

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 361st
MEETING**



Tuesday, 4 December 1962,
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 31:

*Report of the Commissioner-General of the
United Nations Relief and Works Agency for
Palestine Refugees in the Near East (con-
tinued)* 181

Chairman: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

AGENDA ITEM 31

**Report of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations
Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the
Near East (A/5136, A/5214; A/SPC/74) (continued)**

1. Mr. SABRI (United Arab Republic) thanked the Committee on behalf of all the Arab peoples for having given a hearing to the representative of the Arabs of Palestine (358th meeting), that uprooted people which lived on the fringe of mankind. He first wished to pay tribute to the Chairman of the Committee and to the Latin American countries, which were linked to the Arab world by ties of friendship and a common basis of culture. He also wished to congratulate the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) on his annual report (A/5214), which reflected considerable courage and objectivity. There had however been another report, which had not yet seen the light of day—that of Mr. Johnson. The United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine had asked Mr. Johnson to find a means of repatriating, in accordance with the Assembly's injunctions, the millions of Arabs of Palestine who had been driven from their homeland by the ruthless attacks of the terrorist gangs. He had had to make elaborate plans for consulting, by means of a referendum, all the displaced Arabs. But no one had ever expressly guaranteed their return to their homes. Israel leaders had always made it clear that they would bar the way to such return. In those circumstances, how was it possible to take Mr. Johnson's proposals seriously, assuming indeed that anything concrete came of them? Mr. Johnson himself was not to blame; he had simply been given an impossible task.

2. Israel, which continued to flout the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, was trying to confront the United Nations with a dead-end, by compelling all the Member States to believe that the Charter offered no solution for the Palestine situation. It wished to force the Member States to wash their hands of all responsibility and to consign the question to "direct talks" between the parties concerned. The United Nations, if it fell into that trap, would be signing the death-warrant of a million Palestinians whose homeland had been plundered.

3. At the sixteenth session, Israel had tried very hard to secure the adoption of a resolution in favour of direct talks, hoping that in that way its past offences would be effaced and that it would be relieved of the moral onus of respecting the countless resolutions of the United Nations—resolutions of which neither its leaders nor its Parliament wished to take account. It was now canvassing various countries, on a large scale, to induce them to accept its plans. On the present occasion its approach was more subtle, but no less dangerous. The Israelis were trying once again to move the Member States to vote for the formation of a new commission to pave the way for direct talks between Israel and the Arab States. It would indeed be a new commission, since its task would go beyond the mandate of the Conciliation Commission. It should be pointed out that if, despite its limited mandate, the latter Commission had been unable to report any progress, it was because Israel had systematically ignored its existence. It had simply used the Commission as a vehicle to membership in the United Nations.

4. Even if the Member States allowed themselves to be deceived by those intrigues, no agreement could gain international acceptance unless it was signed by the parties concerned. There were already the various General Armistice Agreements,^{1/} signed by a number of Arab States and by Israel. But Israel had time and again repudiated those documents, in word and deed: it had been proved that every military clash which had taken place since the signing of the Agreements in question had been initiated by Israel. Such brazen flouting of international obligations was unprecedented in the present century, except in the history of Nazi Germany. That was no matter for surprise: Nazi Germany had been racialist and expansionist, and Israel was the same. Israel had proclaimed itself the homeland of a "chosen people", and aimed to extend its sway from Dan to Beer Sheva and from the Euphrates to the Nile. While Nazi Germany's ambitions had been confined to the East, Israel's expansionist ambitions were boundless. Not content with claiming a border as far south as Beer Sheva, the Israelis had, just after the signing of one or two of the Armistice Agreements, seized Umm Rashrush which they had renamed Eilat, on the Gulf of Aqaba; they did not respect their own signatures; how could they be trusted by others?

5. He suggested that a United Nations commission be instructed to examine, on the spot, the many flagrant violations of the Armistice Agreements which Israel had committed, not only by launching large-scale military attacks but by continuing to occupy various demilitarized zones, repeatedly expelling Palestinians across the cease-fire demarcation lines, and engaging in activities contrary to the letter and the spirit of every Armistice Agreement which bore its signature. If Israel sought direct talks with the Arabs,

^{1/} Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplements, Nos. 1-4.

it was simply in order to rivet its hold on property which it had usurped, to make new territorial claims and to hatch fresh invasion plans. Israel had in any case not attempted to conceal its ambitions.

6. In 1956, when Egypt had withdrawn its troops in order to deal with the invasion forces of the former Prime Ministers Anthony Eden and Guy Mollet, Israel had moved into the resulting vacuum and had proclaimed the Egyptian Arab Sinai Peninsula to be an integral part of "Erets Yisrael". Was it being asked of the Arabs that they should recognize the rightness of such a situation? And even if the Israeli-Zionists could be forced to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council there was no assurance that the Palestinian Arabs returning to their homes would be left to live in peace with their neighbours. For Arab land in Palestine could be confiscated under the Land Acquisition Law, which had been described as plain "robbery of land". Moreover, Arab victims of such injustice could make no successful appeal against it. Certain non-Arab witnesses, who even included Israelis, had openly stated that in Israel there was no safeguard either for Arab property or for Arab lives. An American of Judaic faith had described, in the *Jewish Newsletter*, the persecution to which the Arabs in Israel had been subjected.

7. As for guarantees to be given to the Arabs returning to Palestine, Israel would certainly see in such guarantees an intrusion into its internal affairs. He recalled that, on the subject of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of another country, Mr. Ben-Gurion had stated, at the twenty-third Zionist World Congress, that all Zionist organizations had the obligation to aid the Jewish State in all circumstances and under all conditions, even if such an attitude conflicted with that of their own national authorities. By adopting that principle of interference in the internal affairs of other countries, by implanting and cultivating "Israelomania" in other States, Israel had removed every basis for its own thesis.

8. He himself, far from being anti-Semitic, was as an Arab more Semitic than all those persons of East European origin who had found it expedient to assume Hebrew names in order to create the impression that they were of Hebrew origin. For instance, the real name of Mr. Ben-Gurion was Grün, while Mrs. Meir's maiden name was Zlotnick.

9. Mr. COMAY (Israel), speaking on a point of order, asked that the representative of the United Arab Republic should abstain from making personal attacks upon the Israel Minister for Foreign Affairs or upon any other individual. Such attacks simply betrayed the weakness of his position.

10. Mr. SABRI (United Arab Republic), resuming, said that Mr. Abba Eban, who had been born in South Africa, was in fact Major Aubrey Stone, of the British Army.

11. Mr. COMAY (Israel), again speaking on a point of order, asked the Chairman to call the representative of the United Arab Republic to order.

12. The CHAIRMAN, while noting that there were no grounds for applying rules 108 and 114 of the rules of procedure, appealed to Mr. Sabri's courtesy and asked him to refrain from making personal remarks.

13. Mr. SABRI (United Arab Republic) said that he could see no harm in mentioning certain people by

their real names; were they by any chance ashamed of them?

14. The discussions which should have centred on the Palestine problem as such had been obscured by the "Israelomania" of the Zionists and their sympathizers; it was high time to probe deeper into the matter, for the creation of Israel had brought misery and destitution not only to 1 million Palestinian Arabs but also to millions of Jews inside and outside Israel. He quoted from several United States writers of Judaic faith to show that Jews had been forced to immigrate into Palestine. Zionist totalitarianism was trying to bring the entire Jewish people under its influence by force and violence. Zionist organizations all over the world were striving to become a State within the State, with the single objective of disseminating "Israelomania".

15. The equitable solution of the Palestine problem would lead not only to the restoration of the rights of 1 million Palestinian Arabs but also to the emancipation of millions of Jews, for in reality Zionism had proved itself to be the most anti-Semitic institution Judaic communities had ever had to face.

16. In order to solve the problem it would be possible, in the first place, to appoint a United Nations custodian for Arab property in occupied Palestine, who would pay over the revenue from that property to the Commissioner-General of UNRWA so that the latter might pursue his humanitarian activities with no need for international charity. In the second place, Member States could be invited to investigate the activities of local Zionist organizations and, when their true nature came to light, proclaim them to be foreign agencies. He was convinced that, if the United Nations adopted and applied those two methods, Member States would find it easier to advance, at subsequent sessions of the Assembly, further proposals which would lead to an equitable solution of the Palestine problem.

17. Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan) drew attention to the situation of the Palestine refugees as described by the Commissioner-General of UNRWA in his report (A/5214).

18. Over a million Arab refugees were living in misery and poverty, dependent on outside charity. The time had come to take positive action to solve that problem instead of resting content with speeches of condolence and meek resolutions.

19. The Arabs of Palestine, who had been unjustly deprived of their ancestral lands for the benefit of outsiders, were as deserving of human sympathy as the Jews who had been expelled from Germany and Eastern Europe. The least the United Nations could do was to implement paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III).

20. The United Nations had an obligation in the matter because, on the insistence of the great Powers, it had accepted the partition plan which had driven the Arabs from their homeland. In the interest of Peace in the Middle East and for the sake of human rights and justice, the General Assembly was under a duty to take the following measures at the current session.

21. It must support UNRWA in its admirable work, extend the Agency's mandate beyond 30 June 1963, and give it increased financial assistance.

22. Pending the return of the Arabs to their homes and an honourable settlement of the Palestine problem, Arab property in Palestine should be placed in United

Nations custody and the income from it should be returned to the legitimate owners. That would lighten the financial burden on UNRWA and give back their dignity to the Arab refugees. They were entitled to claim the protection of their property in virtue both of General Assembly resolution 181 (II), chapter 2, and of the provisions of international law.

23. The mandate and composition of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine should be revised to enable it to take, at long last the effective measures required of it under resolution 194 (III), to apply paragraph 11 of that resolution.

24. His delegation would consider favourably any proposal designed, on the basis of those three points, to protect the interests of the Arabs of Palestine and to bring about a final solution to the problem.

25. Mr. COMAY (Israel) said that he had no wish to stray from the subject under discussion but could not leave unanswered the charges of aggression and expansionism laid against Israel by a State which, in view of its own conduct, might well have shown greater discretion.

26. Leaving aside Egypt's invasion of Israel in 1948, the proclamation of a state of war, the illegal blockage of the Suez Canal, and the threats that were constantly reiterated, he would merely mention a few facts of public record, not relating directly to Israel.

27. In 1958 the Sudan had complained to the Security Council of Egyptian military occupation of part of its territory.^{2/}

28. In 1958 Lebanon^{3/} and Jordan^{4/} had brought complaints to the Security Council arising out of aggressive activities and subversion by Egypt, and an Emergency Special Session of the General Assembly had been convened to deal with the matter.

29. Syria had only recently regained its independence and no longer maintained relations with Egypt.

30. Turkey, Iran and Jordan also had no diplomatic relations with Egypt; Saudi Arabia had followed their example after the bombardment of its territory by aircraft of the United Arab Republic. There was a bitter quarrel between the United Arab Republic and Iraq.

31. Only recently Radio Cairo had called, in the name of Arab unity, for the assassination of the King of Saudi Arabia and the King of Jordan.

32. There was an Egyptian army of 15,000 men fighting in Yemen, murdering and bombing, in flagrant contradiction of the protestations of non-intervention made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt from the United Nations rostrum on 2 October 1962 (1139th plenary meeting).

33. It was thus clear that the present régime in the United Arab Republic was the main trouble-maker in the Middle East, and that Cairo was the only imperialist capital in the Middle East or in Africa.

34. The only reason why the Egyptian-Israeli General Armistice Agreement had become a scrap of paper was that Egypt had violated the letter and spirit of that Agreement by sending the Fedayeen, armed bands, to

commit murder, robbery and sabotage in Israel territory.

35. He took the strongest exception to the comparison of Israel with Nazi Germany. Six million Jews had been slaughtered by Hitlerite Germany. It took a sheer nazi mentality to make such a comparison, and there was nothing surprising about that, since it was known how many Nazis had fled to Egypt and were now working for the Government propaganda machine of the United Arab Republic.

36. Mr. SHUKAIRY (Saudi Arabia), exercising his right of reply, began by observing that the Israel representative's remarks had been completely irrelevant to the subject in hand. The internal affairs of the Arab world were no concern of Israel. At the United Nations, the Arab family formed a common front which no one could breach, however hard he tried. The Israel representative had mentioned in his statement the name of King Saud. The Saudi Arabian delegation was sure its King would rather be killed by the Arabs than live with Israel and, if he was to be killed, would prefer to lose his life in a battle to regain the liberty of Palestine. His delegation categorically rejected all the Israel representative's attacks on the Arab States, for which Radio Cairo was the symbol of Arab renaissance. Who had committed aggression, he asked; certainly not the Arab countries. Israel had committed aggression, not only against the Arab people of Palestine but against the United Nations as a whole, by its unrelenting opposition to the will of the international community, whose decisions it continually violated. The evidence was limitless; it was to be found both in official United Nations documents and in official statements by Israel representatives. In 1947, after the international community had decreed that Jerusalem should be internationalized, the Israel authorities, with Mr. Ben-Gurion at their head, had rejected that decision on the grounds that Israel could have no other capital. Mr. Ben-Gurion had made that known, both to the United Nations and to the Press, in the language of aggression and of war. At that time he had given short shrift to negotiation, of which the Zionists and their supporters were now making great capital. As to respect for human rights, the Conciliation Commission bore witness to the fact that Israel had rejected repatriation even in principle.

37. As to the territorial aspect of the question, Mr. Eban—who, as the representative of the United Arab Republic had very pertinently observed, was definitely of South African origin and thus an outsider in Palestine—had announced straight away that the Israel Government refused to cede one iota of the territory it had conquered and over which it exercised authority. That was surely the language of war. Such an attitude was surely a violation of the United Nations resolutions which stipulated that the Armistice Agreements were temporary. No terms were too strong in which to describe the constant efforts of Israel and its supporters to becloud the issue by misrepresenting every facet of the situation. In a book he had published,^{5/} Mr. James G. McDonald, the first United States Ambassador to the so-called State of Israel, had confirmed that his efforts to persuade Mr. Ben-Gurion to accept territorial revisions had proved fruitless. The Israel representative had spoken of aggression. That committed by the Israel Government in 1956 showed clearly that respect for international law was no concern of that Government. In the statement he had made before the

^{2/} Ibid., Thirteenth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1958, document S/3963.

^{3/} Ibid., Supplement for April, May and June 1958, document S/4007.

^{4/} Ibid., Supplement for July, August and September 1958, document S/4053.

^{5/} *My Mission in Israel* (New York, Simon and Schuster, 1951).

Israel Parliament on 8 November 1956, Mr. Ben-Gurion had said that one of Israel's objectives in the Sinai campaign had been to free part of the fatherland still in foreign hands. Since when, he wondered, had the Egyptians been foreigners in the Sinai peninsula? The whole policy of Israel was to make use of a de facto situation in order to gain its ends. Mr. Weizmann the first President of the so-called State of Israel, had said that the Zionists' only chance was to create facts, to confront the world with those facts and to build on their foundations. The representative of Israel himself had not shrunk from saying, during the fifteenth session (209th meeting), that nothing short of a war that destroyed the State of Israel would enable the refugees to return to the ruins. That was indeed language worthy of the Nazis.

38. Respecting the activities of Tacuara, the Saudi Arabian delegation thanked the Latin American delegations for having thrown light on the question and took note of the information that had been supplied. It was apparently a fascist movement which, though insignificant at present, caused the Latin American countries some anxiety. His delegation would take the liberty of asking those countries what their reaction would be if the movement had led to the establishment of a fascist State in the Western Hemisphere. That was precisely what had happened in the Middle East, for a fascist State had established itself in the very heart of the Arab world. The Arab countries were not the only ones to attach the neo-fascist label to the Israel régime. It was also the verdict, for example, of the distinguished historian, Arnold Toynbee, who had shown in A Study of History^{6/} the similarity between the crimes committed by the Zionist Jews against the Arabs of Palestine and the Nazi crimes of which the Jews had been victims. A Catholic, Father Ralph Gorman, had arrived at the same conclusions. It was impossible to deny the striking analogy between the methods and activities of the Zionists and the most detestable manifestations of nazism and fascism. In 1947, in the New York Post, an advertisement had appeared for a Palestine resistance fund inviting American Jews to rejoice at the success of terrorist acts of sabotage against the British in Palestine. That was the true face of Tacuara. Israel's acts of destruction and terrorism had brought it four condemnations from the Security Council. The last condemnation of Israel for violating the Armistice Agreements^{7/} concerned the destruction of an Arab village perpetrated by the Zionists in violation of the most elementary human rights. But Israel went even further. It did not even respect consecrated places. Israeli desecrations of cemeteries and churches, of which he quoted several examples, had drawn down the indignation of Catholics and complaints from ecclesiastical dignitaries. The most hateful episode in the Nazi history of Israel had been the destruction in 1951, on Christmas Day no less, of the Christian village of Ikra in Western Galilee. The feelings of the Arab countries towards those crimes were the same as those expressed by the Latin American delegations in regard to the activities of Tacuara.

39. Mr. EL SANOUSI (Sudan), exercising his right of reply, pointed out that the representative of Israel had referred to an incident which had nothing to do with the subject under discussion. He wished to emphasize that any differences of opinion which might arise be-

tween his nation and sister nations were not the business of Israel. On Zionism and the question of Palestine, the Sudanese Government and people shared the views of the other Arab States.

40. The Sudanese delegation rejected with contempt all interference in the domestic affairs of the Arab world.

41. Mr. SABRI (United Arab Republic), exercising his right of reply, said that the Eichmann trial had given indications of complicity between that war-criminal and members of Zionist organizations, evidence of which could be found in the book Perfidy, by the well known Zionist, Mr. Ben Hecht.^{8/} Moreover, the Israel delegation was particularly ill-qualified to speak of the respect due to United Nations resolutions. The information which he had supplied had come from Israel sources, and the Israel representative's attack on the United Arab Republic showed that those were facts which Israel had persistently tried to hide.

42. Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan), exercising his right of reply, protested against Israel's slanderous allegations regarding the relations between Jordan and the United Arab Republic and against the malicious attempt to make use of the name of the King of Jordan. The Jordan delegation considered that any differences of opinion there might be between Arab countries were such as might arise within any family. If the United Arab Republic was the target of attack from Israel or from any other country, Jordan would be the first to stand at its side to defend the common aspirations of all the Arab countries, one of which was to combine in a wider national union. It refused to accept false expressions of sympathy from the spokesman of a foreign force which had illegally established a foothold in Palestine and whose only aim was to dismember the Arab nation and as a means to self-aggrandisement. It was for the Arab States themselves to settle any differences which they might have.

43. Mr. TARAZI (Syria), exercising his right of reply, reiterated that all the mendacious comments of the representative of Israel were diversionary manoeuvres engaged in by the Zionists and imperialists in order to take advantage of a special situation, which they had moreover helped to bring about. It was false to say, as the representative of Israel had alleged, that Syria had recovered its independence in 1961. As former Mandated Territories, Syria and Lebanon had become independent in 1945, in accordance with the Charter. The Israel representative's insinuation was contrary to the historical and juridical facts. Syria had never lost its independence. In 1958, Syria and Egypt had decided to form a single State, the United Arab Republic; in 1961, Syria had resumed its former status as a separate entity. Moreover, the relations of the Arab countries with each other were no business of Israel's and the attempts of the Zionists and their supporters to undermine the Arab nation and Arab unity were doomed to complete and certain failure. Several representatives had realized the true nature of the Israel régime, and had pointed out that Israel nationalism ran counter to the current of history. The representatives of the socialist countries had shown such an understanding long ago when they had stated that the Zionist movement was a bourgeois movement in the pay of the imperialists.

44. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) wished to declare very solemnly that the people of Iraq and the people of the

^{6/} Vol. VIII (London, Oxford University Press, 1954).

^{7/} Official Records of the Security Council, Seventeenth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1962, document S/5111.

^{8/} New York, Messner, 1961.

United Arab Republic were members of one great nation, united by common hopes and problems, which one day would undoubtedly realize its aspirations for independence and unity.

45. On the question of Palestine, in any case, there could be no difference of opinion whatever between Iraq and the United Arab Republic.

46. The representative of Israel had been angered by the parallel drawn between Zionism and nazism. Unfortunately it was only too true that the Zionist movement was dragging the Jews down the same path as that formerly followed by the nazi movement. Both were based on the racist concept of the innate superiority of one people—be it "Herrenvolk" or "chosen people"—over all others. As Arnold Toynbee had remarked, Zionism and anti-Semitism had much in common, the one aspiring to recreate the mediaeval apartheid, and the other seeking to turn Palestine into the greatest ghetto of all.

47. Israel had no respect for human rights or for the Charter; the Security Council had condemned it on several occasions for acts of aggression committed in violation of the cease-fire. Israel also bore the heavy responsibility for the death of Count Bernadotte, murdered on mission at a time when he was under the protection of the Israel authorities. Those authorities had not only implicitly encouraged the murderers but had apparently done nothing to punish them as they deserved. Such actions spoke louder than any words and showed that Israel was a born aggressor.

48. Mr. DIMECHKIE (Lebanon) refused to be distracted by the Israel representative's diversionary tactics. He recalled that in the last twelve years, the Security Council had four times condemned Israel for aggression, a measure which had never been taken against the Arab States.

49. The Arab representatives had drawn attention to the analogy between Zionism and nazism; the representative of Israel had protested, pointing out that the Jews had been the first and chief victims of the Nazis. That did not prevent nazism and Zionism from having many points in common; both of them were based on an exclusive national fanaticism and on racial discrimination. Like nazism, Zionism had been responsible for murders committed in cold blood, for the uprooting of a people and religious discrimination. Just as the Nazis had claimed the loyalty of Germans outside Germany, the Zionists claimed the loyalty of Jews living outside Israel. In *A Study of History*,^{9/} Arnold Toynbee had written that in 1948 the Jews had imitated some of the evil deeds that the Nazis had committed against them. Lastly, Israel, which was simply an alien body in the Middle East, had no business to interfere in the relations between the Arab States.

50. Mr. COMAY (Israel) said that the protestations of Arab unity which his intervention had elicited would have been more convincing if they had been accompanied by concrete proof in the area. As they were its closest neighbours, anything which concerned the Arab countries must necessarily concern Israel.

51. He noted, however, that he had not made any personal reference to the King of Jordan, but had merely quoted from an official broadcast by a "sister Arab nation". Anyone who tried to attribute to the Israel Government the slightest responsibility for the death of Count Bernadotte or sought to involve the Jewish Agency leaders in the crimes of Adolph Eichmann was uttering a shameful falsehood. Any comparison between nazi Germany and Israel would arouse the indignation of any decent person, Jew or non-Jew.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.

^{9/} See foot-note 6.