

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 738th
MEETING**



Tuesday, 1 December 1970,
at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

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)**

1. Mrs. GAVRILOVA (Bulgaria) said that her country had always considered the problem of the Palestine refugees from a political standpoint, but that it also provided direct assistance, in cash and in kind, to the refugees and to the host countries. However moving and useful the humanitarian actions of individual Governments, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East or voluntary organizations might be from the point of view of human solidarity, they could not provide a permanent solution to the problem, or alter the effects of aggression on the Palestine people or return their country to them.

2. Charity was not a means of providing justice and of punishing the guilty. It could constitute a temporary means of alleviating the lot of the refugees, but it should not become an end in itself or a permanent way of life for them. There could be no question of a million and a half Palestinians remaining dependent on the international community indefinitely. In any case, it appeared that they had no intention of doing so.

3. Therefore, her delegation thought that the Committee, instead of concentrating its discussion exclusively on the increase of voluntary contributions, should continue to study all sides of the question. It was the duty of the United Nations to find a just and lasting solution to the refugee problem, which was one of the main elements in the Middle East conflict as a whole. Limiting the question to its humanitarian aspect and ignoring its political aspect could be interpreted as acceptance of the existing situation and of the dangerous stand of the Israeli Government, which for decades had refused to implement the decisions of the United Nations. Moreover, appeals for pity which did not mention the political causes of the sufferings, for which a remedy was being sought, made that charity humiliating for those who received it, and might impede a solution by diverting attention from the source of the evil.

4. The twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly should consider the problem in its true light: what was at issue was not the existence of the Agency as such or the

continuance of its activity, but firm intervention by the United Nations to compel one of its Member States, Israel, immediately and unconditionally to return to the Palestine refugees all their legitimate rights, in accordance with the pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

5. The United Nations could not however ignore all the other means to which the Palestinian people had recourse in order to bring about a just solution of the refugee problem, and to defend their right to self-determination. Recognition of that right and of the right to national existence entailed recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle for liberation of the Palestinian people and of its national liberation movement. The time had come for the United Nations to give to that struggle the material and moral support which that recognition logically obliged it to provide.

6. While all progressive forces welcomed the fight of the Palestinian people, who had decided to take their national destiny into their own hands, the forces of reaction and imperialism inveighed against them and heaped insults upon that liberation movement: but had it ever been otherwise? It seemed to them that to install a régime of violence and terror and drive millions of people into exile was the natural right of the invader, while at the same time they tried to present as banditry any opposition to the system they imposed. The representative of Israel was no exception to that rule, which was not surprising. Occupation régimes were the same everywhere. They used the same methods and the same political vocabulary. It was not through ignorance or ingenuousness that, in an effort to exculpate his country by verbal acrobatics, he had compared the exile of the Palestine refugees to a voluntary emigration, as a consequence of war or for political reasons. Several representatives had shown that the comparison was not apposite. What had happened to the Palestine refugees was not a normal wartime phenomenon but the result of an aggression, of international gangsterism, of national and racial discrimination, of a policy akin to genocide and *apartheid*.

7. It was said that all countries had a collective responsibility for the future of the refugees. Her delegation disagreed. It held that Israel alone was responsible. If it was possible to speak of collective responsibility at all, it could only refer to Israel and the United States, which encouraged by every political and military means Israeli aggression against the Arab States.

8. Her delegation would once more support the adoption of a draft resolution clearly stating the guilt and responsibility of Israel for all the sufferings of the Palestine people, and demanding that Israel should carry out all the earlier

resolutions of the United Nations calling for the repatriation of the exiled people and for their compensation. Bulgaria wished Israel to be specifically forbidden from interfering in the teaching given to the Palestinian children. It wished the United Nations to recognize the legitimacy of the fight of the Palestinian people, with all the political and material consequences that entailed for the United Nations.

9. Mr. EL-SHIBIB (Iraq) deplored the fact that the international community, which bore direct responsibility for the plight of the people of Palestine, should allow the continued deterioration of the financial position of UNRWA, when its operations were vital to the existence of the Palestine refugees. It was a glaring example of the failure of the United Nations, that after twenty years basic relief to the refugees should be threatened, instead of their problem being solved. His delegation hoped that the spectre of the Agency's financial ruin would be banished through effective international response, and in that connexion drew the attention of the members of the Committee to the sacrifices made by the host countries in fulfilment of the humanitarian work of UNRWA, as described earlier by the representative of Syria (727th meeting).

10. Iraq received a large number of Palestinians outside the scope of the operations of UNRWA and had always upheld the principle of solidarity with the people of Palestine and their equal rights with other Iraqi citizens. In that spirit, and in addition to a number of laws and regulations dealing with the residence of Palestinians, a presidential decree issued on 17 August 1969 ordered that housing and health services, education and scholarships should be provided to Palestinians residing in Iraq in full equality with other Iraqi citizens. In addition, all government posts and other sources of employment were to be open to the Palestinians in full equality with their Iraqi brethren.

11. Whatever success the humanitarian efforts of the Agency might achieve, it would never be able to solve a question that was of such enormous political importance that its ramifications went far beyond the Middle East. The existence of the refugee problem and the dangerous situation in the Middle East were the result of the confrontation between two opposed and irreconcilable forces, namely those of Zionism and its designs on Palestine and the Middle East and the cause of freedom and self-determination for the people of Palestine. The goal of Zionism, which was to gather together all the Jews of the world in a colonized Palestine, had been clearly stated from the day of its inception. In 1921, Mr. Eder, a member of the Zionist Commission, had said that there could only be one national home in Palestine and that was a Jewish one, and no equality in partnership between Jews and Arabs but a Jewish preponderance as soon as the numbers of their race had increased sufficiently. In 1951, one of the founders of Israel, Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, had stated: "We have to set up a dynamic State built upon expansion". That policy had never been more clearly expressed than in the statement of Minister of Defence Moshe Dayan on 5 July 1968 to Israeli occupation forces: "This is not the end, for, after the present cease-fire lines, there will be new lines, but they will extend beyond the Jordan River, maybe to Lebanon and perhaps to Central Syria as well."

12. To the Zionists, the Arabs—for whom Palestine had been a homeland from time immemorial—were human obstacles which must be eliminated. So far, their plan had succeeded in dividing the people of Palestine between the exiles in their refugee camps and those languishing without any rights under Zionist military occupation.

13. Zionism had many and varied weapons to achieve its grand design: powerful propaganda, the use of economic and political pressure and the final resort to terrorism and force, and then the crowning act of blackmail which consisted of attacking anyone who opposed their political aims as an anti-Semite.

14. However, from the earliest days of the Mandate, the Zionists' determination had met with adamant resistance from the Palestinian people, who were determined to defend their inalienable rights. In June 1919, the King-Crane Commission set up by President Wilson had concluded that the non-Jewish population of Palestine, nine tenths of the total population, were emphatically against the Zionist programme. That opposition to the Mandate and to colonization had never subsided, and, having exhausted all forms of political action to no avail, had culminated in armed revolts in 1920, 1921 and 1929 and from 1936 to 1939.

15. The struggle of the Palestinian people was based upon their inalienable rights, which had been legally and unequivocally recognized. Today, the Palestinian revolution was part of the great revolutionary movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America to achieve freedom and self-determination in the face of imperialism and colonialism. The representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, speaking (734th meeting) on behalf of the Palestinian people, had stated that the only way to solve the crisis of UNRWA and the Middle East lay in the programme of the Palestinian revolution, which aimed to destroy the source of tension and injustice and to establish a State where Moslems, Christians and Jews could live in peace.

16. The Palestinian resistance was receiving ever-widening support among the peoples of the world, and the General Assembly had just adopted resolution 2649 (XXV) affirming the right of the people of Palestine to self-determination. Although the exercise by the Palestinian people of their legitimate rights depended on the struggle they were waging, it was still vitally important that the United Nations should clearly express its recognition of the legitimacy of that struggle and provide it with encouragement and assistance.

17. Mr. MAROOFI (Afghanistan) said that his delegation was distressed to note that UNRWA had had to curtail some of its relief activities, owing to lack of funds, and that it might be compelled to halt its services completely if it did not receive increased contributions. His delegation was particularly concerned at the fact that the Agency might have to curtail its educational activities, which seemed to be the largest item of expenditure. However, those activities had to be given lower priority, because further reductions in the health and sanitation services might endanger the health and life of the refugees. It appeared necessary to give the highest priority to the immediate needs of the refugees in terms of food, clothing and lodging. In any case, his

delegation felt that any reduction in the activities of the Agency would mean an abdication of responsibility by the General Assembly.

18. The problem of the Palestine refugees could not and should not be solved by international charity alone. The United Nations itself bore the heavy responsibility of having adopted the resolution which had made refugees of thousands of people, and should therefore strive to find a just and equitable solution to the problem as a whole. However, while the United Nations sought solutions to the financial problems, the Palestine refugees were gradually losing the confidence they had placed in it to secure their inalienable rights.

19. In his delegation's view, the problem of Palestine refugees was essentially a political one. Concern should therefore be directed more towards the cause of the problem, and efforts should be made to return the refugees to their homeland, rather than to find ways of providing for them as refugees. It could not be expected that those refugees should be eternally dependent on relief agencies such as UNRWA.

20. The legitimate right of the Palestine refugees to self-determination had been recognized in a number of resolutions of the General Assembly. It was the United Nations which had originally decided the fate of the Palestinians. It was therefore its responsibility to remedy the resulting situation and secure for the refugees their inalienable rights. His delegation firmly believed that the implementation of decisions of the United Nations and resolutions of the Security Council would make possible a peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem, and it was incumbent upon all Member States to seek an equitable solution. It was necessary not only to feed and shelter more than one and a half million refugees, but above all to restore to them the dignity which was essential to mankind, and to restore to a people in exile their rights to self-determination.

21. His delegation hoped that the international community would make it possible for UNRWA to meet the basic needs of the refugees, and that those countries which had the means would fulfil at least their humanitarian obligation to provide the necessary funds for the Agency.

22. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that, while the Committee was considering the question of the Palestine refugees in the context of the report of the Commissioner-General (A/8013), the interest of all Member States in that question was due not so much to humanitarian considerations as to the fact that it was an extremely important political question upon which the fate of the entire Arab people of Palestine depended. He stressed the need to achieve a political settlement, for experience had shown that palliatives of a humanitarian nature did not lead to a solution to the problem, which in essence was the following: the Arabs of Palestine must stop being refugees and return to their homeland. The important thing was therefore to put an end to the injustice which had been committed against them.

23. The situation had grown out of the expansionist and aggressive policy of the Government of Israel towards the

Arab countries. It was that policy which, in 1948, had obliged the majority of the Arab population, of what had later become Israel, to go into exile; it was that policy which had compelled an entire people to live outside its homeland; it was that policy which continued to impede the restoration of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine. That policy, aimed at driving out the indigenous population and depriving it of its ancestral lands, could not succeed. It only increased tensions and endangered international peace; the Palestinian people, with the support of all peace-loving peoples, were increasingly determined to struggle in defence of their rights.

24. The solution to the problem could be found only through a decision of principle based on respect for the legitimate rights of the Arab population of Palestine. Those rights had been repeatedly recognized by the United Nations. Indeed, since the adoption of resolution 194 (III), the General Assembly had always maintained that the refugees who wished to do so must be permitted to return to their homes, and that compensation must be paid for the property of those who decided not to return to their homes. Since 1948, resolutions of the General Assembly had repeatedly affirmed that the refugees had the right to choose without condition or restriction between repatriation and compensation. However, the Government of Israel had not only failed to implement those resolutions, it had served to widen the scope of the problem through its acts of aggression; thus, in 1967 hundreds of thousands of "displaced persons" had had to flee the occupied territories in Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic.

25. For its part, the Security Council, particularly in resolution 237 (1967), had called upon the Government of Israel to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who had fled the areas where military operations had taken place, but the Israeli Government, far from complying, was forcing the inhabitants of occupied areas to leave them in order to install Israeli settlers. Among decisions forming a political and legal basis for the settlement of the Palestine refugees question, he referred also to resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council, which affirmed the necessity for achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem, with a view to the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, which should include the prior withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from occupied territories.

26. He noted that those various decisions had the support of the majority of the States Members of the United Nations, but that they remained nevertheless a dead letter. The reason for that was that the Government of Israel sabotaged their application, refused to implement them and no longer participated in the Jarring negotiations, thus blocking a peaceful settlement. If the Government of Israel could indulge in defiance of the decisions of the international community, it was evidently because it knew it had the support of the forces of international Zionism and the United States.

27. The lack of progress towards a settlement of the refugee problem was bound to be a source of concern and protest to the Palestinians themselves, to the Arab countries and to all those who valued the maintenance of peace and the prestige of the United Nations.

28. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics assisted the refugees on a bilateral basis. It staunchly supported the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine and felt that the United Nations should compel Israel to implement its decisions on the matter forthwith.

29. It was to be hoped that the debates at the current session would contribute to a solution of the acute and pressing problem of the Middle East.

30. Mr. MICHELMORE (Commissioner-General, United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East) informed the Committee that forty-three countries had been represented at the meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the General Assembly for the Announcement of Voluntary Contributions to UNRWA. He thanked those countries which had agreed to increase their contributions, the members of the Committee who had emphasized the importance of the financial problems confronting the Agency, and the Chairman for the appeal he had made at the 733rd meeting.

31. Some of the statements made in the *Ad Hoc* Committee had related to 1970 rather than to 1971. Some Governments were not yet in a position to make pledges for 1971 and, in some cases, the exact application of the intended contribution would require further discussion with the Government concerned.

32. Despite those uncertainties, it could be estimated, on the basis of the most recent figures, that the Agency's deficit in 1971 would be between \$5.5 million and \$6 million, or \$1 million less than the shortfall previously envisaged. The outlook was extremely grim and a further deficit in 1971, after so many others, would lead to the collapse of the Agency. Additional income must therefore be found, or expenditure reduced. He profoundly hoped that the appeals made in the Committee, which might be endorsed later by the General Assembly, would encourage a greater flow of contributions to the Agency, and that Governments would continue to seek other ways including those mentioned in the note¹ submitted at the previous session of improving the Agency's financial situation.

33. The Executive Board of UNESCO had authorized the Director-General to launch an international appeal for the continuation and improvement of educational services for the refugees. The Director-General was expected to launch that appeal officially in the near future. UNRWA would support that effort in every way possible, and he hoped that it would produce substantial additional funds for the UNRWA/UNESCO education programme.

34. Nevertheless, a decision to reduce must be planned against the contingency that such funds would not be forthcoming, although that decision would have such disastrous consequences for the refugees that in the past it had been postponed beyond the limits of elementary financial prudence.

35. Subsidies for education, health and relief, which had previously been paid to a number of Governments, had

been withheld in 1970, although the relevant amounts had not yet been removed from the budget estimates, \$1.1 million for 1970 and \$1.4 million for 1971. It now seemed clear that those subsidies must be regarded as indefinitely discontinued and, unless the General Assembly directed otherwise, he proposed to reduce the 1971 estimates and to adjust the 1970 accounts accordingly. The result would be that the Governments concerned would have to cover the costs involved.

36. Total expenditure for 1970 was estimated at \$46,750,000 and income at \$42,344,000, with a resulting deficit of approximately \$4.4 million for this year.

37. As regards the future, it would be painful to make further reductions. No significant savings could be hoped for in the rations distribution programme, even if the number of recipients were reduced, since most of the commodities distributed were received as donations in kind. Cash was what was required to pay for health and educational services.

38. His own view was that the aim should be to preserve as much of the education programme and health and relief services as was compatible with the resources available. Many members of the Committee had emphasized the significance of the education programme for the refugees and he therefore felt it would be preferable to see if expenditure on relief and health services could be reduced before cutting education. Health and relief services were, however, already provided on an austere basis, and no lowering of standards could be contemplated, since it might jeopardize the health of the refugees and of the people among whom they lived. Existing services must therefore be continued; he would explore with the Governments concerned the possibility of their assuming responsibility for those services, the annual cost of which approached \$1.4 million. He would also ask whether any of those Governments could relieve the Agency of some of the medical services it now provided from its budget. Apart from those possibilities, he saw little hope of significant savings in the health and sanitation programmes.

39. With regard to relief services, the Agency could, by discontinuing the issue of kerosene and blankets, save a total of only approximately \$200,000. For more substantial savings, it would have to reduce the programme of supplementary feeding for children and nursing mothers. Priority in that programme should be given to hot meals and other supplements for very young children. Any reductions must therefore affect the distribution of protein supplements, hot meals for children aged between 6 and 15 who were living in emergency conditions, and other branches of the programme introduced to meet the needs of persons displaced in June 1967. The amount involved would be about \$400,000, but he would approach such a reduction with great reluctance since the existing level of nutrition provided under those programmes was barely adequate.

40. In the education programme, there were items of a relatively minor nature or some which were carried on elsewhere than in UNRWA establishments, such as adult craft training and other training, university scholarships and a youth activities project executed jointly with a voluntary

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 36, document A/SPC/134.

agency, which accounted for a total of \$450,000, half of which was accounted for by the scholarship programme. Those items could be regarded as less important than the remainder of the education programme.

41. All the reductions mentioned so far would free about \$3,750,000 annually; but if all the relevant decisions were not taken until the following year had begun, only part of that amount could be saved in 1971. As the savings thus made might not be sufficient, it seemed almost inevitable that reductions would have to be considered in the UNRWA/UNESCO education programme, in general education or vocational and technical education, or both. The cost of the preparatory cycle of general education was \$4.5 million, and the cost of all vocational and technical education carried on in UNRWA/UNESCO centres was \$3 million.

42. He would wish to discuss with the Director-General of UNESCO all questions concerning possible reductions in the education programme and, before taking a decision, the Agency would wait until it knew the results of the appeal which the Director-General of UNESCO would soon launch. However, any decision about the school year 1971-1972 would need to be taken before April of 1971.

43. If the necessary funds were not forthcoming, the decisions would not be easy, principally because of technical difficulties. For instance, much of the vocational and technical training was financed by special contributions received for specific purposes, and it seemed difficult to switch those contributions to other forms of expenditure. The preparatory cycle of general education affected about 60,000 children and hundreds of teachers, and any curtailment of that service would have serious repercussions.

44. The educational programme offered to the Palestine refugees covered about 250,000 children and nearly 7,000 teachers, and was comparable in size to the educational system of many Member States. To finance such a programme by voluntary contributions was very difficult indeed. He hoped that the Agency would not have to conclude that it was impossible, and be compelled to tell the Palestine refugee families that on top of a reduction in relief and welfare assistance, the right of their children to education was to be diminished.

45. Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait) proposed that the Commissioner-General's statement, which was very relevant to the Committee's discussions, should be reproduced in full. Furthermore, he requested that delegations which, like his own, had already made statements should be permitted to speak again in order to reply to certain points.

46. Mr. CAHANA (Israel) supported that proposal.

47. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would assume that the Committee decided that the statement of the Commissioner-General should be transcribed from the sound recording and circulated.

It was so decided.²

² The full text of the statement was subsequently circulated as document A/SPC/738.

48. The CHAIRMAN pointed out, with reference to the second point raised by the representative of Kuwait, that the list of speakers in the general debate was closed; nevertheless, the Committee could decide that those representatives who wished to clarify certain points would be permitted to speak again.

49. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) said that, in view of the gravity of the situation, the Committee might devote a meeting to the consideration of the Commissioner-General's statement, which was the core of the problem before the Committee.

50. Replying to a question from Mr. SAYEGH (Kuwait), the CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would do its utmost to circulate the text of the Commissioner-General's statement the next day. If there was no objection, he would suggest that the Committee should devote the afternoon meeting of the next day to the consideration of that statement.

It was so decided.

51. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that it must not be forgotten that the refugees had come from Palestine, a geographical entity whose existence the representative of Israel preferred to question.

52. He recalled certain aspects of the history of Palestine. When the Philistines, who had come from Crete and established themselves in what was now the Gaza Strip, had given it its name, Palestine had been inhabited by various Semitic tribes, including the Canaanites. It was not until later that the Hebrews, coming from Ur of the Chaldees, had arrived and settled in Palestine; even then, they formed only one of the various Semitic groups there. All kinds of raids were also carried out in Palestine, either by Semitic peoples like the Arabs from the Arabian Peninsula, or by non-Semitic tribes such as the Egyptians, who originally had been Hamitic and had not been semiticized until the seventh century. Furthermore, Semitic referred to culture, traditions, arts, religion, ethics, language and way of life, but not to race—even if certain physical characteristics were common to the whole region—just as American referred to culture, language and way of life. Hence the Jews had no right to claim to be the first Semites in Palestine. Some were there before them. And, even if they had been, would the United Nations recognize the rights of the Indians in United States territory on the basis that they had been there first? The Indians had not based a claim to Manhattan on the religious ceremonies which they had performed there three and a half centuries earlier; nor were the Jews entitled to Palestine on the grounds that they had founded a religion there. In any case, Palestine had been the cradle of three religions—Judaism, Christianity and Islam. If lands had to be shared out according to rights conferred by religion, what principles could be put forward by the Zionist minority of sixteen million Jews in the world as a basis for claiming the sole rights to Jerusalem?

53. The representative of Israel had stated that the islamization of Palestine had followed the settlement of the Hebrews in that country. But even though the peoples of Palestine, including Jews and Christians, had embraced Islam, the fact remained that they were the original Semitic

inhabitants, since all the peoples who had settled in Palestine, whether of Egyptian, Hittite, Arab or European stock, had been semitized, the same as the Sudanese negroes in Africa.

54. The theory that God had bestowed Palestine on the Jews carried little weight. Did God distribute lands? Did He discriminate between peoples? The argument was not only inept, it was fallacious.

55. He invited the Committee to consider why the Zionists were so eager to settle in Palestine. First, he quoted a statement by Mr. Nahum Goldmann, President of the World Jewish Congress, in which he had said:

“The Jews might have had Uganda, Madagascar and other places for the establishment of a Jewish fatherland, but they want absolutely nothing except Palestine: not because the Dead Sea water by evaporation can produce 5 trillion dollars’ worth of metaloids and powdered metal; not because the subsoil of Palestine contains twenty times more petroleum than all the combined reserves of the two Americas; but because Palestine is the crossroads of Europe, Asia and Africa, because Palestine constitutes the veritable centre of world political power, the strategic centre for world control.”

He then quoted the following statement made by Mr. David Ben-Gurion:

“The image of the world in 1987 as traced in my imagination: . . . the increasing influence of the workers and farmers, and the rising political importance of men of science, may transform the United States into a welfare state with a planned economy. Western and Eastern Europe will become a federation of autonomous states having a socialist and democratic régime. With the exception of the USSR as a federated Eurasian State, all other continents will become united in a world alliance, at whose disposal will be an international police force. All armies will be abolished, and there will be no more wars. In Jerusalem, the United Nations (truly united nations) will build a shrine of the Prophets to serve the federated union of all continents; this will be the seat of the supreme court of mankind, to settle all controversies among the federated continents”.

The representative then quoted a statement by General Moshe Dayan

“... Our fathers reached the frontiers which were recognized in the Partition Plan. Our generation reached the frontiers of 1949. Now the six day generation has managed to reach Syria, Jordan and the Golan Heights. This is not the end. After the present cease-fire lines there will be new ones. They will extend beyond Jordan—perhaps to Lebanon and perhaps to Central Syria as well”.

In the light of those statements, it was no longer possible to be deluded by the Israeli representative’s humanitarian tone.

56. He then read out a letter from an American ex-journalist, who observed that at present, information

sources and the means of disseminating news were in the hands of Israelites and Israelophiles, who were thus able to make the truth seem like a lie. And the majority of people concerned with disseminating information, even when they were not Israelites, were subject to financial pressure from Zionist circles.

57. He then outlined the circumstances of the Balfour Declaration and its approval by King Feisal, who had believed that the Jews who settled in Palestine would help in modernizing the country for the benefit of all its inhabitants. However, in 1948 the United Nations, in violation of the provisions of Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter, had been placed at the disposal of the Zionists. When had the Palestinian people, which had been placed under British Mandate had the right to self-determination? The United Nations had been warned of the consequences of the introduction of a foreign element into Palestine. It was the presence of that foreign element which had necessitated the creation of UNRWA. Of course, the people of Palestine was still alive, but unfortunately, it had been compelled to resort to the same methods used by the Zionists to drive out the British.

58. After quoting an example of the corruption rife in American political life, he spoke of an article published in *The New York Times* of 24 November 1970, in which Mr. W. Averell Harriman had proposed that Israel should be given lend-lease aid, which would make the entire American arsenal available to crush the Palestinians. He recalled the perfidy of the Anglo-Saxon leaders who had given Palestine over to the Jews, from the Englishman Balfour to the American Truman, whose only idea had been to be rid of them.

59. He drew attention to the purely emotional consideration interjected by the Israeli representative into his statement, in particular his depiction of the Jews as victims of the Inquisition, which, so he pointed out, had burned more Christians than Jews. The fact that the Nazis had tried to destroy the Jews did not authorize them to usurp the lands of the Palestinians. The Israeli representative had also attacked the Arab Governments. He should know that the Arab Governments had authority over their own nationals only. The Palestinians were masters of their own destiny.

60. He recalled his efforts to have included in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights the provisions of article 1 of those covenants, which he quoted. In defiance of those provisions the Palestinians were being denied their country and their resources because of the intrigues of the great Powers. All the present difficulties had arisen from that situation.

61. Would the United Nations, which had helped to deprive the Palestinians of their land and resources, make amends? He hoped that his words would touch the conscience of those who should be endeavouring to bring about the rule not only of peace but of justice, for peace without justice could only be the peace of the grave.

62. Mr. GIMER (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he had listened patiently to the representative of Saudi Arabia since he

considered that the situation of the Palestinian refugees was such that all possibilities of action should be considered. However, the Saudi Arabian representative had not once mentioned UNRWA, which was the subject of the Committee's debate. He had, on the other hand, spoken of certain influences allegedly being brought to bear on the political life of the United States.

63. The United States defrayed 70 per cent of the UNRWA budget. Moreover, it was President Nixon who was responsible for deciding the foreign policy of the United States. Mr. W. Averell Harriman was free to have his own opinions, but he did not speak for the Government of the United States.

64. Mr. PAL (Pakistan) said that he fully agreed with the views expressed by the Saudi Arabian representative. The example of the American Indians was repeated in the experience of the aborigines of Australia and New Zealand, who had experienced the same fate. The political problem in the Middle East was a consequence of colonialism and must be solved at the political level.

65. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Palestinian Arab refugees would have preferred not to have had to take a single cent from the United States or from other Powers, and would have preferred their never having intervened in Palestine. The Arabs had never threatened American interests. On the contrary, they had granted them oil concessions and markets.

66. What was the point of stressing the size of the United States contribution for the benefit of the refugees? The Arab countries also contributed to UNRWA, to the extent of their means. However, the Government of the United States was contributing to the Agency because it had a guilty conscience and in order to pacify the Arabs, who had been suffering for years as a result of American policy. Of 6 million American Jews, not more than 10 per cent could be Zionists, but they were putting pressure on their Government to intervene through Israel.

67. He recalled the position he had adopted with regard to the episode of the Russian missiles in Cuba. Why should the Americans make themselves the arbiters of the destiny of the Arabs, who were thousands of miles away?

68. Mr. COTTON (New Zealand), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he was surprised by the views expressed by the Pakistan representative with regard to the people of New Zealand. He assured the Pakistan representative that he was the victim of a complete misunderstanding in his comments about New Zealand and he reserved the right to take up the question further should it be appropriate.

69. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Office of Public Information had just published the statement of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA as a press communiqué.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.