



CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 45

Agenda item 43:

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine
Refugees in the Near East:

- (a) Report of the Commissioner-General;
- (b) Report of the Working Group on the Financing of the
United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine
Refugees in the Near East;
- (c) Report of the United Nations Conciliation Commission
for Palestine;
- (d) Reports of the Secretary-General
Report of the Special Political Committee

Agenda item 44:

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-
keeping operations in all their aspects: report of the Special
Committee on Peace-keeping Operations
Report of the Special Political Committee

Agenda item 45:

Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli
Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of
the Occupied Territories
Report of the Special Political Committee

Page

1

**Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli
Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population
of the Occupied Territories**

**REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
(A/9374)**

1. Mr. CASTALDO (Italy), Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee: I have the honour to introduce the report of the Special Political Committee on item 43 [A/9372], which was discussed between 5 and 20 November. The debate focused on the two interrelated aspects of the question of refugees: on the one hand, the financial problems of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East [UNRWA] and the need to ensure that its irreplaceable humanitarian activities may continue; and, on the other hand, the rights and aspirations of the Palestinians, which are at the root of the whole question. The Committee listened to the views of many delegations, which cast light on many aspects of the question, and also benefited from the statements made by representatives of Palestinian organizations. It concluded its work with the adoption of six draft resolutions, which are grouped together in paragraph 36 of the report as draft resolution I (A to E) and draft resolution II. Parts C and D of draft resolution I, which were adopted with a large majority, concern the rights of the Palestinians. Parts A, B and E concern contributions to UNRWA. Of these, the two fundamental draft resolutions were adopted, as in previous years, with near unanimity. Draft resolution II, also adopted unanimously, requests the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA to continue its efforts for a further period of one year. The Committee recommends these draft resolutions to the General Assembly for adoption.

2. I have the honour also to introduce the report of the Special Political Committee on item 44 [A/9373]. The question was discussed by the Committee between 26 and 29 November. The debate was enhanced by the interventions of a number of delegations which offered constructive suggestions for a fruitful resumption next year of the efforts of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations. At the conclusion of the debate a draft resolution was adopted by acclamation. This draft resolution requests the Special Committee and its Working Group to intensify their respective efforts to complete by the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly their task of achieving agreed guide-lines for the carrying out of peace-keeping operations. The Committee recommends the draft resolution, which is contained in paragraph 7 of its report, to the General Assembly for unanimous adoption.

President: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

AGENDA ITEM 43

**United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine
Refugees in the Near East:**

- (a) Report of the Commissioner-General;
- (b) Report of the Working Group on the Financing of the
United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine
Refugees in the Near East;
- (c) Report of the United Nations Conciliation Commission
for Palestine;
- (d) Reports of the Secretary-General

**REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
(A/9372)**

AGENDA ITEM 44

**Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping
operations in all their aspects: report of the Special Com-
mittee on Peace-keeping Operations**

**REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
(A/9373)**

3. Finally, I have the honour to introduce the report of the Special Political Committee on item 45 [A/9374]. The Committee debated this question between 19 and 26 November. It concluded its work on the matter by adopting, this year, two draft resolutions, which are grouped together as parts A and B of the draft resolution in paragraph 14 of the report. Part A affirms that the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949 applies to the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967. It was adopted unanimously. Part B, which was adopted by a large majority, concerns the human rights of the population in the aforementioned territories. The Committee recommends the draft resolution to the General Assembly for adoption.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will consider first the report of the Special Political Committee on item 43 [A/9372].

5. In this connexion an amendment has been submitted in document A/L.716. I call on the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, who wishes to introduce the amendment.

6. Mr. GEHLHOFF (Federal Republic of Germany): In introducing our amendment [A/L.716] I shall be very brief, since I do not wish to reopen the debate held in the Special Political Committee.

7. The motive for our amendment is our concern for UNRWA, which, as is well known, we firmly supported long before our recent admission to the United Nations. The amendment does not affect the substance of draft resolution I E contained in document A/9372, paragraph 36. Its objective, a limited but necessary one, is to delete the relevant formulation singling out my country.

8. I do not fail to recognize that our being expressly mentioned in the draft resolution could be interpreted in a positive sense, since the Federal Republic of Germany, like other European countries, does indeed take a deep interest in the Middle East. This is borne out by the declaration of the nine countries of the European Community of 6 November of this year. Yet our being singled out may also be interpreted in a different manner. We have reason to fear that, should we be expressly mentioned as an individual country, this resolution could be misunderstood by both the Parliament and the public in my country, which in the past have generously supported the work of UNRWA.

9. My country has always been among the major contributors to UNRWA and is at present the third largest donor. After the 1967 war the Federal Republic of Germany launched a special programme under which it is making substantial additional contributions to relieve the suffering of the Palestine refugees.

10. This is all the more reason why we consider the singling out of the Federal Republic of Germany to be entirely unjustified. Such an approach in connexion with voluntary contributions is unique in the annals of the United Nations and would set a precedent which could not be in the interest of any delegation. We appeal to all delegations to understand our objective—and I am addressing this appeal also

to the sponsor of the original text of that draft resolution. I ask our fellow delegations to vote in favour of our amendment.

11. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): My intervention will be analytical and will lack platitudes. Far be it for me to take a rigid stand without any reason. My good colleague from the Federal Republic of Germany approached me several times and asked me to withdraw the words whose deletion is proposed in the amendment he has presented this morning. I explained the position of the delegation I represent. He seemed to regard the singling out of the Federal Republic of Germany in the text of draft resolution I E in the report of the Special Political Committee as being inimical to the interests of the Palestinian refugees. He told me what he has just said today: that Parliament might take exception to the fact that the Federal Republic of Germany was singled out. I replied that I felt constrained to oppose any amendment that he might submit to delete the phrase in question, for the simple reason that the whole draft resolution is recommendatory. But, in addition, I saw to it that all the implications to which his delegation had objected were removed from the text when it was presented as an amendment to the United States draft resolution.

12. Of course, the United States delegation automatically refused to accept my amendment and said that if the amendment were adopted it would not vote for its own draft resolution. So I had no choice but to formulate a new draft resolution, which was approved by the Special Political Committee. I must here thank the United States delegation for not having raised the issue of its opposition to my amendments once they had taken the form of the draft resolution in which there was an allusion to the United States. I believe that the United States delegation had in mind the possibility that it might have difficulties with its own legislative body, but I tried to explain that the phraseology which I was submitting in the form of a draft resolution reflected certain facts that were necessary to appease the young—not necessarily Governments, but the young that constitute between 55 per cent and 60 per cent of the Arab world. I have said time and again that the young consider that the Palestine refugees were the victims of policies formulated by the United States and a good number of Western European States in 1947. So, in order to try to appease the young so that they may not always focus the attention on certain States, I said that certain Governments represented in the Special Political Committee should consider contributing more than they had in the past.

13. I hardly need mention that all these draft resolutions are recommendatory and are not binding. But I went further in order to dispel the fears of my colleague from the Federal Republic of Germany. I removed the allusion which had appeared in my amendment, and I thought he should then have no objection.

14. But the rigidity which I found in my colleague drove me to ask him, Which is better: to remove those three or four words, or to engage in a general debate in which I should have to be brutally frank? I said I would have no choice, unless at the last minute he raised a point of order stating that he was withdrawing that amendment. I said that unless he did that, I would be free to state the facts as they

obtain. And I am ready to do that now. I do not relish doing it because I really do stand on certain rights. But it seems that he has instructions, and they remind me of the instructions he might have received if he had been the representative of his country in the 1930s—rigid instructions; nobody could change an iota of what the German Government said. I watched the Germans in the 1930s when I was in Europe. They had Hitler. It is understandable; he was a dictator. But then their heads were in the clouds; we could not see the heads of the Germans then and so we could not talk to them. And I mean that. Do not think that I am now expressing the emotions that were generated in Europe by the emergence of Hitler. I am talking about the Arabs. We reason sometimes. We tried to reason with the Nazis. You might think now that this is hindsight, an altruistic approach, realizing that the persecution of the Jews might affect the question of Palestine. But who are we? Who were we? We were like the Jews, second-class citizens. This was the European approach. The British Empire had its colonies and Hitler had his Luftwaffe. I must say France was more reasonable. You could give and take with France—perhaps because it is a Mediterranean country and was affected by the history of the great Mediterranean civilization. I still find this rigidity today, after Hitler is no more. And this is what stirs me. Now I can understand why the Allies partitioned Germany.

15. But in fairness to the German Democratic Republic, I must say that that Republic seems to have taken into account the arbitrariness of Hitler and has heeded our warning—indeed more than heeded our warning. It is sympathetic to the Palestine cause. But not so the Federal Republic of Germany. And who created this Palestine question but, to a large extent, those who now represent the Federal Republic of Germany and represented Germany during the days of Hitler? Had Hitler not persecuted the Jews, I assure you that the Palestine question could have been solved between us and the Jews. We would have opened the door of Palestine for those who were motivated by religious sentiment to come and worship. But those remnants of the Jews who were placed in concentration camps were indoctrinated with the idea that they had a land, the land of Palestine—and they usurped it and named it Israel. So, to a large extent, the Germans contributed to the creation of the situation which obtains today in the Middle East.

16. But one might say: "Let bygones be bygones. There was a big war, 60 million people lost their lives in that war, and you, Baroody, always say that one should forgive". Here in the United Nations I often cite the famous saying "To err is human, to forgive divine", and say that we should have compassion and mercy. Yes, that is true.

17. No one stood up for Germany when it was weak as did my delegation here in the United Nations. I took issue with those who razed Dresden—and Dresden was no Arab city. I said that they were not brought to task before the Nürnberg Tribunal. I stood up for Germany when it was weak. But I am surprised that the old spirit is emerging in spite of the fact that Germany has no strong army of its own, and by the rigidity, not of Mr. Gehlhoff, the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany, who is a very reasonable man, but of those who issue instructions to him.

They ask, "Who is Saudi Arabia and who is Baroody to single us out?"

18. I shall tell you, my good colleague from the Federal Republic of Germany, why I singled you out, although I have tried to save face for you by eliminating phraseology to which you took exception before this amendment existed, phraseology that had certain allusions which I understood were objectionable to you. So I began that paragraph to which you objected with the words: "Considering further the deep interest which certain Western European and other States, and in particular the Federal Republic of Germany . . .".

19. Now I shall tell you what interests the Federal Republic of Germany manifested in the Middle East in the aftermath of the war. I think you told me that you spent about 20 years in various posts in the Middle East, my good friend, Ambassador Gehlhoff. But for certain reasons you seem not to fathom deeply enough the revulsion that the young of the Arab world have developed because of your behaviour with regard to the usurping State of Israel.

20. The Government of Mr. Adenauer and succeeding German Governments in Bonn assured us that they would not allow arms to be sent to Israel. They solemnly made that promise to our diplomats. And what happened? Pressure was brought to bear on the Federal Republic of Germany to send arms clandestinely to Israel, and many of us had no choice but to break diplomatic relations with the Federal Republic of Germany. We were compelled to do so. What do you say to this, my dear Mr. Gehlhoff? Do you have an answer to it? I have an answer to it for you, given by none other than my good friend who at one time was here as the observer of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. von Braun, who I think is still a member of your Government. When I brought this matter to his attention in the Delegate's Lounge a few years ago, he said "What could we do; we were a beaten country; we were forced to do it".

21. That is how the Western Powers played havoc with the destiny of our people. All right, one should look at this occurrence with a certain feeling of exoneration. After all, what Mr. von Braun said is true. Germany was beaten in the Second World War and sometimes it had no choice but to yield to pressure, and especially the pressure of the mighty United States that emerged as one of the super-Powers in the world.

22. Then why make an issue of including the phrase "and in particular, the Federal Republic of Germany"? What follows that phrase: "and in particular"—meaning, with the Western Powers—"the Federal Republic of Germany", which has manifested deep interest in the Middle East for many years. Whether willingly, inadvertently, unwittingly or because of pressure is beside the point. We know one thing, namely, that the Federal Republic of Germany had a keen interest in the Middle East.

23. But were we to stop at that point some might say, "Well, one should give the benefit of doubt to the Federal Republic of Germany." First, I should like to say that I know that there were five conspiracies by the German people to kill Hitler—which redounds to the honour of the

German people when they thought they had a tyrant and a dictator—although they did not succeed. So I am not belittling the honour and the magnanimity of the German people. Others would say that they were under pressure and would ask what they could do, as was asked by Mr. von Braun, the erstwhile observer of the Federal Republic of Germany—"What could we do?" That applies to anyone who is beaten in a war. What could they do? But then, as if that were not enough, what did the Federal Republic of Germany do?

24. The Zionists considered every German Jew who was killed by Hitler as being an Israeli before Israel was born, and they imposed their will on the people in the Federal Republic of Germany to make reparations at a time when the League of Arab States formed a committee to watch all firms abroad that did business with Israel. They applied a boycott to such firms, and that boycott is still in existence. I want to tell you about the might of the Zionists. Some members may remember Henry Ford—the first Henry Ford. I saw him at the New York World's Fair in 1939. At one time he had written a book that was in some way inimical to the Jews. I do not think he should have done that; he should have known better and later he learned better from the might of the Zionists in this country. They created a lot of trouble for him. His grandson, Mr. Ford Jr., whom perhaps you know, wanted to build an assembly line for Ford cars. We—the whole Arab world, that is—warned the Ford Motor Company that we did not want any assembly line plant for Ford cars and that we would boycott Fords. And the Zionists brought such pressure on him that he had to build his assembly line. Where? In Israel. Now we do not see a Ford car in all the Arab world. It shows that our boycotts are serious because we are at war with the usurping State of Israel.

25. And what do the Germans do because of their interest in the Middle East? They send millions upon millions, thousands of millions I should say, of marks and other currencies to Israel, which has usurped the legitimate right of self-determination of the Palestinian people and has driven them out of their homeland. We warned Germany time and again—and I know our diplomats that were sent to Bonn were so instructed before we broke relations with Bonn. We said, For heaven's sake, you are doing us harm. You are keeping the Palestinian people in camps. They were expelled from their homeland. Those warnings were to no avail. They began to assume that air of self-righteousness—not so much perhaps as certain colonial Powers, but nevertheless inflexible and rigid.

26. You might say, Well, let bygones be bygones. But can we stop here? No. I will tell you more about what happened. And I stand to be corrected by my good friend the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany. Of course, the Federal Republic of Germany, which was admitted to membership here, is a sovereign State, and it is right to do what it thinks is right. We cannot interfere in its domestic affairs or in its policies. But when its policies affect the policies of 19 States—there are now 19, because Mauritania is a member of the Arab League—and the people of those States, we should try to formulate certain phraseology to appeal to it to reconsider. If an appeal to reconsider frays the Germans' nerves so much, is it because of a sense of guilt or is it

because of stubbornness? I am not a psychoanalyst. I think there are many psychoanalysts in the German world. They can give me the answer. Why? Is it because of a sense of guilt or because of inflexibility? "We are Europeans; we are a member of the Western European group; and we will see to it that the Western Europeans vote with us by solidarity."

27. Again and again for the last 15 years I have stood against solidarity. There are votes by groups; there are votes that are influenced by lobbying; and there are votes based on logic and equity. Which one, my dear colleagues around this table, are you going to uphold: the vote by groups, or the vote that is influenced by lobbying, or the vote based on logic and equity?

28. This is why I have taken so much of the time of the General Assembly, not only today but quite often, to draw attention to the fact that this Organization will totter and fall if we vote just because we have national interests with someone, and not on the basis of logic, equity and justice.

29. The German Democratic Republic had the good sense, not to keep aloof, but to take the side of justice. Ah, you might say to yourselves—you do not dare to say it out loud—it is a satellite of the Soviet Union. It is not a satellite of the Soviet Union. It sits here as a full-fledged Member of the United Nations. If I were to mention the satellites—good Lord, I could mention about 60 or 70 clients of this Power or that Power. But for heaven's sake, let us not do that. It would be very embarrassing to us all, including me.

30. The German Democratic Republic had the good sense not only to refute what other Germans had done but to decry and harshly criticize the Federal Republic of Germany for currying favour with the usurping State in our midst, none other than Israel, at the expense of the Palestinian people, at the expense of their right of self-determination which is enshrined not only in the Charter but in the International Covenants on human rights.

31. Vote if you want to by groups on the basis of petty national interests, or because of lobbying. "Please vote with me on this; I will vote with you on another question". What a cheap method the United Nations has been using over and over again, the same method used by the League of Nations, which finally could not survive because of the injustices infused by those who wanted their own way and, when they could not get it, used surreptitious means. Sometimes they paid money. And money sometimes is paid here. I do not want to embarrass people. They tell me, "Write your memoirs". I do not want to write my memoirs. I could tell you how money and advantages are sometimes given here to people to get their vote. Should we keep silent? Should there be a sense of decorum? Where is our conscience? We vote by groups or by solidarity, but sometimes we should realize that votes on matters like this should be cast on nothing except a basis of equity and justice.

32. Now, would it not have been better if my colleague from the Federal Republic of Germany had heeded my friendly warning that I would open a debate on these few words? Of course, I commiserate with him if he is under instructions. But he had ample time to tell his Government what the result would be if it did not, so to speak, let sleeping

dogs lie and accept gracefully that paragraph which has reference to the Federal Republic of Germany—after what may have been objectionable was removed from the original amendment that became the basis of the draft resolution labelled “I E” in the report of the Special Political Committee.

33. Do not think I will let this occasion pass without referring to someone who insulted us. The Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, when he went to London for a Conference of Socialist States not very long ago, is reported to have said—and I am paraphrasing—that something should be done to stop “those extortionists”, meaning those who put an embargo on oil. Who does he think he is? As he is a Chancellor I respect his office, but if he calls our peoples, our Governments, extortionists, I will bring him to dust. I asked whether he was a Protestant or a Catholic and I was assured that he was a Protestant. Cajoling our enemies to such an extent, that is his business, but to call us names, who does he think he is? No one is immune to criticism when he touches the susceptibilities of sovereign States. It is not the practice. We should treat our kings and presidents of republics with decorum. Yes, but when they interfere directly, explicitly, in the affairs of other States by insults, then they no longer have the immunity of the court. How many times have the Africans and the Asians been maligned by them? We took issue with them on account of it, and there is no exception. If he is a Protestant, I know that Protestants do not revere relics of saints—unless they are high Church of England. During the reign of Henry VIII, you know, they did not want to be under the Pope, so they maintained all the catholicism in England, and that is their privilege. I am not entering into religion now.

34. But why does he call us extortionists? I have seen pictures of him on his visit to the usurped land of the Palestinians, bowing like this before the saint, Mrs. Golda Meir. And then he calls us extortionists. I do not want to mention the name of another person, but there is a picture of that person, a Chief of State, saluting Saint Golda Meir like this, while she was going to enter into her car. I shall not say where it was, but I have the picture and if anyone wants to see it privately I will show it to him.

35. All this, and when I come and say in draft resolution I E “Considering further the deep interest which certain western European and other States, and in particular the Federal Republic of Germany, have manifested in the Middle East for many years . . .” to the leaders of the Federal Republic of Germany, it is as if the sky has tumbled over the earth. Think, my good colleagues, how he wants to upset the vote. He thinks I am here just to win or lose on that board. Go and vote in the way you want, I do not care. I have made my point. And in the future, as long as there is breath in me, I shall defend the people who have been insulted.

36. I am not a Palestinian, distorting the news—as *L'Express* has done to belittle the Arab cause. When none other than the Ambassador of Israel was interviewed by that magazine, *L'Express*, he said “*Le fameux Baroodi, c'est un palestinien*”. Every one of the Arabs is a Palestinian and every Palestinian is an Arab. But I am not a Palestinian. I am descended from an Arab family that goes back 1,500

years, originating in the peninsula, and the Baroodi clan is spread all over the Arab world. You will also find many of them in the United States, but you will find none of our family in Palestine.

37. I have quoted from this French Zionist magazine, *L'Express*, to show you how the Arab cause is twisted, and how they seek to confuse the issue. And if we defend our cause as Arabs—not using bombs, not using cannons, but using an embargo—chiefs of State, allegedly responsible legislators, call us blackmailers and extortionists. Who do they think they are? They say, “We may use counter-measures”. Let them use counter-measures. The oil will go up in flames, if not today, tomorrow, and if not tomorrow, then the day after tomorrow, if they want to use force. This chicanery of expression does not intimidate us. We would rather die with dignity than live with injustice.

38. Go ahead, press the buttons. I have said my say. I want a roll-call and a recorded vote, and let it be against me or with me, that is beside the point. If my fair warning has not been heeded, there is a lot to come this year and perhaps next year on this issue when I shall have occasion to speak.

39. I thank you, Sir, for your kindness in having given me the floor and in having allowed me to speak at such length, but I did not want this debate. I was constrained to do it, and I appeal to my good friend, Ambassador Gehlhoff, not to press his amendment to the vote, just as he appealed to me to withdraw the words from my proposal. The appeal may not be interchangeable, but I can assure him that I have no arsenal of arms. I have an arsenal of facts that will be adduced time and again until States—whether they are in Western Europe or in the new world—will treat the Arabs with respect and recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

40. We who sit in the Arab seats are Arabs, regardless of where we come from. But please, Sir and fellow representatives, heed what might develop in the future should western Powers and Powers in the new world play wantonly with Arab interests.

41. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call upon representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

42. Mr. BLANCO (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to explain why it wants to be identified especially with draft resolution I D and that was adopted by the Special Political Committee and now appears in paragraph 36 of its report and is being submitted to the Assembly for approval.

43. As we understand it, the essential value of that draft lies in the fact that it truly expresses the substance of the matter: the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to liberation, sovereignty and self-determination. Slowly but inexorably, truth is gaining ground. There is, in fact, no problem of the Palestine Arab “refugees”. The truth is much harsher. Millions of persons have been deprived of their homes, land, property and national rights—in short, their homeland—by the most hateful methods.

44. The implementation of a premeditated systematic plan of colonial expansion for the benefit of the most reactionary imperialist forces has given rise to a situation in which, in flagrant violation of international law, a people has been deprived of its most fundamental rights under the principles of international law enshrined especially in the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

45. The situation of the Palestinian people, like the existence of *apartheid* in South Africa and the survival of colonial practices in that and other continents, undoubtedly represents one of the greatest affronts to the United Nations while at the same time it reveals the deplorable weaknesses and shortcomings of this Organization.

46. In fact, they are similar situations. The occupation of national territory, deliberate changes of demographic composition, control by foreign investors, changes in national culture and its replacement by the culture of the colonial forces are not exclusively methods of the policy of Israel but are well known by many peoples which, like those of Zimbabwe and others in southern Africa, are still subject to colonial policy and are waging an heroic struggle for full independence.

47. No one can submit that the Palestinian problem is merely a question of refugees in need of assistance. Their struggle falls squarely within the general struggle of the peoples of the third world for liberation. Heroically, they have found a predominant place in that struggle. One of my country's heroes of independence once stated that rights were not asked for but were taken. The inalienable rights of the Palestinian people will be conquered by them at the sacrifice of their lives.

48. We are gratified that in its first preambular paragraph draft resolution I D reads as follows:

“Recognizing that the problem of the Palestine Arab refugees has arisen from the denial of their inalienable rights under the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.”

49. Throughout the years, the cynical and hypocritical position that certain Western Powers, and especially the United States, have adopted in our debates on this question has been intolerable. Those who massively support the criminal expansionist policy of Israel and its colonial practices in the occupied territories try to appear here like philanthropists. They underestimate human intelligence if they think they can deceive anyone. For those who victimize people to offer them crumbs after despoiling them of their property is a ridiculous manoeuvre. From soup to gunfire—everything manufactured in the United States: that appears to be the political philosophy of imperialism.

50. True solutions lie elsewhere. A condition *sine qua non* for the final settlement of the explosive situation in the Near East, is the restoration to the Palestinian people of its legitimate rights.

51. Cuba's support for this draft resolution is the expression of our solidarity with the heroic people of Palestine and their movement of national liberation. We have on more

than one occasion said that we reserve the right to help that people through every means at our disposal.

52. Thus we follow a clear logic. The fight between progressive and reactionary forces is gaining universal scope in our time. No one can remain indifferent to it. The humble and generous blood being shed in Cambodia, the Near East and Guinea-Bissau is shed by all the peoples of the world. The altruistic gesture of those revolutionary fighters troubles the conscience of any sensitive person. Every honest human being has the duty to support them fully and unconditionally. We must preserve peace in the world. That is why we are compelled to fight for a better world, a world in which no people will be subjected to the kind of situation that today exists in Palestine.

53. Mr. JAYAKUMAR (Singapore): My delegation, which will vote in favour of all six draft resolutions recommended by the Special Political Committee, wishes to explain its affirmative votes, in particular those on draft resolution I C, concerning the right of displaced inhabitants to return to their homes, and draft resolution I D, on the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine.

54. With regard to draft resolution I C, on the right of displaced inhabitants to return to their home, my delegation's affirmative vote reflects our concern for the plight of such persons, and also my Government's stand on the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by the use of force.

55. With regard to draft resolution I D, on the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine, in casting its affirmative vote my delegation is again reflecting my Government's concern in this regard. As my Prime Minister recently stated, in the search for peace every effort must be undertaken to see that justice is done to the peoples and countries in the Middle East, including the Palestinians. More recently, our concern was again manifested in the three-point joint statement on the Middle East question signed by the Foreign Minister of Indonesia on behalf of the five members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations [ASEAN], including Singapore, circulated as United Nations document A/9369-S/11139, in which, *inter alia*, the five ASEAN member countries strongly urged that the lawful rights of the Palestinian people be fully respected and restored.

56. My delegation wishes to state that our interpretation of the draft resolution is in the context of United Nations resolutions and that our vote should not be taken to mean that Singapore questions the right of Israel to exist as a State.

57. Mr. SCHAUFLE (United States of America): My delegation stated in the Special Political Committee that we believe the debate on UNRWA should centre on the administrative and financial aspects of the Agency and on humanitarian problems. We of course recognize that humanitarian questions are almost inextricably intertwined with political questions. But the latter are specific subjects of debate in other forums, both in the United Nations and elsewhere.

58. Draft resolution I B, introduced in the Committee by the United States, focuses upon financial matters and clearly calls upon all Governments, as a matter of urgency, to make the most generous efforts possible to meet the needs of UNRWA; it also urges non-contributing Governments to contribute and contributing Governments to consider increasing their contributions. How does this compare with draft resolution I E, introduced in the Committee by Saudi Arabia?

59. The second preambular paragraph of draft resolution I E notes that "many Member States are not in a position to make any contribution" to UNRWA. We believe every Member State should contribute, if only in a modest way, as evidence of its concern for the welfare of the Palestinian refugees—a concern which we think is almost universally shared.

60. The third preambular paragraph of draft resolution I E notes that "many States, instead of contributing to the budget of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees in the Near East, prefer to extend direct aid to the Palestinian refugees". We have no disagreement with those who provide direct humanitarian aid; we do so ourselves. But no matter how laudable this may be, it should not excuse such donors from a moral obligation to join in a common United Nations cause, the financial support of UNRWA. Again, only a modest sum is necessary, as further measurable evidence of their concern for the Organization itself.

61. Support for UNRWA, as in the case of other United Nations organs, must come from the voluntary contributions of Member States. Over the years my Government has contributed voluntarily, willingly, well over half UNRWA's funds, and we have again made a large pledge this year. We ask only that others share in this support in accordance with their means.

62. Draft resolution I E can be of no help to UNRWA. It encourages others not to give and asks those already giving the most to give more. This strange draft resolution poses the very grave danger that over-all financial support will be decreased rather than increased. We hope that this is not the intent of the draft resolution, but our analysis of it leads us to that conclusion.

63. Those genuinely concerned about the financial well-being of UNRWA have already expressed their intention of supporting draft resolution I B. We hope that every delegation which supports it will urge its Government to make a generous contribution to the Agency's budget needs. We hope that each delegation which votes for draft resolution I B and shows genuine concern for UNRWA will continue to express that concern by voting "No" on this mysterious draft resolution purporting to be an appeal to help UNRWA, which it is not. We will vote "No" on draft resolution I E because we genuinely desire to help UNRWA, and we urge others who are similarly concerned about the well-being of UNRWA, and therefore of the Palestinian people, also to cast negative votes.

64. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania): In discussing the plight of the Palestinian people and the prob-

lems confronting the refugees, Tanzania has always maintained that the basic issue is the acquisition by the people of Palestine of their inalienable and natural rights. Those rights have been flagrantly violated—violently violated—by Israel. Certain States, like the United States of America and some others in the geographical group mentioned in the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution I E, have taken action and manifested interests that are against the interests of the people of Palestine. For that reason my delegation, while it will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions before us, cannot associate itself with the fifth preambular paragraph of resolution I E and will not participate in the vote on the amendment contained in document A/L.716.

65. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now proceed to vote on the draft resolutions recommended by the Special Political Committee in paragraph 36 of document A/9372.

66. I put to the vote first draft resolution I A.

Draft resolution I A was adopted by 122 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 3089 A (XXVIII)).

67. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now vote on draft resolution I B.

Draft resolution I B was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 3 abstentions (resolution 3089 B (XXVIII)).

68. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now vote on draft resolution I C. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Barbados, Costa Rica, Israel, Nicaragua.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Iceland, Khmer Republic, Malawi, Portugal, United States of America, Venezuela.

Draft resolution I C was adopted by 110 votes to 4, with 12 abstentions (resolution 3089 C (XXVIII)).

69. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We shall now proceed to vote on draft resolution I D. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala,¹ Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Barbados, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Israel, Nicaragua, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Draft resolution I D was adopted by 87 votes to 6, with 33 abstentions (resolution 3089 D (XXVIII)).

70. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We turn next to draft resolution I E. In accordance with the rules of procedure, I shall put to the vote first the amendment contained in document A/L.716. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Sudan, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Sweden, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia,

Zambia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Canada, Central African Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Khmer Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Spain.

Against: Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Algeria, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Iraq, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Mauritania, Mongolia, Oman, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia.

Abstaining: Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Zaire, Afghanistan, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Fiji, Guyana, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka.

The amendment was adopted by 64 votes to 28, with 28 abstentions.

71. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will now proceed to vote on draft resolution I E as amended. I call on the representative of Iraq, who wishes to speak on a point related to the voting.

72. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq): I should like to request that a separate vote be taken on the fifth paragraph of the preamble of draft resolution I E.

73. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now put to the vote the fifth paragraph, as amended, of the preamble to draft resolution I E. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Bahrain, Barbados, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jordan, Liberia, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon,

¹ The delegation of Guatemala subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as an abstention.

Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire.

The fifth paragraph of the preamble to draft resolution I E, as amended, was adopted by 35 votes to 20, with 62 abstentions.

74. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution I E as a whole as amended.

Draft resolution I E as a whole as amended was adopted by 81 votes to 3, with 41 abstentions (resolution 3089 E (XXVIII)).

75. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We turn now to draft resolution II. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/9391. I now put draft resolution II to the vote.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 125 votes to none (resolution 3090 (XXVIII)).

76. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to explain their votes after the voting.

77. Mr. TALEB-BENDIAB (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation voted in favour of resolution I B.

78. As we did in the Special Political Committee, we should like now to state our reservations on some of the provisions of this resolution. Paragraph 1 does not mention the main responsibility borne by Israel because of its obstructionist policy with regard to resolution 194 (III), directed at compensating the refugees or restoring their homes to them.

79. We also have reservations because this resolution does not take account of the need to restore the rights of the Palestine peoples, which have been reaffirmed on many occasions by our Organization. We consider that the refugee problem is essentially a political one and, for that reason, only the restoration of the lawful rights of the Palestinian peoples would constitute the basis for a just and lasting solution to this problem.

80. My delegation wishes these reservations to be included in the record of this meeting.

81. Mr. DORON (Israel): I do not need to explain the voting of my delegation on draft resolutions I A, B, C and D, and draft resolution II contained of document A/9372. We

made our views on these drafts abundantly clear in the Special Political Committee and I reaffirm them now. I wish, however, to say a few words on draft resolution I E.

82. The professed objective of that resolution is to call on certain States to increase their respective contributions to UNRWA. It is ironic, and indeed grotesque, that in these very days the same Arab States whose income from oil is measured in countless thousands of millions, and who for cynical reasons do not contribute to UNRWA anything in proportion to their fabulous wealth, dare call on others to increase their payments to UNRWA while at the same time they engage in large-scale economic warfare by blackmail against many parts of the world. That is why my delegation voted against draft resolution I E.

83. Mr. PONCE (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The votes cast by my delegation in favour of the draft resolutions relate to the statements made in those drafts that enshrine principles previously defended by Ecuador in this forum as well as in other international forums, but do not entail a commitment of acceptance of all the assertions made in the operative paragraphs of those draft resolutions that are detrimental to one of the parties involved in the conflict.

84. Mr. AL-SAYEGH (Kuwait): In explanation of our votes, particularly on draft resolutions I B and I D, I would very briefly reiterate the understanding of my delegation of the vital provisions contained in them, an understanding which my delegation has placed on record at greater length in the Special Political Committee.

85. We understand the references in both resolution I B and resolution I D to resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948 to mean that the return of the Palestinian refugees to their homes and property is recognized by the General Assembly as an inherent and inalienable right. We understand by that resolution also, and therefore we understand by the references to that resolution in draft resolutions I B and D, which we have just voted for, that such return must be: (a) subject only to the choice of the refugee himself, for it is his choice between repatriation and compensation that determines whether he returns or does not return—subject only to his own choice; (b) a matter of right and not a matter of sufferance by anybody; (c) in the capacity of a full citizen with full rights and not as a second class subjugated citizen; and (d) with the rights of the refugee guaranteed by the United Nations, as stipulated in section C of part I of resolution 181 (II), in consequence of which he was displaced from his home.

86. Furthermore, we understand from paragraph 3 of draft resolution I D, which has just been adopted, that the return of the Palestinian refugee to his home, in the manner I have just described, is (a) indispensable for a just settlement of the refugee problem, (b) a prerequisite for the attainment by the Palestinian people of its right to self-determination, and (c) a prerequisite for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East as a whole.

87. In view of the delicate period through which the Middle East is passing today, my delegation finds it extremely important to underline its understanding of the meaning of

resolution 194 (III), adopted by the United Nations a quarter of a century ago, and of the resolutions that we have adopted this morning.

88. Mr. SHARAF (Jordan): The Assembly has just adopted several draft resolutions recommended by the Special Political Committee stemming from the report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA. My delegation had urged and worked for their support and approval by the Assembly. Failure to redress the injustice inflicted upon the Palestinian Arabs several decades ago has not only compounded the Palestinian grievance, but has also sown the seeds of inevitable and recurrent confrontation in the area.

89. When UNRWA was set up almost a quarter of a century ago, the fundamental assumption was that a temporary *ad hoc* relief operation would be carried out pending the implementation of pertinent United Nations resolutions, particularly paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III), enabling the repatriation of the Palestinian refugees to their homes and their homelands, which is their birthright as well as the universal will of the community of nations. The various resolutions, therefore, reaffirm, explicitly or in spirit, the urgency of implementing the right for the Palestinians. It is part and parcel of the right of self-determination for the Palestinian people recognized by the Charter and successive resolutions.

90. The report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA reminds us, moreover, that with the continued Israeli military occupation of the west bank of the Jordan, the Gaza Strip and part of the Golan Heights in Syria, the vast majority of the refugees and the people newly displaced from these territories since 1967 are still unable to return. I would wish to add that as of now the total number of displaced persons from the west bank and the Gaza Strip presently residing in East Jordan approximates 400,000 people. The new displaced persons from the war of 1967 should be immediately repatriated, in accordance with their inalienable rights and the successive resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

91. The report of the Commissioner-General also indicated that the total number of refugees registered with the Agency as of 30 June 1973 was 1,540,694. The figure is significant not only because it gives a definitive description of the magnitude of the problem, but also because it is an answer to the Israeli allegations over the years that the existence of a substantial refugee population was a myth and a hoax. Of the total number, only a little over 50 per cent are receiving United Nations assistance. The limitation of funds also threatens to paralyse the educational programme and the whole operation of UNRWA. This serious problem requires an urgent and adequate solution by the international community.

92. My delegation is satisfied that the resolutions before the Assembly were adopted. We hope that serious action will be taken to put their content and their basic philosophy into effect.

93. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We turn now to the report of the Special Political Committee on agenda item 44 [A/9373].

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Special Political Committee.

94. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The draft resolution recommended by the Special Political Committee in paragraph 7 of its report was adopted unanimously in the Committee. May I take it that the General Assembly also adopts it unanimously?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 3091 (XXVIII)).

95. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We turn now to the report of the Special Political Committee on agenda item 45 [A/9374].

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Special Political Committee.

96. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

97. Mr. DORON (Israel): Another year has passed and the General Assembly is again called upon to vote in connexion with the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories. But this time we have been presented with two draft resolutions instead of the usual one. Draft resolution A in document A/9374 is completely uncalled for. It is well known, and this has been confirmed many times by the International Committee of the Red Cross, that Israel has always respected, and continues to respect, the principles of the fourth Geneva Convention. It is also a matter of record that we have certain legal reservations on the question of the applicability of that Convention to the administered areas.

98. No endeavours by anybody are required to ensure respect for and compliance with the provisions of the Convention in those areas. The conditions obtaining there speak for themselves and prove that all the human rights of the population are fully observed and respected. The draft resolution is, therefore, utterly unnecessary and my delegation will not support it.

99. I now come to draft resolution B in the same document, purportedly based on the report of the Special Committee. In the detailed statement of my delegation in the Special Political Committee at its 890th meeting on 19 November 1973, and in our subsequent statements in the Committee, we have dealt with and refuted all the allegations made in the report, as well as all the tendentious and fanciful charges directed at us by a number of delegations in the course of the debate.

100. On the present occasion I would, therefore, like to devote particular attention to some salient features of draft resolution B in document A/9374, which are typical of the reprehensible approach of the sponsors of the resolution.

101. As pointed out by the Special Committee in its latest report, resolution 3005 (XXVII) of the General Assembly for the first time expressly referred to three additional sub-

jects for investigation by the Committee, namely, the alleged

“(c) . . . exploitation and the looting of the resources of the occupied territories; . . .

“(e) . . . pillaging of the archaeological and cultural heritage of the occupied territories; . . .

“(f) . . . interference in the freedom of worship in the holy places of the occupied territories”.

It was quite obvious at the time, and has become absolutely clear by now, that the only purpose of including these additional allegations in resolution 3005 (XXVII) was to provide the Special Committee with few more headings under which it could group some more baseless findings and conclusions.

102. Well, it goes without saying that the Special Committee gladly obliged. But even that Committee was unable to come up with anything substantive and substantiated, and any unprejudiced reader of its report [*A/9148 and Add. I*] will be left with the inescapable impression that the Committee, having set out on its annual fishing expedition, has returned with an empty basket and no catch, but with what are known as “fishermen’s tales”.

103. Anybody who cares to scrutinize the report will himself reach the unavoidable conclusion that it is a paper made up of preconceived ideas, irrelevant assertions, baseless allegations, selective quotations and so-called “findings” which have no foundation whatever and which, more often than not, have in fact no connexion with what the Committee dares call “evidence”. But let me make some observations on the draft resolution.

104. The technique of the sponsors of the draft resolution is to transpose these fanciful “findings” into the text of the draft resolution and then to express grave concern, or another synonym for it, at whatever the Special Committee has decided to impute to Israel, even when there is nothing in the report itself to support the contents of the draft resolution.

105. Let me give this meeting a few examples to illustrate this malpractice.

106. Paragraph 3 (g) of the draft resolution would have the General Assembly express its grave concern at what it terms “the pillaging of archaeological and cultural property in the occupied territories”.

107. Now, paragraph 124 of the report of the Special Committee mentions resolution 3005 (XXVII) as having indicated this as a subject for the Committee’s investigation. Twelve paragraphs later, the Committee duly expresses its opinion that the evidence available to it establishes the fact that:

“. . . the occupying Power has taken, and is taking, measures contrary to the Hague Convention inasmuch as these measures amount to acts of disposal of property over which the occupying Power has acquired no right.” [*A/9148, para. 136.*]

108. But on reading paragraphs 125 to 135—namely, those lying between the opening of that chapter and those conclusions—one searches in vain for the slightest indication of any pillaging of the archaeological and cultural heritage of the occupied territories. In those paragraphs there are quotations from letters to the Secretary-General, there is a recital of actions taken by UNESCO, but there is absolutely nothing—but nothing—which anybody who had not made up his mind in advance could conceivably call evidence of pillaging.

109. Furthermore, the Committee notes that there is lack of agreement on the interpretation of the Hague Convention and that its implementation is seriously hampered by this fact. But the Committee is not hampered by the absence of a shred of evidence of “pillaging”.

110. Yet that is what the Committee was asked to investigate, and findings based on thin air are made, and conclusions based on something even more unsubstantive are drawn, and grave concern is expressed in the draft resolution over something that does not exist.

111. The same is true in respect of the other matters contained in paragraph 3 over which the sponsors would have the General Assembly express its “grave concern”.

112. The draft resolution as a whole shows utter recklessness, complete irresponsibility and open contempt for the intelligence of the representatives of the States Members of the United Nations on the part of the sponsors.

113. Just one or two examples of this approach of “anything goes” should suffice to show what absurdities this approach produces:

114. Paragraph 2 (c) of resolution 3005 (XXVII) “strongly” called on Israel to rescind and desist from all policies and practices such as “the destruction and demolition of villages, quarters and houses”, and paragraph 8 (d) of that resolution referred, for good measure probably, to the alleged destruction of houses and towns.

115. The present report quotes in paragraph 30 the Committee’s own letter of 1 March 1973, in which it mentioned paragraph 8 of resolution 3005 (XXVII), but nowhere does the report contain a single word on the alleged destruction of towns, villages, quarters or houses. There is some oblique reference to—and of course criticism of—the construction of security roads in the Gaza Strip, but absolutely nothing about the alleged destruction of towns, villages, quarters or houses. Yet the present draft resolution, undaunted and unaffected by the fact that even the report has nothing to say on the subject, desires in paragraph 3 (c) that the General Assembly should express its grave concern over the destruction of Arab houses, quarters, villages and towns.

116. This lighthearted approach is highly inappropriate in the context of a subject like human rights, and if the General Assembly is to vote on a draft resolution, something more solid and less flippant and frivolous should be demanded.

117. Just as is the case with the report of the Committee, so the draft resolution cannot stand up to any serious

examination, but this does not seem to matter in the least to the sponsors, who know that they are assured of a numerical majority and do not care in the slightest degree about the veracity, or at least the semblance of veracity, of the contents of the draft.

118. Similarly, there is nothing in the report to justify grave concern or any degree of concern as asserted in paragraph 3 (f) of the draft resolution, in respect of alleged "Administrative detention and ill-treatment inflicted on the Arab inhabitants". There is a rehash of some earlier allegations, in accordance with the technique—which the Committee indulges in and which I already exposed last year—of repeating itself, of treating any kind of unproved assertion as a fact, of basing generalized sweeping statements on some allegation of an isolated incident and then of drawing conclusions that lack the minimal foundation and justification.

119. Such was also the system used in connexion with the chapter on the alleged "interference with religious freedom, religious practices and family rights and customs", which, of course, is reflected in paragraph 3 (h) of the draft resolution.

120. As pointed out last year, this is a particularly obnoxious charge, and it stands out in its maliciousness and has nothing to support it.

121. I believe that the examples I have adduced suffice to illustrate the completely unacceptable and improper approach manifested by the sponsors of this draft resolution, which even exceeds the distortions and misrepresentations committed by the Special Committee in its report.

122. We all know how that Special Committee was decided upon and set up. Grave doubts exist as to the legality of the procedures involved. Grave doubts have been expressed concerning its mandate, which clearly prejudged the issue. But no doubts exist concerning the lack of impartiality of its members, both individually and as representatives of the particular States from which they come. And no doubts exist as to the intentions and interests of the supporters of the Committee.

123. The present baseless and misleading draft resolution is the best proof of these evil intentions, exemplified in, among others, paragraphs 6 and 8 of the draft. It contributes nothing to the present, intensified quest for peace in the area.

124. My delegation rejects this draft in its entirety and will vote against it.

125. Mr. NANDAN (Fiji): My delegation, which did not participate in the voting in the Special Political Committee on the two draft resolutions now contained in document A/9374, has decided to vote in favour of both the draft resolutions in the plenary Assembly.

126. We have no difficulty in supporting draft resolution A, as it essentially requests full compliance with the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949.

127. We should like to explain, however, that our support for draft resolution B is based on our understanding that this draft generally endorses the spirit of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). Our support for draft resolution B, however, must not be construed as necessarily an endorsement of that text in every particular. We do believe that some elements of fact and some of the allegations in the draft resolution may be difficult to substantiate, and on that account there may be some basis of objection to their inclusion. The tone of the draft resolution itself may not be helpful in promoting the necessary dialogue towards a solution of the wider problem in the area. However, in our view, the main objective of the draft resolution is to seek compliance with the provisions of Security Council resolution 242 (1967).

128. My delegation considers the implementation of that Security Council resolution, in all its parts, by all the parties concerned, to be a sound basis for the restoration of peace and the prevention of future hostilities in the area.

129. Mr. SHARAF (Jordan): The Assembly is considering and will soon vote on two necessary draft resolutions on Israeli violations of human rights in the occupied territories.

130. My delegation voted for and actively worked for their adoption in the Committee. The draft resolutions emphasize the applicability and provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949.

131. One of them—draft resolution B—defines the areas of violation of human rights committed by Israel in the Arab territories under occupation since June 1967. It calls upon the occupying Power to desist immediately from such practices, and reaffirms the right of the inhabitants of the occupied territories to international protection and support.

132. May I say here that it is necessary for this Assembly and the United Nations to extend their protection to the people under occupation against the excesses of the occupying Power, but the first duty of the United Nations is to end the occupation. However, the survival and elemental welfare of our people in the occupied areas are most urgent considerations. So is the survival of the occupied areas against physical and demographic mutilation. If their integrity is not ensured, we shall have lost any objective basis for any future peace in the area. And here, in the physical and demographic integrity of the occupied areas, lies the central issue and the point of departure for any appraisal or protective effort.

133. In my delegation's detailed statements in the Committee we spoke in detail of the other violations of human rights, such as interference with religious freedom and the mutilation of cultural institutions and monuments of cultural significance, as well as violations of political rights. The most immediate danger is, however, the present policy of the occupation authorities of settling and gradually absorbing the occupied areas. Such a policy finds expression in different forms and actions, the most visible of them being the establishment of Israeli settlements in the occupied Arab lands. That policy is being carried out in the Gaza Strip, the west bank of the Jordan, the Golan Heights and

the Sinai Peninsula, while the Arab city of Jerusalem is the most direct victim of the Israeli annexationist policy. In the Holy City, construction work is continuing on confiscated Arab land inside and outside the walls of the city to build at least 13 Israeli quarters over the ruins of Arab quarters and villages and in pursuance of Israel's declared policy of annexing occupied Jerusalem. The location of those new Israeli quarters extends over all of Arab Jerusalem. The Arab-owned hills surrounding the city have already been taken over, thus cutting off the Arab population of Jerusalem from their compatriots in the rest of the occupied west bank of the Jordan. In the meantime, the limits of annexed Jerusalem have been expanded to constitute a substantial part of the West Bank extending to the north, the east and the south of the city and to include an expanding number of towns and villages.

134. Those most radical changes in the physical, demographic and cultural composition of the Holy City aim at the systematic strangulation of its Arab inhabitants and the gradual elimination of the city's Arab identity. If Jerusalem has been subject to this mortal danger, all of the occupied areas are witnessing the continuing threat of loss of national character. The occupying Power has been frantically planting settlements in the various parts of the occupied territories. Nearly 50 settlements have so far been established in the west bank of the Jordan, the Golan Heights, Gaza and Sinai. With the rapid emergence of those agricultural, industrial, military settlements—all inhabited by Israelis—the physical and demographic character of the occupied areas is being systematically eroded. It is a process of national replacement, much more fearful, radical and basic than the traditionally known violations of human rights of people under conventional occupation.

135. Peace can only be based on the full integrity of the West Bank, including Arab Jerusalem, and of Gaza and the Syrian Heights, and on the full deliverance of those occupied territories from occupation.

136. The whole thrust of Israeli policies towards the occupied areas is the systematic integration of those areas into the Israeli economy and the squeezing-out of the largest possible economic gain from the occupation. Israel came to a prosperous and healthy economy in the occupied territories, particularly the west bank of the Jordan. Israel is now absorbing and exploiting that prosperous and healthy economy. As the Special Committee has said, it is "a policy and a situation which conforms to the classic pattern of colonial economic dominance and exploitation."

137. If Israel has not spared the physical environment of the people it now rules by force, it has not spared the people themselves the agonies of major dislocation. Over half a million Arabs from the occupied territories had to flee the area of hostilities in 1967. East Jordan received some 400,000 displaced persons. Despite repeated calls on Israel by the Security Council and the General Assembly to allow the displaced persons back into their areas of residence prior to the hostilities, Israel has turned a deaf ear. So Israeli policy in the occupied territories involves a clear and distinct violation of human rights. But what is more serious is that it constitutes a clear and distinct threat to the national identity and natural historic character of the people and the area they have inhabited for many centuries.

138. Nothing can radically alter the situation except an end to the occupation. In the meantime, the issue of the inhabitants of the occupied territories must remain alive and must command world attention. The Assembly will do well to adopt draft resolutions highlighting the plight of the inhabitants of the occupied territories, the danger to the integrity of their homeland and the need for remedial action through the strictly observed application of the fourth Geneva Convention of August 1949.

139. It is necessary to renew the mandate of the Special Committee investigating Israeli practices in the occupied territories, for it is a United Nations Committee that is keeping the Assembly and world informed of developments in the occupied territories. That must continue until Israel ends its occupation of the Arab territories in their totality.

140. Mr. AL-SAYEGH (Kuwait): My delegation spoke in some detail during the meetings of the Special Political Committee both about the report of the Special Committee and also about the two draft resolutions that eventually emerged, with very large majorities, from the discussions of the Special Committee, which in its report now recommends them to the General Assembly for adoption.

141. The first of the two recommended draft resolutions, draft resolution A, is not only aimed at ensuring the application of the Geneva Convention in the occupied Arab territories. It is in fact a pronouncement to ensure the integrity of the international system, because, as a famous and eminent American judge—a Jewish American judge—wrote a quarter of a century ago, "If one man is allowed to determine for himself what is law, every man can, and that means first chaos and then tyranny."

142. Similarly, if every State can determine unilaterally and for itself when an instrument of international law to which it is a party applies and when it does not apply, then other States can do so, and the result will be first chaos and then tyranny and war.

143. This draft resolution is not uncalled for. This draft resolution is a reprimand to Israel's allegation that the Geneva Convention does not apply to the occupied Arab territories, or that—and in effect this means the same thing—Israel has unspecified reservations about the applicability of the Convention, reservations which it was asked in the Special Committee and in the Sixth Committee to explain but about which it has never given either Committee the benefit of an explanation. When Israel says that it has reservations about the applicability of the law, which itself says that it applies in all circumstances of occupation, then Israel is in effect rejecting the applicability of the law; and by affirming the applicability of the law the General Assembly is rejecting Israel's rejection and reprimanding Israel for purporting to be the unilateral arbiter of when law should apply and when it should not apply. This is the import of draft resolution A, and any vote for draft resolution A means a rejection in principle of Israel's position on the question of the applicability of the Geneva Convention to the occupied territories.

144. My delegation believes that those who vote for draft resolution A and are States parties to the Convention and

are in a position to influence Israel's judgement must, in accordance with operative paragraph 3, use their best endeavours to prevail upon Israel to acknowledge its obligations under the law and, having acknowledged them, to comply with them.

145. As far as draft resolution B is concerned, my delegation has supported it, and will support it in the vote that will soon take place here, as a draft resolution that above everything else upholds the integrity of the Special Committee in the occupied territories. All the remarks made by the representatives of Israel during the debate in the Special Political Committee casting doubt on the impartiality or the integrity of the investigating Committee are repudiated by the vote of the Special Political Committee, and, we trust, will be by the vote of this Assembly, on the draft resolution which, among other things, in operative paragraph 1 commends the Special Committee for its efforts in performing the tasks assigned to it by the General Assembly.

146. Israel's opposition to the Special Committee is not caused by the composition of that Committee—as the record of Israel shows with regard to its opposition to any other investigating body established by the United Nations. Israel opposed other investigating bodies even before it knew the identity of their components. What Israel opposes is the principle of international supervision, and not one or another given body of one composition or another. The dialogue between the Ambassador of Honduras and the representative of Israel just before the vote in the Special Political Committee was indicative of the truth of this conclusion, which my delegation had reached before that dialogue.

147. All the charges against Israel contained in draft resolution B before us are based not only on evidence which the Special Committee has laboriously, patiently, painstakingly, scrupulously and judiciously amassed and analysed and from which it has drawn its conclusions, but also on additional evidence furnished by several delegations during the debate in the Special Political Committee, evidence which has received only one reply from the representative of Israel—blanket rejection and blanket denial.

148. My delegation believes that life would be too comfortable if it were possible and acceptable for one person or one Government, when confronted with overwhelming evidence about its wrongdoing, to vindicate itself by the simple strategy of saying "All this evidence is not true", without even taking the trouble of showing why it is not true.

149. I hope that in the vote we shall soon be taking we shall, by supporting draft resolution B, not only vindicate the Special Committee and uphold our faith in its integrity and judiciousness, but also repudiate the refusal of Israel to account for its actions internationally, a refusal it insists upon despite the fact that it is bound by international law to make such an accounting.

150. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now put to the vote draft resolution A recommended by the Special Political Committee in paragraph 14 of document A/9374. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Bolivia, Costa Rica, Israel, Malawi, Nicaragua.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 120 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 3092 A (XXVIII)).

151. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): We turn now to draft resolution B. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/9392. I now put draft resolution B to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Barbados, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Israel, Nicaragua, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 90 votes to 7, with 27 abstentions (resolution 3092 B (XXVIII)).

152. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Ecuador, who wishes to speak in explanation of his vote.

153. Mr. PONCE (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation has voted in favour of the draft resolutions relating to item 45, but I should like to state that the scope and meaning of our vote on draft resolution B must be construed in the light of what we said in explaining our vote on the draft resolutions which were voted on under agenda item 43.

The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.