adopt draft resolutions which aimed at creating chaos in the Middle East?

49. He was very grateful to the representative of Kuwait for having so clearly indicated, in his last statement, his own ulterior motives and those of the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.198. As far as Mr. Sayegh was concerned, there was no Jewish people of Palestine and the Jews who were in Palestine had no right to live there. The so-called secular Palestinian State which had been proposed

would accept only the 2 per cent of Israeli Jews who had lived in Palestine before 1917. The representative of Kuwait had clearly said that he denied Jews the right to consider themselves a nation, the right to a national existence and to self-determination, since he denied the State of Israel the right to independence and sovereignty recognized in the Charter. That was the thesis being advanced in draft resolution A/SPC/L.198, which was being proposed for adoption by the United Nations on the eve of a new year which many hoped would be one of negotiations, understanding and agreements.

50. Mr. TOMEH (Syria), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, pointed out that the first and second preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/SPC/L.199 recalled four other resolutions. In the first, resolution 237 (1967), which had been unanimously adopted by the Security Council in June 1967, the Council had, in paragraph 1, called upon "the Government of Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations have taken place and to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who have fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities". The contents of that resolution had been reiterated and reaffirmed in General Assembly resolutions 2252 (ES-V), adopted on 4 July 1967, 2452 A (XXIII), adopted on 19 December 1968, and 2535 B (XXIV), adopted by the Assembly on 10 December 1969. The Security Council resolution had been adopted unanimously, and at least 100 Member States had voted for each of the General Assembly resolutions. Those resolutions thus represented the opinion of the world community, against which the representative of Israel was setting his own opinion. The Geneva Conventions, on which the resolutions were based, had surely never said that the people of occupied territories were to be expelled. Even Hitler had not followed that course in Europe. Moreover, the cease-fire surely did not authorize Israel to annex the occupied territories officially in order to apply its laws and establish population centres there while the Arab States were to wait patiently for Israel to be good enough to let the newly displaced persons return to their home. Mr. Tekoah, who preached realism, should himself guard against the fanaticism which Israel and its representatives displayed.

51. He held to the interpretation of draft resolution A/SPC/L.198 that he had given when introducing it; Mr. Tekoah could not change the meaning of that interpretation by playing on words. All human beings, without regard to race, colour or religion, must have the same rights. Recognizing the rights of one people must not mean denying them to another.

52. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that since there was nothing in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly to protect representatives against deliberate falsification of their views, he was obliged to repeat his previous explanations. He had said that there was a Palestinian people, the majority of which was not at present in Palestine, and a people in Palestine, the majority of which was not Palestinian. To demand the right of self-determination for the Palestinian people, the majority of which was not now in Palestine, in no way meant denying that right to the people now in Palestine. The people of Palestine did not seek revenge; they wished only to return to their homes and to live in a State where

the indigenous Palestinians, Christians and Moslems as well as the non-indigenous Jews, could live side by side, consider themselves nationals of the State, and be proud of their contribution to its national grandeur. Surely that did not mean denying the Jews of Palestine the very right to breathe Palestinian air.

53. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that the representative of Kuwait was in fact denying the Jews of Palestine the right to breathe the air of freedom, self-determination, independence and sovereignty in Palestine, despite two thousand years of struggle by the Jewish people to preserve their national identity and regain their freedom and independence. Some members of the Committee were making vague assertions which concealed their real intentions. Behind draft resolution A/SPC/L.198 lay a proposal for dismantling the State of Israel and replacing it by a new Arab political entity. The Jews who were permitted to remain would live there as a minority. He wished to know whether the representative of Kuwait could deny that assertion and whether he could deny that the Palestinian conference held in Cairo in May 1958 had made it clear that only those Jews who had been in Palestine before 1917 would be accepted in the proposed Palestinian State and that the others would be expelled.

54. The question was whether the Israeli nation, like all others, had the right to live in freedom and independence. No one had denied that right to the Arab States or to the Arabs of Palestine. It was an established fact that within the boundaries of Palestine there were at present two States, one of them Arab, as King Hussein attested when he said that Jordan was Palestine and Palestine was Jordan.

55. The Committee must ask itself whether the United Nations, while it was asking Israel to conclude a peace agreement with its Arab neighbours, should adopt a draft resolution which denied Israel, one of the peoples of Palestine, the right to independence, freedom and self-determination. To vote for the draft resolution meant denying Israel its rights.

56. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, deplored the fact that in spite of reiterated explanations, the representative of Israel persisted in his attempts to make him say that he refused to recognize the right of the Jews of Palestine to reside in that country. He therefore found himself obliged to repeat his comments. First, the people who were at present in Palestine were not in the aggregate a people of Palestine, since they included Jews who had not originated in that country. However, the Palestinians did not deny the Jews of Israel the right to live in Palestine. Secondly, the Palestinians, the indigenous inhabitants of Palestine, who for the most part were at present outside Palestine, wished to return there and, together with the people who, although not from Palestine, were now in that country, constituted a State. No one denied that the character of the State of Israel would be changed by the return of the Palestinians to their lands; but to change the character of a political entity was not to call for the destruction of human beings.

57. He then warned the Committee that the representative of Israel had engaged in an exercise in semantics with regard to the meaning of the word "Palestine". The United

Nations had never understood the term "Palestine" other than in its only admissible legal meaning, namely, the Palestine of the British Mandate. Never, in the history of the United Nations, had there ever been any question of Jordan. The extension which Mr. Tekoah would like to give to the meaning of the term "Palestine" was purely arbitrary.

58. Mr. TOMEH (Syria), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, wondered whether any rational discussion was still possible after hearing Mr. Tekoah. He pointed out that even in draft resolution A/SPC/L.196, proposed by the United States of America, the word "Palestine" appeared in several paragraphs. He asked, therefore, why Mr. Tekoah was so frightened of that word.

59. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel), exercising his right of reply, said that geographically and politically the Palestine of the British Mandate, established after the First World War, had comprised the territory of Israel and that of Jordan. It was only in 1922 that Transjordan, i.e. the territory situated east of Jordan, had been separated from Palestine, to meet the aspirations of the Palestinian Arabs. The term "Palestinian people" must therefore be understood to mean the peoples on the west bank of the Jordan and those on the east bank. He asked whether the representatives of Kuwait and Syria would impugn the testimony of King Hussein, who had on several occasions stated that Jordan was Palestine and Palestine was Jordan.

60. There now seemed to be agreement regarding the fundamental meaning of draft resolution A/SPC/L.198: the representative of Kuwait had explained that the Jews would be allowed to live in a Palestinian Arab State. But how could the representative of Kuwait have the audacity to set himself up as a judge of the affairs of one of the most ancient peoples in history and deny them their rights to freedom and self-determination? The Jewish people knew what it meant to be a minority in an Arab State: they had known that situation for centuries and had not forgotten the persecution and discrimination which they had undergone. For two thousand years the Jews had asked for, and in 1948 had finally obtained, equality with other nations. The representatives of Kuwait and Syria were now proposing that the Jews should be denied the right to constitute a State. The Committee should decide whether those two representatives were right, or whether there could be any hope of peace being established between Israel and its neighbouring Arab States.

61. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait), exercising his right of reply, said that Mr. Tekoah was perfectly aware of the difference between Palestine and Transjordan and of the fact that the agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom and the world Zionist organization had excluded Transjordan, as was clear from the text on page 290 of Chaim Weizmann's autobiography entitled *Trial and Error*. The provisions of the Balfour Declaration concerning the rights of the Arabs, which had represented 90 per cent of the population at that time, applied to Palestine excluding Transjordan. It was the rights of the Palestinian people excluded from Palestine that the draft resolutions sought to reaffirm.

62. He recalled once again, for the benefit of Mr. Tekoah, that he had not spoken of the creation of a Palestinian Arab

State in which the Jews living at present in Palestine would be simply tolerated, but of the establishment of a Palestinian State in which the non-indigenous Jews, as well as the indigenous Moslems and Christians, would co-exist with equal rights and to the glory of which they would all contribute. In a State which belonged equally to all its people, there were only free men. It was only in a State which excluded part of the people and belonged to the other part only that there were free men and slaves.

63. Mr. THYNESS (Norway) informed the members that on the following day he would submit a draft resolution on the establishment of a working group to study the financing of UNRWA. He hoped that the Committee would agree to consider it as a matter of priority, so that a vote could be taken in the course of the morning meeting of the following day.

64. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that it was important for the Committee to conclude its work on the agenda item under consideration the following day, so that the last week of the session could be devoted to the last item on its agenda, item 101.

65. Mr. HOLDER (Liberia) said he had understood that the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/L.196 and A/SPC/L.197 would be taken at the current meeting.

66. The CHAIRMAN said that it was for the Committee to decide when the votes would be taken. Should the draft resolution to be submitted by the representative of Norway be put to the vote during the morning meeting of the following day, the Committee would be able to take a decision on the other draft resolutions at the afternoon meeting.

67. Mr. CHALIKULIMA (Zambia) associated himself with the comments of the Liberian representative. He hoped that the draft resolution to be submitted by the Norwegian representative would not be controversial and that the other draft resolutions could be dealt with expeditiously, since all the parties had had ample opportunity to present their arguments.

68. Mr. PAL (Pakistan) supported the comments made by the representative of Zambia.

69. Mr. CUREÑO (Mexico) and Mr. ORTIZ (Ecuador) thought that it would be preferable for the vote on the draft resolutions to be taken during the meeting of the following afternoon, so that delegations would have time to receive the necessary instructions from their Governments.

70. Mr. HIERRO GAMBARDILLA (Uruguay) said that he shared that view, although his delegation would be in a position to vote as early as the morning meeting of the following day on the draft resolution to be submitted by the Norwegian representative.

71. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) proposed that the vote on the draft resolution to be submitted by the representative of Norway should be taken at the meeting of the following morning, that explanations of vote should then be heard and that the other draft resolutions should be put to the vote in the afternoon.

72. Mr. HOLDER (Liberia) pointed out that at the preceding meeting no one had objected to voting on draft resolutions A/SPC/L.196 and A/SPC/L.197 during the current meeting. If there had been any objections, it was then that they should have been voiced. The procedure followed did not seem satisfactory to him.

73. Mr. AMONOO (Ghana) thought that it was a mistake to lay down a working procedure that was too rigid. The Committee might, at its morning meeting of the following day, vote on the draft resolution to be submitted by the Norwegian representative and then, after the explanations of vote, could vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/L.196 and A/SPC/L.197, which had been before the Committee for a week. At the afternoon meeting, it could vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/L.198 and A/SPC/L.199.

74. Mr. KANIARU (Kenya) supported the Ghanaian representative's suggestions.

75. The CHAIRMAN thought that the representatives of Zambia, Tunisia, Ghana and Kenya had made wise suggestions which should enable the Committee to conclude its work on the agenda item it was considering, the following day.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.